

Exhibit 5

DATE: October 8, 2025
TO: Lisa Foster, City of Alameda
FROM: Jimmy Jessup and David Parisi, Parametrix
SUBJECT: Community Input Summary
PROJECT NAME: Gibbons Dr/High St/Fernside Blvd Safety Updates

Engagement Overview

The Gibbons Dr/High St/Fernside Blvd Safety Updates Project conducted public engagement to present results of the [intersection analysis report](#) that evaluated three proposed alternative concepts for intersection improvement. Over the course of September 2025, the project team undertook the following engagement efforts with community:

- 9/22/2025-10/5/2025: Gibbons/High/Fernside online survey (373 responses)
- 9/25/2025: [Community Open House](#) (approximately 120 attendees)
- 9/30/2025: [Virtual Workshop](#) ([video](#), 33 attendees)

The team took these steps to inform the community about input opportunities:

- Public outreach postcards (1,256 addresses)
- Email bulletins (5 email bulletins sent starting September 2025, plus earlier bulletins sent as part of the Fernside Traffic Calming & Bikeways Project)
- Direct emails to school and HOA representatives

This memorandum summarizes the responses and feedback received through the online survey, community open house, and virtual workshop. A collection of all received written feedback from the free response online survey questions, community open house comment cards, virtual workshop questions, and received emails is provided as a separate comment compendium.

Online Survey


Parametrix conducted an online survey between September 22 and October 5, receiving 373 responses. The survey gathered community input on safety, traffic, and mobility at the Gibbons Avenue, High Street, and Fernside Boulevard intersection, and informed the long-term planning for Fernside Boulevard.

This survey provided an opportunity for people to give their input, instead of or in addition to attending workshops or sending emails. It is an additional tool to collect feedback from engaged community members, and it is not statistically significant.




Travel Frequency by Mode at the Gibbons/High/Fernside Intersection

Most respondents report traveling through the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection by car, with 34% doing so daily and another 27% four to six times per week. Walking is also common, with 16% walking daily and over two-thirds doing so at least once per week. Biking is less frequent, as 55% bike less than once per week, while bus use is rare, with 75% riding less than once weekly. A small share (about 2%) reported using other modes daily.



Respondent Location / Place of Residence

About 12% of respondents reside on Gibbons Drive, while most respondents (64%) live on other streets within the area bounded by Central Avenue, Broadway, High Street, and Fernside Boulevard. The remainder of respondents live either elsewhere in Alameda (23%), or outside of of Alameda (1%).




Analysis 1: Intersection Safety and Operations

The next section of the survey focused on the analysis of the Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard intersection, asking respondents about its current safety and operations. Questions in this section were related to the intersection, with neighborhood-wide effects addressed later in the survey.

Intersection Challenges


Respondents were given the opportunity to identify their three most challenging issues at the intersection. The most frequently cited issues were high auto speeds (44%) and intersection complexity or confusion (42%). Concerns about pedestrian safety (38%) and bicyclist safety (28%) were also notable. 34% of all respondents reported no or only minor issues at the intersection.

Only 2% of Gibbons Drive residents reported no or minor issues at the intersection, compared to 47% of residents on other neighborhood streets.



Safety and Accessibility Issues

The most significant safety and accessibility concerns were speeds from the High Street Bridge (40%), general speeding (36%), and vehicle conflicts at turns (31%), indicating that traffic speed management and vehicle turning conflicts are the primary identified issues.



Additional comments on challenges at the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection

- Respondents were largely divided: some cited frequent speeding and confusion; others said they've never experienced safety issues.
- Many respondents described confusion at the intersection, particularly for drivers turning from Gibbons onto High Street, citing unclear signals and driver hesitation.
- Commenters who thought the intersection had safety issues noted the need for improvements such as clearer signage, protected crosswalks, and traffic calming to reduce speeding from the High Street Bridge.
- Several residents favored removing the right-turn slip lane and adding crosswalks or a roundabout for improved pedestrian and bike safety.
- Multiple comments urged better enforcement and signal timing instead of full redesigns.


Design Alternatives

Safety Comparison – Alternative A

Among all respondents, 42% believed that Alternative A would make safety much better or better, 48% said safety would get much worse or worse, and 8% felt there would be no difference.

Compared to all respondents, Gibbons Avenue residents viewed Alternative A much more favorably – 81% felt it would be better, while only 13% thought it would be worse. By comparison, residents of nearby neighborhood streets were more critical, with 26% saying that safety would be better and 61% saying it would be worse.


Other Alameda residents tended to align more with Gibbons Avenue residents, with 65% saying safety would get better and 30% saying it would be worse, suggesting a divide in opinion between those living directly on Gibbons or elsewhere in Alameda, compared with those living in the surrounding neighborhood.



Safety Comparison – Alternative B & C

Overall, 45% of respondents preferred maintaining the left turn from Gibbons Drive onto High Street, even if it leads to more congestion, while 29% supported restricting the left turn to prevent backups. Another 13% said they need more information, and 13% selected other responses.

Compared to the overall group, Gibbons Avenue residents showed strong support for restricting the left turn (59%), with only 13% wanting to maintain it. In contrast, residents of nearby neighborhood streets were more likely to favor keeping the left turn (60%), while only 15% supported restrictions. Other Alameda residents also leaned toward restrictions (54%) over maintaining the turn (20%), indicating differing priorities between those living on Gibbons and those in surrounding areas.



Other comments on the intersection safety and operations analysis

- Respondents were split on the credibility of the analysis — some agreed with the congestion and safety findings, while many questioned its data accuracy and objectivity.
- Supporters of Alternative A emphasized that speeding, confusion, and long pedestrian crossings justify action.
- Supporters of Alternative B and C suggested that traffic projections and congestion claims were overstated, with some noting minimal observed backups.
- Several commenters suggested implementing simple measures first — such as speed cameras, signage, or minor signal adjustments — before major reconstruction.
- Residents raised concerns that left-turn restrictions would worsen safety on other narrow streets.
- Some respondents mentioned the need for additional data on collision, pedestrian volumes, and comparisons with other intersections in the City.

Section 2. Neighborhood Traffic

The next section of the survey focused on overall traffic conditions within the area bounded by Central Avenue, Broadway, High Street, and Fernside Boulevard. It presented findings on how the turn restriction in Alternative A could affect neighborhood traffic, noting that Alternatives B and C were not analyzed since they do not include this restriction.

Top Issues on Neighborhood streets

In response to the question “What do you think are the top issues on neighborhood streets today?” the most common neighborhood concerns were vehicle speeds on neighborhood streets other than Gibbons Drive (53%), intersection safety at nearby locations (47%), and speeds on Gibbons Drive (45%).


Additional issues included sidewalk conditions (33%) and cut-through traffic (31%), while fewer respondents cited parking (4%) or reported no major issues (11%).

Neighborhood Traffic Projections

This survey section presented neighborhood traffic projections and asked the question: “Alternative A would decrease traffic going northbound on Gibbons Drive and increase it on neighboring streets including Southwood, Bayo Vista, and Cornell Drive. The new traffic would still be relatively low and similar to other local streets in Alameda. What do you think of this change?”

Overall, 57% of respondents said the turn restriction of Alternative A and resulting increase of traffic on other neighborhood streets was not acceptable. Only 20% of Gibbons residents and 29% of residents elsewhere in Alameda shared that view.

Overall, 40% of respondents said the turn restriction would be acceptable on its own or acceptable if constructed with neighborhood traffic calming, while 78% of Gibbons residents favored these options.



Traffic Calming Measures

Respondents were asked which traffic calming features would be desired in the study area. The most preferred traffic calming measures were:

- Speed humps on Gibbons Drive (58%)
- New marked crosswalks (58%)
- Neighborhood traffic circles or roundabouts at major intersections (54%)
- Speed humps on other neighborhood streets (34%)
- Other measures (9%)

Other comments on traffic diversion and neighborhood traffic calming

- Many respondents opposed diverting Gibbons traffic to smaller neighborhood streets, citing narrow widths and poor visibility, and forecasting severe congestion and safety issues.
- Some reiterated that Gibbons should carry most traffic due to its width and historical function as a connector street.
- Supporters of traffic calming favored speed humps, raised crosswalks, and traffic circles at key intersections (Northwood/Southwood/Gibbons, Bayo Vista, Cornell).
- A group of respondents supported diversion if accompanied by comprehensive traffic calming and roundabouts to ensure slower speeds throughout the neighborhood.
- Several called for all-way stops at neighborhood intersections, better enforcement, speed cameras, and clearer signage rather than structural changes.
- Some respondents suggested delaying Gibbons changes until surrounding street safety improvements are in place.
- Others stressed urgent need for calming on High Street and Fernside, with many calling them the true speed corridors.


Section 3: Project Timing

This section of the survey presented potential options for when safety improvements could be implemented in coordination with other efforts, including the 2026 paving program, 2028 paving program, or after 2030 along with the larger Fernside Boulevard Project.

Overall, 35% of respondents said the updates are not needed at all and 60% selected a timeframe. The latter were evenly split on the level of urgency, with 20% of respondents favoring safety improvements in 2026, 20% in 2028, and 20% in 2030+.

Among residents of nearby neighborhood streets, 45% of respondents said the updates are not needed at all and 50% selected a timeframe. A larger proportion favored a longer timeframe without urgency: 11% of respondents favored safety improvements in 2026, 14% in 2028, and 25% in 2030+.

In contrast, Gibbons Avenue residents expressed a much stronger sense of urgency — 57% said improvements should happen in 2026, 28% favored 2028, 4% were comfortable with 2030+, and 9% said the updates are not needed at all.



Comments on phasing recommendations

- Opinions were highly polarized. Some urged quick implementation for safety, while others called the project unnecessary or premature.
- Supporters of early implementation (2026) cited persistent speeding and danger for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Opponents argued there is no urgent safety problem and called the project a waste of funds. Several residents said changes should wait until traffic calming across the entire neighborhood is implemented.
- Others felt the timeline should align with the Fernside Boulevard project for coordination and cost savings.
- A few supported a phased approach — temporary quick-build improvements followed by permanent construction if proven effective.
- Many urged prioritizing cheaper, targeted improvements such as speed humps, stop signs, and signals.

Additional comments on design alternatives, neighborhood traffic analysis, or project timing


The survey closed with a prompt for respondents to offer any further comments on the design alternatives, neighborhood traffic analysis, or project timing. Widespread comments were received, touching on many topics from the study. Themes included:

- Many comments expressed preference against closing or restricting vehicle movements on Gibbons, citing spillover traffic, longer travel times, and risks on smaller streets.
- Many respondents mentioned Alternative C as a moderate, lower-cost solution preserving access while improving safety.
- Supporters of Alternative A emphasized the existing need for improvements, and preferred addressing pedestrian and cyclist safety and reducing confusion at the intersection.
- Some respondents mentioned concerns about data bias, insufficient study of side street impacts, prioritizing this project over higher-need areas of the City, and expressed distrust in the project outreach process.
- Several called for stronger traffic enforcement and better coordination with other citywide safety initiatives.
- Many residents expressed fatigue over repeated studies and urged the City to focus on practical, data-driven improvements.

Section 4: Optional Demographic questions

A majority of survey respondents (51%) reported having school-aged children (18 or under) in their household. Most respondents (74%) were under age 65, while 21% were 65 or older.

Homeownership was high, with 87% of participants owning their homes and only 8% renting. In terms of income, 40% reported household incomes over \$300,000, and another 33% earned between \$150,000 and \$299,999.



Community Open House

The Community Open House was held on Thursday September 25 from 5:30-7:30 PM at City Hall. There were approximately 120 participants in attendance. The agenda featured a presentation from the project team reviewing the project background and goals, traffic study results, and recommendation for improvements at the Gibbons/High/Fernside Intersection, followed by an open house and input session. During the open house, attendees perused project information on existing intersection challenges, intersection safety and operations analysis results, neighborhood traffic analysis, and implementation timing. Project team members were available to converse with attendees, answer questions, and collect input. A large map on a table welcomed participants to offer feedback on what locations and types of traffic calming outlays would improve neighborhood circulation and livability. In addition, input was gathered via Presentation Question Cards and Comment Cards that were available to all participants during the presentation and the open house, respectively.



Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025

Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside




Southwood and Northwood are crazy streets / intersections that currently have near misses. How will they be safer with the proposed plan.

37 Presentation Question Cards and 27 Comment Cards were collected by the end of the Community Open House. Of these, the majority expressed opinions critical of the analysis, of the outreach process, or of the recommended implementation of Alternative A at the intersection, particularly related to the restriction of the left turn from Gibbons onto High Street. Concerns regarding Alternative A centered on the effects of increased volumes of redirected traffic and high vehicle speeds on narrower neighborhood streets. Other concerns

mentioned included noise and air pollution from vehicles traveling through the neighborhood, difficulty of accessing the High Street Bridge, and a desire to explore lower-cost improvement alternatives. Some cards noted existing safety concerns, such as excessive vehicle speeds from the High Street Bridge, poor visibility and sight lines at intersections that make it challenging to cross the street. Many cards emphasized the desire for traffic calming implementation in the neighborhood, with numerous participants noting that Alternative A should not be implemented prior to neighborhood traffic calming. Fewer than 10 cards supported efforts to address the intersection, noting its existing problematic and confusing arrangement.

Over 60 comments were made on the neighborhood traffic calming map, most indicating with sticky note annotations the locations of desired traffic calming treatments in the neighborhood. Streets such as Southwood Drive, Bayo Vista Avenue, and Cambridge Drive received numerous comments about speed humps and marked crosswalks. Numerous locations for neighborhood traffic circles were suggested, including the intersections of Gibbons/Southwood, Southwood/Thompson, and Southwood/Bayo Vista/Fairview.

Other remarks on the map noted consideration for children traveling to and from Edison Elementary school, desire for more stop signs, challenges with turning left onto High Street, and suggestions for traffic calming and improved crossings along High Street.



Virtual Workshop

A Virtual Workshop was held on September 30, 2025 from 12-1 PM on Zoom. There were 33 participants in attendance. The material that was presented at the Community Open House was also presented during this session, followed by a Question & Answer session during which participants typed questions into the Zoom Q&A function.

The Q&A input comments reflect community concern and skepticism regarding the proposed Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection changes. Residents expressed concerns that closing the left turn would divert traffic onto narrower residential streets where children walk and bike to Edison Elementary School, creating new safety hazards rather than solving existing problems. Residents also raised concerns about emergency evacuation access, questioned the timing and sequencing of intersection changes relative to neighborhood traffic calming measures, and challenged the street reclassification of Gibbons Drive and crash history at the intersection that underlies the project rationale. Several procedural and planning concerns were expressed, including requests for clarification on CEQA compliance and criticism of what residents perceived as biased survey questions. Many commenters suggested alternative approaches, including implementing traffic calming measures first before making major intersection changes, adding speed bumps to Gibbons Drive, or reconsidering a smaller roundabout design. While a few residents expressed support for improving intersection safety for pedestrians and cyclists, the general sentiment reflected frustration with what many characterized as a solution that may potentially create more dangerous conditions on smaller residential streets while solving a problem that residents argue has been exaggerated or mischaracterized.

After the presentation, project team members dedicated the remainder of the meeting to directly addressing resident concerns and providing detailed responses to the questions raised. Staff clarified the crash data methodology, explained the rationale for the street reclassification timeline, and discussed the project's phasing strategy, emphasizing that the draft recommendation called for implementing comprehensive neighborhood traffic calming measures concurrent with the intersection reconfiguration of Alternative A. Team members also provided technical explanations regarding the traffic analysis, and how traffic calming would address concerns on neighborhood streets.

Gibbons Dr/High St/Fernside Blvd Safety Updates

Collection of Public Input

Contents

Emailed Input 2

Online Survey Free Responses 16

Virtual Workshop Q&A..... 76

Community Open House Presentation Question Cards and Comment Cards
..... 86

Community Open House Input Regarding Traffic Calming Needs..... 151

Emailed Input

From: Diana Gibson Pace <paces99@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 10:15 AM

To: CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Regarding proposed traffic diversion in Fernside neighborhood

Dear Madame Mayor and City Councilmembers,

I am resending a letter I wrote to you all a few months ago regarding the proposed traffic changes in the Fernside neighborhood. I also attached the videos I referenced in the letters

This proposal seems super political, and I am very unclear on who would actually benefit from these changes.

Diverting traffic from Gibbons will simply increase it on surrounding streets. I encourage you to watch the videos. I would like you to think about what would have happened if a child, or even a dog, happened to be standing there when this happened. And yes, I live RIGHT BY Edison school. Children cross this exact intersection every single day.

I don't have time to go to City Council meetings and spend hours waiting for three minutes to talk. I do think you all have big problems to solve, and I thank you for your service in this capacity. I know that yours can be thankless jobs.

However, this initiative not only does not solve the problems before you, but it's a waste of resources and time.

If you do this and then we experience another traffic death, it will be squarely your responsibility. So I encourage you to think carefully.

Let's calm traffic, not just divert it.

Thank you for your consideration,

Diana Gibson Pace

--

Dear Madame Mayor and City Councilmembers,

I am an Alameda resident and have lived on Cambridge Drive for 25 years.

I am writing about the Fernside Blvd Traffic Calming & Bikeways Project. I was made aware of this by neighbors just this evening. Please note that I have had zero awareness of this before this evening. My awareness came from a neighbors, not the City. I see from the website that attempted outreach is listed, but it certainly wasn't made widely available. Those of us with demanding jobs and children to raise are not studying the city webpages looking for these things.

I have strong concerns about his project, because it will simply divert traffic, not calm it. I have been advocating for traffic calming on Cambridge Drive and our surrounding streets for many years, never with any luck. We advocated for speed bumps, traffic circles and other solutions. We were always turned down.

I had my car totaled in front of my house in June 26th, 2023 by a car going at least 80 miles per hour down Cambridge Drive. My neighbor's car was also totaled in the same accident. The driver was the only car involved and was driving so fast he spun out and wrecked two parked cars. The driver was not even arrested because he claimed a medical condition. If anyone wants to see the video of that, I have it - it was caught on security cameras. It is terrifying when you think how many pedestrians and animals there are in this neighborhood, especially since we are right by Edison school

Additionally, I watched the cars speed past our house in a high speed chase that killed a young man a few years ago on Fernside and Cambridge and literally drove into a resident's house. They drove by our front window as my daughter was playing piano and then we heard the crash. We didn't realize at the time they had killed someone.

The Versailles "traffic calming" has simply diverted additional traffic onto Cambridge Drive and surrounding streets. There are more cars driving faster, and I have witnessed countless people ignoring stop signs and driving through intersections with stop signs at speed.

Diverting traffic from one street to others will not calm traffic. That is what this initiative is attempting to do. Moving problems around doesn't solve them.

I cannot attend the meeting Tuesday because of a work obligation, so I am writing instead. I ask that you please hold on this initiative and make MUCH MORE of an effort to talk to all concerned and do a better job of coming up with a solution that doesn't just shift traffic around to other residential streets. Diverting does not solve the problem.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Diana G. Gibson Pace

1717 Cambridge Drive

Alameda, CA 94501

510-599-5810

Sent from my iPad

From: Aileen <mrs.aileendubois@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 7:51 PM

To: CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Urgent Safety Concerns – Gibbons Dr/High St/Fernside Re-Design and Traffic Diversion Impacting Narrower Side Streets

Dear Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft, City Engineer Scott Wikstrom and Members of the Alameda City Council,

We are writing to express our deep concern about the proposed **Gibbons Drive, High Street, Fernside re-design** and the subsequent diversion of traffic onto nearby residential streets—particularly **Southwood Drive, Bayo Vista Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Fremont Drive, Harvard Drive, Yale Drive and Cornell Drive**.

The streets onto which traffic is proposed to be diverted are narrow neighborhood streets lined with parked cars on both sides, leaving very limited space for two-way traffic to safely navigate. They are **heavily used by pedestrians, school children, cyclists, and families**, especially during school pick-up and drop-off hours, as well as on weekends. Introducing increased through-traffic to these roads would create more overall danger to the community by shifting traffic away from Gibbons and its intersections, which are much better-equipped to handle such flow.

In their current design, the streets onto which traffic is proposed to be diverted:

- **Lack space for two cars to pass safely**, often forcing drivers into confrontational situations or causing them to swerve dangerously close to pedestrians or parked vehicles.
- Have **poor visibility at intersections**, especially when cars are parked close to corners-- and this proposal would result in more traffic turning at multiple intersections.
- See **regular foot and bike traffic**, including children traveling to nearby schools, people walking pets, and seniors accessing local services.

Are **narrower and less direct** than Gibbons.

With traffic being rerouted from Gibbons Drive—an arterial street—onto these much narrower residential roads, the risk of accidents, speeding, and injury rises significantly. This change also

presents serious challenges for emergency vehicle access and routine city services like waste pickup and street sweeping.

We urge you to:

1. **Pause the Gibbons Drive re-route proposal** until a comprehensive impact assessment is completed.
2. **Conduct a traffic safety audit** for the various affected side streets.
3. **Engage directly with local residents** who live the daily reality of these narrow, pedestrian-heavy streets.
4. **Explore alternative solutions** that address traffic concerns without sacrificing neighborhood safety and accessibility. For example, we suggest exploring the use of speed cushions on the areas of Gibbons where most speeding occurs. This could dramatically reduce speeding without reducing arrival time for first responders.

We all value efforts to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion. But this proposal just shifts--and potentially increases--danger from a road that has served as an artery for decades onto side streets that were never designed or intended to serve as arteries.

Thank you for your service and for considering the real-world impact this proposal would have on our community. We welcome the opportunity to engage further on this issue or to attend any upcoming meetings where it will be discussed.

Sincerely,

Chris and Aileen Dubois

Residents, Southwood Drive

Alameda, CA

mrs.aileendubois@gmail.com

925-580-6693

From: Jarrett <jaford622@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 10:19 PM

To: CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Keep Gibbons Drive Open

Dear City Council Members,

As a parent and neighbor, I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to the Gibbons, High, and Fernside intersection. While intended as a safety improvement, the plan would shift heavy traffic onto narrow streets like Yale and Cornell that can barely accommodate one car at a time when parked vehicles line both sides. Forcing more cars through those streets will create new risks for children, pedestrians, and cyclists.

The accident data for the intersection does not justify such a disruptive change. Twenty-two accidents over five years, with most involving improper turns, suggests targeted fixes like clearer

signage or enforcement would be far more effective. Without comparisons to other intersections or consideration of less drastic solutions, the proposal feels premature. I am also concerned about how the plan has been presented. Alternatives are dismissed with alarming language but without supporting evidence, which does not build community trust. This proposal would make our neighborhood less safe and fundamentally alter how it functions. I urge you not to move forward.

Sincerely,
Jarrett Ford

From: Vickie Chan Teng <vchan77@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 12:26 AM
To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concerns around Gibbons Traffic Study and Survey

Dear Mr. Wikstrom,

I hope you're doing well, and appreciate the discussion at City Hall we had over the summer regarding the Gibbons Drive intersection proposal. I look forward to connecting at the upcoming Open house regarding this issue.

Before the meeting, I wanted to express my concern that the study and survey were biased towards an ultimate goal of diverting traffic from Gibbons Drive whether in 2028 or 2030.

ISSUES WITH THE STUDY

- **Gibbons is 33% wider and has operated as a cut-through street for decades (validated by study), but is suddenly expected to function the same as neighboring streets.** In late 2022, the Transportation Commission created street designations in Alameda **questionably classifying Gibbons as a local street**, and I question why we are now trying to overhaul the neighborhood flow to meet new traffic targets.
- **The study cites accidents at the intersection between 2017 and 2021, but fails to mention that this intersection did not qualify as a high-injury intersection.**
- **To increase traffic on narrower Bayo Vista and Cornell by over 300% is dangerous** and the study confirms: "re-routed drivers may cut-through the alternative routes at high speed, offsetting the benefit of traffic reduction on Gibbons Drive."
 - But the study doesn't mention the **safety hazards of forcing 500 cars away from a protected left turn light on Gibbons with crosswalks**; to an already scary unprotected left turn from Bayo Vista onto busy High street where there are already NO crosswalks for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- **The study did not perform a pedestrian study to understand safety in the area, including along Southwood, and along High street at Bayo Vista/Fairview/Thompson**
 - Clearly there is a pedestrian and safety issue along Southwood that the study is saying is "outside of the scope".

- Furthermore, the study does not acknowledge pedestrian safety issues on High Street with confused drivers coming from Gibbons Drive being forced to turn right onto High Street, and then having to find some way to then turn back around in order to go back North onto the Bridge.

BIAS IN THE SURVEY: I took the survey in good faith, but it seems the survey is framed in a way that will skew results to substantiate the change to Gibbons.

As the study suggests, we are creating bigger, greater issues than the original issue of the Gibbons intersection and don't believe we should continue debating using city resources until 2028 or 2030 to force this to happen at the expense of broader safety in the surrounding streets.

Thank you for your time, and I'm looking forward to a good discussion tomorrow.
Vickie Teng

From: Cyndy Johnsen <cyndy@bikewalkalameda.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 7:53 AM
To: Lisa Foster <lfoster@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Rochelle Wheeler <rwheeler@alamedaca.gov>; Susie Hufstader <shufstader@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fernside/Gibbons/High

Hi Lisa,

One question about the recommended reconfiguration: how are bicyclists travelling north on Gibbons supposed to get to Fernside?



Perhaps they should detour like cars, but it's unlikely they will, and the intersection at Bayo Vista is not great for people on bikes, at least as currently configured.

In the Active Transportation Plan, Gibbons and Fernside connect as low stress facilities -- Gibbons would be a neighborhood greenway, connecting to a separated bike facility on Fernside.



Seems like this should be a nice, easy, and safe connection for people biking.

Wondering if the project team might have thoughts on this.

-Cyndy

From: Keenan Dmyterko <kdmyterko@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 12:13 PM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gibbons / Fernside / High Street project

I live at 1908 High Street with a view of the intersection Alameda City Council is proposing to change. I completely do not understand why they would want to divert more traffic onto High Street.

- It is already difficult enough to pull out of my driveway onto High Street during commuting times. I will diffently suffer. Additionally, this will result in people making

poor driving decisions of U-turns on High Street at that intersection or pulling into narrow streets (like Bayo Vista) and making U turns there. There are so many kids, including my 2, that have difficulties crossing High Street to get to school. Instead, they go to Gibbons where it is safe. Other kids still cross at High Street and Bayo Vista and they will have to endure more confused drivers making U turns. Did the study take the U turn likelihood into effect?

- Drivers that know the neighborhood will be okay, but other drivers, who may be less cautious will be driving down narrower streets where there is more pedestrian and bike traffic, unlike Gibbons where there are less bikers and pedestrians (you can barely walk on the sidewalk on Gibbons and it is rare to see bikers going from the High Street bridge to Gibbons). Did the study see how difficult it is for two cars to pass on Bayo Vista? As a frequent driver on Bayo Vista, you have to be mindful and pause to the side when a vehicle is coming towards you. Two cars cannot drive past each other where there is a vehicle parked. Locals will know this, but others will not. Especially the speeders.
- Based on reviewing the study, I believe option Alternative C will be the best option. It is a lot less expensive and can be done to see if that change helps that intersection without greatly effecting the neighborhood. I have stated many times to others the need for better signage at that intersection.

I hope you take a look at the above considerations. I have the hardest time understanding that the City of Alameda wants to make narrow streets more dangerous and causing more chaos on busy High Street. With better signage, there will be less confusion for drivers going from Gibbons to High Street Bridge.

Keenan Dmyterko (12-year resident at 1908 High Street)

From: Courtney Bergin <ccbergin@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 6:04 PM

To: Ttjensen@alamedaca.gov; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>; Andy Wang <awang@alamedaca.gov>; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Thoughts on Gibbons/High/Fernside Intersection

Hello,

I am writing to share my opposition to "Alternate A" and "Alternative B" for the Gibbons/Fernside/High Street intersection.

I have reviewed the materials, and cannot find any sound reason to spend an excessive amount on Alt A or B when Alt C can make substantial changes with considerable savings.

I also find the data collected about how many cars will be driving on the streets to be poorly collected, as the report says it was collected on a Wednesday. One day! That does not seem sufficient to be making projections about the impact this change would have on the surrounding streets.

Do I think the safety of this intersection can be improved? Absolutely. But, diverting traffic from Gibbons to other streets is NOT the solution. Should the residents of Gibbons demand better controls on their road to calm traffic? Absolutely. BUT, they live on a road that was intended to be a thoroughfare and is a wider street than all others in the area. Pushing that traffic to other, smaller streets, is not the solution and would be dangerous as those roads are not designed to handle large amounts of traffic.

In reading all the reports, I see nothing that indicates that this intersection has a higher accident rate than others in town. Yes, it cites 22 crashes between 2017 and 2021 (dates would be helpful here, is that 1/1/17 to 12/31/21?), but how does that compare to the intersection at Grand and Otis? Tilden and Buena Vista? Why is such a major change (Alt A and B) needed?

This is really feeling like the residents of Gibbons are trying to limit traffic on their road and doing it under the guise of safety improvements at this intersection. If the goal is to make that intersection safer, Alt C will satisfy that.

Additionally, I find it completely inappropriate that a member of the Planning Commission (Andy Wang) and City Council (Tracy Jensen) are involved with this as it's my understanding that they live on Gibbons and therefore they should excuse themselves due to a conflict of interest.

Thank you for hearing my concerns,

Courtney Bergin
1711 Cambridge Drive

From: David Harris <dharrisg@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 10:52 PM

To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gibbons Dr. Traffic Calming

Councilmembers,

I support the city's plan to reduce traffic in our neighborhood. Like my neighbors, I care deeply about the safety and livability of our streets. We all want quieter roads and safer crossings for kids and seniors.

On the 3000 and 3100 blocks of Gibbons, speeding and dangerous intersections are a serious problem. I don't even cross at Gibbons and High/Fernside because it feels safer to jaywalk than to use that intersection. Every day, kids walking to and from Edison Elementary have to navigate cars that speed up to stop signs, often startling them.

I understand the concerns about traffic being redirected to side streets. Those concerns are real, and the city should monitor impacts closely and be ready to adjust if one block ends up with too much of the burden. At the same time, this plan is an important step toward a healthier balance for the neighborhood as a whole.

The focus should not just be on moving cars off Gibbons more quickly once they're here, but on **preventing unnecessary traffic from entering in the first place**. The real issue is cut-through trips — large trucks and drivers racing to catch the High Street Bridge light — not neighbors accessing their homes or the bridge.

I know you will hear opposition, especially from those on side streets who may see short-term increases. That perspective is important. But as councilmembers, your responsibility is to look at the bigger picture: the safety, health, and livability of the entire neighborhood over the long term.

I encourage you to move forward with the plan, include a review period with data collection, and present a long-term vision that keeps Gibbons for **local traffic only** — not as a cut-through. This is a chance to create the safer, more livable community we all want.

Thank you.

David Harris - an interested citizen

From: Natasha DeCourcy <Natasha@kramerlaw.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 8:22 AM
To: CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to closing Gibbons

Dear Madame Mayor and Council Members,

I have lived in the Fernside Neighborhood since 2008, first on Bayo Vista and now on Cambridge Drive.

I have four boys and we walked to Edison every day. They also walk around the neighborhood with their friends and ride bikes. Two are in college but two still walk to Alameda High School.

Cambridge is such a narrow street that much of the time cars need to slow to a stop to pass one another. The end of our first block headed toward Central away from Fernside is the scariest intersection. Just before school starts and at the end of the school day the entire neighborhood is trying to get to school but throughout the day children, adults and pets are out walking and have to cross that intersection. We rely on cars going very slowly. If Gibbons is closed, more

cars will race down this narrow street. We have already had many accidents on this street and one fatal one that ended on Fernside.

It is unsafe to close Gibbons, there is no reason why this makes sense. Anyone who moved to Gibbons did so knowing they were moving onto a larger thoroughfare whereas when we moved to this smaller street, we did so to stay off a busier street. Just because a few people who live on Gibbons do not like the traffic is no reason to make the rest of the neighborhood more unsafe.

If there is another death on this street or even just an accident that is caused by rerouting traffic that would have been preventable.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best, Natasha DeCourcy
(415) 518-8480
tashdecourcy@gmail.com

From: Hoon Kim <hoonhkim@yahoo.com>
Date: September 25, 2025 at 6:53:29 PM PDT
To: CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concerns with Gibbons/High/Fernside Traffic Study Conclusions

To the city council,

The September 2025 Gibbons/High/Fernside Intersection Analysis recommends **Alternative A** (restricting northbound Gibbons to right-turn only). While this option is presented as the “safest” and “most efficient,” the study fails to fully address several critical concerns that disproportionately impact residents of surrounding streets.

1. Street Width & Safety Context

- **Gibbons Drive is the widest residential street in the study area (40 feet)**, specifically designed to accommodate higher two-way volumes.
- By contrast, **Cornell, Bayo Vista, and Southwood, and all other neighboring streets are significantly narrower (30–35 feet)**, with higher risks from added traffic: tighter clearances, limited sight lines, and more frequent pedestrian crossings.
- The study acknowledges that redistributed vehicles may travel at similar or higher speeds, but it downplays the risk of **increased crash potential** on these less-suited streets.
- Shifting traffic from a wide collector-like street onto narrower residential streets contradicts both traffic engineering principles and neighborhood equity.

2. Equity & Perceived Bias

- Over **50% of vehicles on Gibbons are cut-through traffic**, yet the solution advanced prioritizes Gibbons residents by diverting these trips onto other blocks.
- Importantly, **two current City Council members reside on Gibbons Drive**. While this does not invalidate the analysis, at minimum, this creates an appearance of conflict of interest and requires careful scrutiny.

3. Alternative C Merits

- Alternative C (low-cost “quick-build” safety improvements) addresses immediate pedestrian safety issues **without dramatically redistributing traffic**.
- It is cost-effective (\$150k vs. \$600k–\$850k), faster to implement, and avoids exacerbating neighborhood inequities.
- While less transformative, it strikes a **balanced approach**: improving safety at the intersection while preserving neighborhood circulation until a comprehensive traffic calming program is funded and designed.

4. Requested Actions

1. **Defer Alternative A** until neighborhood-wide traffic calming is in place and independently funded.
2. **Advance Alternative C** as an interim solution, improving safety without burdening adjacent streets.
3. **Commission an equity and safety addendum** analyzing redistributed traffic impacts on narrower streets (accident risk, pedestrian exposure, and quality of life).
4. **Establish clear conflict-of-interest protocols** to ensure that councilmembers with direct residential stakes on Gibbons abstain from voting on related motions.

The current recommendation risks shifting danger, noise, and traffic from a street designed to handle it (Gibbons) onto narrower, less-suited neighborhood streets. A more equitable path forward is to prioritize **Alternative C** as an interim measure while planning a comprehensive, citywide solution to cut-through traffic.

Thank you for listening to this matter.

Hoon Kim

Cambridge Drive resident.

From: Cindy Mills <cindyomills@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 7:31 PM

To: Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>; Andy Wang <awang@alamedaca.gov>; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedacagov.mail.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fernside / Gibbons / High St Intersection

I am an Alameda resident and I live on the tiny block of Cornell between Fernside and Gibbons Dr. I have spent a significant amount of time trying to understand the city projects in my area and have attended community meetings. As I attempt to learn more about each project, I have questions that I can not find the answers for and concerns that I do not feel are being heard.

Gibbons Drive:

I understand that at some point in the past, the city redesignated Gibbons St from a “connector” street to a “neighborhood” street. Having lived in the neighborhood for over 25 years, I can say with certainty that I was not aware of this change. Nor were any of the many neighbors I have spoken to.

With that redesignation, I understand there is a different traffic target for the street. But I have not seen any public announcement informing residents of the change or any street detours that would move traffic from feeder streets away from Gibbons allowing the city to achieve its Neighborhood Green Street traffic goal. I have also not seen any traffic calming measures on Gibbons to deter use of the street. With no effort to divert and / or calm traffic on Gibbons the residents of Alameda have continued to use the street as a “connector”.

Why is the city considering the most drastic solution, to close bridge access from Gibbons, when no traffic calming and/or diversions have been tried?

Since Gibbons remains, for all intents and purposes, a “connector” (because the traffic has not been managed away), shouldn’t it undergo a very rigorous process of redesign and not be attached to the Fernside Bike Lane project?

Fernside / Gibbons / High St Intersection

Although the Gibbons / Fernside / High St intersection can be confusing, it is by no means unusual and the data does not show that it is extremely dangerous. Although it may have more accidents than other intersections along Fernside, it sees a higher volume of cars than any other intersection. I understand it is not even in the top 20 of the most dangerous intersections of Alameda. As someone who uses this intersection daily, I imagine more accidents occur from the speed of traffic coming off the bridge and cars turning left from High St. onto Fernside than from the cars coming from Gibbons St. These two more dangerous issues are not even addressed in the intersection redesign.

The city has successfully redesigned other intersections (such as Grand / Otis) without the need to dramatically change the existing traffic pattern.

If the goal is safety at the intersection, why has there not been more effort to increase signage and reduce speed at the intersection first? Why is the city considering the most drastic solution of closing off bridge access from Gibbons?

If the concern is pedestrian safety, why was a pedestrian study not done?

Again, as a daily user of the intersection, I almost never see pedestrians at this intersection. The pedestrians I do see in the area are people who work at the Marina Garden Nursing Home. They

often park across the street and they cross Fernside on foot about 100 feet up from the intersection - never using the intersection.

Why was the traffic study so narrowly defined? It did not include or leave room for solutions that move pedestrians / bikes away from the intersection.

Current City Projects

There are two significant city projects in the works that will impact the neighborhood surrounding Gibbons. The Fernside Blvd Traffic Calming & Bikeways project and the Tilden Way/Blanding Avenue/Fernside roundabout. During the community meetings for the Fernside Blvd Traffic Calming & Bikeways project, residents brought concerns regarding the reduction of street parking. The general feeling was that residents would need to park on the smaller side streets. It has also been pointed out that the Fernside dedicated bike lane may require a new signaling sequence at the intersection, which is going to increase congestion on Fernside and on High St.. Traffic on Fernside already routinely backs up past the intersection with Cornell and traffic on High St backs up past the intersection with Bayo Vista. Yet, the Gibbons intersection project would put even more cars on Fernside and High Street.

Residents on the smaller side streets may see (1) more parked cars on their streets from Fernside, (2) there may likely be longer waits on Fernside and High street due to signaling, and (3), in the instance of Cornell, a possible 290% increase in moving cars coming off Gibbons!

Why is this Gibbons / Fernside / High St intersection recommendation being put forth BEFORE the Fernside Blvd Traffic Calming & Bikeways project and the Tilden Way/Blanding Avenue/Fernside roundabout project are complete? Both of these projects will have an impact on the neighborhood - including additional parked cars on neighborhood streets and greater intersection congestion due to signaling. Seeing and understanding the impacts of these projects is vital before other nearby projects are approved.

The city should finish the projects underway and then analyse the traffic patterns before changes are made to the Gibbons / Fernside / High St interaction.

I urge the city to pause on any decision regarding the closure of Gibbon to cars exiting the island. I urge them to wait to see the impact of projects already underway. I urge the city to make every effort to achieve their goals of safety on Gibbons and the intersection through means other than closure of this vital exit point for Alameda residents.

Respectfully,
Cindy Mills
1819 Cornell Dr.

From: [Candace Gutleben](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gibbons/High/Fernside Intersection
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 12:47:29 PM

I appreciated and attended the "Open House" at City Hall, but was disappointed, along with others, there was no official Q&A at the end, rather a haphazard chance to talk individually with members of the staff, some of whom were not present. Consequently, none of our conversations were on the record. Since this matter is very important to me and my family who live on Thompson Ave west of High Street, I am sending my feedback to you directly, in the hope it will become part of the official record.

1. This intersection is not the most important safety issue. I drive through it almost daily. There are very few pedestrians or bicycles using it. However, simply adding audio pedestrian signals would increase safety. I would like to know how many accidents, car or pedestrians have occurred.
2. The most important safety issue is speeding on Gibbons Drive.
3. The issue of speeding can be mitigated by crosswalks at every cross street, flashing pedestrian lights, speed humps, speed limit signs, and a stop sign at Cornell.
4. **Closing Gibbons to through traffic would greatly increase the danger** to the larger number of pedestrians and bicyclists, many of whom are children coming and going from Lincoln Middle School and Edison Elementary School, on the neighboring streets, which are also much narrower than Gibbons Drive.
5. It is easier and perhaps more economical, to slow traffic on Gibbons with the addition of crosswalks, pedestrian lights, speed humps and speed limit signs than to re-design and build a new intersection.
6. If many more cars, from the High Street Bridge, begin making a right hand turn onto Bayo Vista right after the intersection, there is an increased danger of accidents with the cars coming from Gibbons making a right hand turn onto High Street, so close to the intersection.

Thank you for your consideration.

Candace Gutleben

From: [Elina Rubuliak](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gibbons/High/Fernside Intersection - Support for Alternative A
Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 1:27:53 PM

Hello,

I would like to comment on the Gibbons/High/Fernside Intersection project and add to a comment I shared during the Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study Zoom call on Sept. 30th.

This past Friday morning (Sept. 26) about 9AM, I was driving down High Street towards Fernside and had to preemptive stop before the intersection, because TWO cars coming from Gibbons ran the yellow and then the red light in a rush to get on to High Street to cross the bridge into Oakland. The second car, a dark grey Tesla, came to an abrupt halt as the light to cross Fernside turned red. I'm lucky I saw them coming and had time to give them space.

These close calls are common and dangerous. I've seen drivers coming from Gibbons towards the bridge appear to confuse the diagonal light repeatedly since moving to this neighborhood. When approaching the intersection from Fernside with the intent to turn up High Street, I am very careful when turning to watch for vehicles coming from Gibbons who wrongly think they have right-of-way.

This intersection is dangerous and confusing. This safety work needs to happen. And any increase of traffic on adjacent neighborhood streets will primarily be by the very residents of those streets. **I am in full support of the proposed Alternative A to realign and restrict the left turn from Gibbons and the proposed timeline.**

As always I am grateful to the city staff and contractors for the thoughtful data-informed approach and the many avenues they offer Alameda residents to contribute and comment on the infrastructure planning in our city. They do an amazing job.

Regarding traffic calming measures on the surrounding streets, I would like to request two or four-way stop signs be added to the intersection of Bayo Vista and Monte Vista Ave. This intersection has a chevron-shape that makes it a blind intersection on which I have had several close calls, especially when the bridge is raised and rushed drivers are trying to avoid waiting to cross the bridge.

Thank you,
Elina Rubuliak
3220 Bayo Vista Ave.

Online Survey Free Responses

Question: Additional comments on the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection?

- General confusion of vehicles traveling from Gibbons onto east-bound High St. I've seen people ignore lights, not understand when they are allowed to proceed, not understand where they may go on green, and general hesitation when pulling into the intersection.
- The intersection has been in existence and functioned just fine for the 40+ years I have lived in the area (just off Gibbons on Johnson). I drive through it daily, have never seen an accident nor seen pedestrian issues. The only problem I've experienced is biking from Gibbons to Fernside, and not triggering the signal unless a car came up behind my bike. We do not need this proposed closure or change.
- Intersection seems to work OK. If left turn to bridge is taken away that will create a lot of traffic on side streets that are not designed for it.
- Great that the slip lane is removed. I had an accident there already (driving).
- Volume of cars and large trucks speeding down gibbons drive as a short cut into town
- Nothing is needed, with the exception of controlling speed on Fernside. People who can't figure out how to drive from Gibbons towards the bridge should have their license revoked.
- Lately I have noticed more and more drivers getting confused at the Fernside and Gibbons intersection. Instead of moving through properly, many end up merging into the High Street queue headed for the bridge and just sit there. A couple of times I have even seen people block both directions of High Street while trying to wedge into bridge traffic, including one Cybertruck driver, which was a sight to behold.
- Walking across Gibbons Drive puts pedestrians at high risk of being hit by vehicles entering Gibbons Drive from the High Street Bridge
- High St/Marina dr has become the shortcut of choice for traffic off bridge into Alameda. Traffic on Marina dr is high speed and reckless adults and children are endangered.
- If adding left turn signals on high, please add a right turn signal on eastbound Fernside so cars can turn right onto high when other cars are turning left from high (north bound) onto Fernside.
- I have seen the "upgrades" in other neighborhoods, especially Shoreline Drive. It seems more dangerous to me to have the bike lane between autos and the curb. Passengers exiting the vehicle on the bike path side cannot use the sideview mirror to check for bicyclists. It is dangerous no matter what configuration. I feel that the City is spending a lot of money needlessly on the new street configurations. Do we really need to close the Gibbons Dr entrance to the Bridge? Seriously? If you want to narrow the pedestrian time to cross then you can instead adjust the walk button times and make the walk button signs more prominent, or do without them and have the walk time on every light cycle at peak times. Far less expensive. The concern then becomes locals who will jump the yellow light knowing it is a long signal. Think some more guys before you start sending Gibbons traffic down the side streets which yes, includes my street, Bayo Vista Ave. I prefer Design Alternative C if one must be done.
- Conflict points with bicyclist and pedestrians on Fernside for vehicles going northbound and turning right onto High St.
- I really think this is a naturally busy area, not sure without major disruption that you can change it for the better.
- Overall, this intersection should be redone by removing the right turn slip lane, and the building of safety of bike lanes and better sidewalks should lead to better throughput of residents by having more people being moved without cars.

- Leave it alone. It's been fine for decades and now suddenly you want to restrict yet another street in an already congested area near a bridge.
- Could consider adding turn arrows for the signals on High St.
- The issues noted above aren't discrete. They compound and exacerbate one another. The design of the intersection is hostile to people with disabilities or mobility impairments, which is made worse by factors such as the lack of a pedestrian signal, the high speeds through this intersection in both directions, and the confusing turns and intersection alignment.
- Do not block off Gibbons and send traffic down the side streets
- "Gibbons needs crosswalks and stop signs at every cross street. After that, perhaps
- speed humps.
- High Street and Fernside need pedestrian flashing lights and crosswalks at every cross street. Digital speed limit signs would also add another level of safety.
- Lastly, and even though this is not part of the survey, the intersection at Gibbons, Southwood and Lincoln Avenues would benefit enormously from a roundabout. It is a very dangerous intersection.
- A lot of people not understanding the five way leading to potential crashes of cars + hitting pedestrians, combined with high speeds coming over bridge and on wide fernside
- the biggest problem in this part of the neighborhood is speeding on high street. This is generally traffic coming over the high st. bridge.
- I believe this is a perfect intersection for a roundabout. This is not a choice and I'd like to know why.
- There are many other far more dangerous intersections in Alameda; those should be addressed first, IMO. Slowing traffic to 25 mph would do wonders for overall safety of that intersection
- Add a camera to ticket people that speed or cross a red light
- I think intersection with traffic lights signal is perfect already. Don't eliminate the right turn exit from Gibbons Dr towards High st bridge.
- "High speeds on Gibbons Drive by cars from all directions
- Big trucks fly down Gibbons Drive like there is no tomorrow "
- I walk using those crosswalks all the time and never have any problems with safety.
- This intersection currently functions well in term of directing traffic; but it is dated, and can use some better visibility for pedestrian walking zones and bike lanes.
- Keep left turn from Gibbons to High Street Bridge open, and improve traffic light signage.
- I was there today on my bike and it was *really hot* waiting for my turn to go in the blazing sun - possible to plant a shade tree in the new curb?
- Far more complex than needed, a roundabout feels appropriate
- Not enough safety issues to warrant an entire redesign of the area and thereby increasing safety concerns on the smaller streets. Closing Gibbons will make our neighborhood more dangerous.
- This was not noted as a high-injury intersection. The study is pulling statistics compared to a goal of zero injuries. While zero is ideal, it is not necessarily realistic comparable to other intersections that feed onto a major highway.
- It's super confusing for everyone, leading to a high likelihood of driver error. People also tend to speed coming off the bridge and heading down Gibbons, which is a neighborhood street, this speeding is also a problem as they continue to cut through the island, leading to another confusing intersection at Gibbons, Central, and Versailles (which is a slow street) if the gibbons intersection is closed, that would also reduce this high speed vehicle cut through traffic at the Central intersection

- This intersection would most benefit from better marking, there are far worse intersections in Alameda from a safety standpoint.
- Keep gibbons open
- Speeds along Fernside and High Street are directly related to City staff's signal timing. There are ways to change signal timing that have not yet been discussed.
- the right hand lane from high street bridge to gibbons is also confusing; that should be right to Fernside only and the straight lane go to gibbons or high street.
- I don't think the intersection needs to change. People are familiar with it. If anything, just improve signage: make it brighter for example.
- signage could be more clear for people not familiar with the intersection.
- Gibbons simply needs speed bumps. Thompson and Southwood do, too. Easy solution and not much money. Closing Gibbons access is very unwise.
- Lots of traffic coming from Oakland that is unfamiliar with the intersection and light timing
- The police should enforce traffic laws instead of closing gibbons. I see people speed up the wrong side of high st daily when the bridge is up.
- I am concerned about the ill-conceived idea to close access to the High Street bridge from Gibbons. This will place much additional traffic on side streets where my children play.
- Gibbons Dr is the widest street in Fernside and was designed as the route to High St bridge. The side streets are much narrower and are not amenable to increased two way traffic. As it is now, cars going in opposite direction on side streets must pull over and yeild to allow other vehicle to drive through first before continuing. This proposed plan will exacerbate this problem and create more safety hazards.
- I see 2-3 incidents of driver confusion at this intersection on a weekly basis, and never walk to Fernside Blvd at that intersection because of this. I feel like I am in danger anytime I cross or enter the street on Gibbons between Central and Fernside.
- The pending two-way bike lane is a safety concern. This is a terrible place to put one. I was involved in a near accident in your two-way bike lane on Clement. The one and only time I rode in the two-way bike lane on Clement I had to maneuver around 6 cars in the bike lane and debris that continually forced me out of the bike lane. Traveling west on Clement, a motorcycle also traveling west, did not see me as they took a left turn into the apartment complex. I could hear it coming from behind me so I slowed down. We both came to a stop approximately four inches from each other with the motorcycle stopped in eastbound lane. This event was very traumatizing. I will never ride in this bike lane again. They provide a false sense of safety and are confusing for cars and motorcycles. Similar to San Francisco, we should stop wasting money on this terrible idea. You tried it. They are terrible. Please stop ruining our town with your pro-bike agenda.
- I travel through there several times a day and seldom experience an issue. Probably my greatest challenge is sitting at a redlight when no other traffic or pedestrians are present.
- Closing eastbound Gibbons traffic from making a left onto High (and pushing redirected traffic down narrow side streets) is a safety disaster waiting to happen.
- Better signage would help, as well as traffic calming on Gibbons
- I've been using that intersection for years from all directions, it works just fine as it is.
- I think that increasing traffic on side streets with more pedestrians, children and pets will be more dangerous than the current traffic flow.
- It should be a traffic circle
- Cars not only speed as they come through the interstecion, but continue speeding on Gibbons making the 3000 and 3100 blocks extremely unsafe. Many kids use Gibbons as part of their walk

to school and we even though no one will cross at this intersection it is the root cause of some of the issues with speeding.

- Its too many directions headed on to the bridge! Love the proposal to stop the insanity.
- While it is a complex intersection, it doesn't seem to be very challenging.
- Violating no turn on red sign from Fernside to high street nearby causing collections
- As a driver, this intersection is kind of terrifying. I don't use it regularly so when I do drive at it I'm usually very confused about where traffic is coming from and which way I'm even allowed to turn. It's truly a terrible intersection and I'm glad something is being done about it.
- The only need is talking pedestrian signals
- Confusing and poor signage
- As a resident I see a lot of the intersection and the largest issues are people speeding and ignoring right of way. This isn't going to be solved with changes to the intersection, this is a people problem.
- I have almost gotten in several accidents turning left onto the bridge because people start driving and then think that they are going through a red light and then suddenly stop. Almost every day I see drivers dangerously speeding down this street. This street was not meant to accommodate this many cars. It is now more of a highway than a residential street.
- The intersection would be easily improved with a simple new light system and road painting. The speed off the High street bridge would not be improved with this new plan. I live on the 3100 block of Gibbons and do not support this plan because of the impact on side streets and the lack of addressing the main problem of speed coming off the bridge onto Gibbons.
- It is fine the way it is. Please do not change it.
- Closing Gibbons would be a 400% increase in traffic on our narrow streets nearby. Traffic currently goes too fast with not police present. This is very dangerous for school children and families who cross streets and bike. This will also cause a reduction of home values on the nearby streets. And trigger an automatic recall of city council members who vote for this!!!
- I've seen a lot of confusion at this intersection - notably, going from Gibbons to the bridge, I often see folks run red lights (because they think the High Street light is for them) or not move on green lights (because they think the High Street light is for them). There is also a lot of confusion coming off the bridge - my husband's car was hit by a truck trying to make a right turn off the bridge because they got confused about which lane went where.
- don't fix what's not broken
- "Living in the area for 25+ years, I have seldom seen any traffic / pedestrian issues - there are other intersections in the area far more dangerous. All issues I have heard about can be resolved with better signage, and speed calming measures.
- There is no reason to eliminate bridge access from this intersection."
- The perceived issues are trivial, and the proposed changes will only create more problems. The collisions were, for the most part, trivial and judging by your failure to include data from the last four years, there have been none worth mentioning for the most current and relevant period. Pedestrians crossing Gibbons are not exposed to any unusual danger from cars though bicycles can be a nuisance.
- It's pretty high on the list of most dangerous intersection for walkers/bikers
- This intersection makes no sense. Both Fernside Dr and Gibbons see far too much speeding; they're not designed to slow people down and should be. The left turn off Gibbons toward the bridge is one of the least intuitive turns I've ever seen. It doesn't make much sense. I'd like to see the whole neighborhood improved with Vision Zero concepts in mind, including effective calming on Gibbons, Northwood, Southwood, etc. Slow them all down.

- The concerns I have heard can be addressed with proper traffic calming measures. There is no need to drastically change this intersection. It is located next to a bridge and was designed to help move traffic through the area.
- minor issues only
- A left turn signal from fernside onto the bridge would improve safety
- "We don't need additional infrastructure—we need more space for cars and bikes, not less. Adding safety measures, such as 'No Right Turn on Red' signals, would greatly improve pedestrian safety. We should also launch a campaign to educate pedestrians, as there seems to be a growing lack of awareness.
- Making these restrictions causes congestions in other streets which will I turn cause safety issues. Keeping the signage & street paintings clear allows for better clarity for all.
- I've seen a few accidents with vehicles turning left on to high st bridge from fernside. There is definitely a problem at this intersection. Many cars also speeding down highstreet coming off the bridge.
- More APD enforcement for speeds
- The current left-hand turn off of Gibbons is confusing. I used to live on Gibbons and made frequent mistakes while I was getting used to it. I am also concerned about the speeds of cars on Gibbons. However, I think limiting access from Gibbons to the bridge would be a big mistake because it would create more congestion. I think the intersection needs to be redone in a way that does not limit traffic flow but makes it clearer. Maybe Gibbons needs some speed bumps too.
- "Crosswalk and stop line painting all faded out.
- Bring back the motorcycle traffic cop that sat at the corner during rush hour. "
- The speed coming off the bridge is an issue, but there are ways to deal with that without rearranging the flow of traffic.
- Overall, the MOST CONFUSING intersection of Alameda period. Coming from Fernside area toward High St bridge (turning left) always feels precarious to me and afraid of being hit every time I drive that. Turning left when everything is red going through intersection confuses me every time.
- Coming westward on Gibbons from the bridge, it is confusing for people in the right lanes whether they're allowed to stay straight toward high or turn toward Gibbons.
- The intersection is safe and very usefull.
- It works well
- Long pedestrian and bicycle crossing distances are also an issue at this intersection.
- It is a mess. Cars race down gibbons at high speed in the morning to make the green light since it is infrequent.
- "I don't understand why this intersection is being brought to attention—we've lived in the neighborhood for 25 years and for most of those years, have had to go through that intersection daily by car, bike, or walking and have never had any problems. The lights system works well and it's an important way to get to High St Bridge and on/off island for our family, esp to access 880 South. Otherwise the access to 880 South is nearly impossible from Fruitvale Brodge then going past Homr Depot and trying to join High St by the intersection near the self storage, esp during rush hours.
- The lights system works, even though there are 3 diff streets feeding into that intersection."
- "Confusing to turn left from gibbon
- I walk/run this intersection daily and drive regularly. As a pedestrian, I think there should be automatic protected crossing cues (as at say Broadway & Central). As a driver, even though I

reside on the street I have remind myself to slow coming on to Gibbons if I have just crossed the bridge - come cue or bump there would help.

- I live on Thompson Av between High and Fernside. My concern is that the proposed changes will increase speeds on High Street and the frequency and speed of "cut through" traffic on Thompson and Fairview. Speeding on High Street and cut through traffic are already a significant safety problem on High, Thompson and Fairview and the proposed plan seems likely to increase the problem.
- Pedestrian crossing is long. Off bridge speeds and speeds on Fernside past the nursing home seem excessive sometimes. Other directions seem fine including gibbons to the bridge.
- The two biggest concerns as a frequent driver here are cars making turns from the wrong lanes, and long backlogs down High St following bridge raising events.
- Traffic congestion doesn't concern me. High speeds kill. We need to design alternatives that do not move high speeding vehicles to streets that children play and walk to school on. Do not solve one problem to create another one.
- confusing as shit
- Compared to many other intersections nearby, this is safer as it has a stoplight and crosswalks.
- I have lived/owned a home near the interersection for nearly 20 years. While it is admittedly odd, I have never had a problem with it.
- I use this intersection as a pedestrian crossing Fernside for the transbay bus, to walk to visit my neighbors, and as a driver. My children ride their bikes through this intersection with my partner. The confusion and speeds heading through this intersection make it dangerous for everyone regardless of their mode of transportation.
- For pedestrians, the islands make it confusing and less handicap accessible. Arrows that show the direction of traffic would be helpful. A signal light that can be pressed to walk would be helpful.
- "I frequently and daily (daytime + nighttime) observe INSANE speeds of vehicles and feel at severe risk as a pedestrian with dogs or cyclist. Police patrols DO NOT WORK HERE! When the police are not present, it is a literal Sears Point shitshow, loud, unsafe, fatalistic and in complete lack of respect for a residential neighborhood. The surveys the studies only prolong any remediation and real solution while the speeding cars continue to destroy the environment and belief of safety. and frankly human/animal life. YET NOTHING EVER GETS DONE and more tragic loss of life and anxiety continues to build. Si what is the point of this survey? Thought venting? Stop delaying and fix it!!! SPPED CAMERAS + SPEED BUMPS NOW!!
- "It's a truly confusing intersection. When we moved to Gibbons in 2021 I had no idea how to navigate. When we have visitors they express confusion and I have to explain how cars are meant to make a left turn. From the opposite direction cars speed through from high street or Fernside onto gibbons. We hear car horns, screeching tires, and even yelling on a daily, weekly basis from our house on Gibbons.
- Cars don't know how to navigate it unless they've seen other traffic navigate it or they've been through the intersection before, and pedestrians are put in an unsafe position by a lack of proper pedestrian infrastructure and driver confusion."
- So many people speed on fernside
- We really need to slow down traffic from this intersection. I drive home from work three days a week, coming over the High Street Bridge and onto Gibbons Dr. It's a frequent occurrence that someone is either tailing me as I drive down Gibbons or swerving into the other lane and going around me. This happens when I am driving the speed limit at 25mph. It's not like I'm driving 5 mph. Gibbons is treated like a speedway. When I'm outside with my kids (ages 3 and 6) playing in

our front yard on Gibbons, every other car is speeding down the street. I often yell out "slow down!" but to no effect.

- Exiting Gibbons toward the High St. bridge there isn't enough room given where the cars on High St. stop - very awkward. Slip lane from Fernside onto the bridge is often taken at high speed crossing bike and pedestrian traffic.
- We take it for granted living here, but this intersection is very confusing for drivers who don't use it regularly. It's also a very unsafe intersection for pedestrians due to the high speeds of cars coming up and down Gibbons from the High St Bridge.
- A left turn arrow for those on Fernside turning to get onto the High Street bridge would be very helpful.
- "I travel by car daily west to east on Fernside, in the evening. No issues observed.
- I can see how the turn from Gibbons can be confusing though looking at the map. "
- I have lived in the area since 1964. I don't think this is a problem intersection.
- THIS is not the issue on High Street that needs to be solved. The issue High Street has is about speed and safety (for cars, bikes and pedestrians) in the stretch BETWEEN Fernside and Santa Clara, where there are no speed calming measures presently. LAST NIGHT a car ended up flipped over between Fairview and Thompsen. Gibbons is not the biggest and most urgent issue in this area of Alameda. Solving for Gibbons only is going to make issues in other areas worse and is focused on a nuisance for a few Gibbons homeowners, not wider safety in the community.
- This is a very dangerous intersection for pedestrians and bikes due to speeding cars going to and from the bridge.
- Most issues revolve around car speeds and increased traffic
- Making it a traffic circle would solve all the problems. The entrance from gibbons is not the problem
- no need for such wide streets for cars. put in medians with greenery and trees and add more bike lanes and pedestrian walkways and cars will be forced to slow down
- Left turns from Fernside onto High is the most dangerous for everyone. Very dangerous for pedestrians crossing High St, and dangerous for cars making left turns onto High. In a car, you're looking for a break to make a left, and may not see someone in the crosswalk either on foot or on a bike.
- Lots of speeding vehicles treating high St into gibbons, and Fernside as a highway
- People speed down Fernside from the Tilden way intersection. Every day I see someone driving 50 plus miles an hour and they don't stop for the crossing lights.
- People unfamiliar with the intersection are likely to be confused when turning left from Gibbons toward the bridge. They have a green light but then immediately see the red light for the High Street traffic.
- A slowing mechanism for those vehicles exiting the bridge is a solution. Closing a main artery is going to cause chaos. and confusion forcing drivers onto narrow streets.
- illegal right turns from Fernside to High St
- None. This works fine. No need to invest millions. No appropriate bike paths
- High Street and Gibbons are primary exist routes for east end Alameda traffic leaving the island/ It is signal controlled. There appears to be a concerted effort to downgrade automobile access on Fernside. I appears that it is the product of a well organized minority to promote bicycles at the expense of automobiles. The entire near term and long term modifications to Fernside should be revisited and modified to provide more equitable access to transportation for all.
- When the bridge is up, traffic gets backed up and people get aggressive, unsafe and sloppy. It is also a nuisance trying to get off the island to get to appointments or work--but the city council,

et al, don't seem to take traffic congestion into account, allowing overbuilding in every available space in Alameda.

- Too many vehicle lanes of traffic for the amount of vehicle traffic. Inability for bicycles to safely turn.
- Gibbons was designed as a throughfare; folks living there knew as much when they bought their homes. Sloughing off traffic from Gibbons onto neighboring streets NOT designed for such traffic smacks of privileging residents of Gibbons at the expense of their neighbors. Traffic calming methods such as speed bumps, by all means.
- Don't change. Enforce traffic laws. Add speed bumps/humps to gibbons and add more 4 way stops on gibbons instead of just stops at northwood/southwood and gibbons.
- I find this intersection to be one of the safest ways off the island. It is far less congested than Park St and the protected light from Gibbons provides that safety.
- There are way bigger problems than this in the area, and there are many things to try for this problem first, that are not nearly as drastic as what is being proposed.
- Pedestrian signal waiting time too long. Does not turn green a second after cars get green in the same direction
- More congestion getting off the island during rush hour that was made worse by the Oakland freeway project completed years ago. Pushing it off onto the side streets causing further delay is not an improvement. This project will make things worse!
- Thru traffic originating in Oakland/Bay Farm Is. using Fernside to High to I880 is significant, instead of them going to I880 via Hegenberger RD, they shortcut through Alameda via Fernside. This is unacceptable and creates many of the speeding problems on Fernside.
- I frequently encounter confusion by drivers entering intersection from Gibbons
- Do not close off any more streets in Alameda stop adding more housing while taking away streets. Enforce traffic laws in place.
- The speed of cars and the volume of cars entering onto Gibbons from High St poses danger to cars, pedestrians and bikes
- bike and pedestrian safety. the awkward left turn onto the bridge from Gibbons is not something everyone understands. The intersection is just confusing. It would benefit from a round about. But trying to limit traffic or trying to funnel traffic down high instead of gibbons will only increase traffic issues on high. There are several day cares etc on high and lots of pedestrians
- it's also very difficult to make left turns on a bike from Fernside to High Street - especially westbound Fernside to southbound High, since there is no dedicated left turn lane so a bike rider has to just hang out in the middle of the street waiting for a gap in traffic and hope nobody runs them over
- Not listed here: Bicyclists and motorbikes pretending to be bicycles speeding through without regard for the rules or signals, endangering pedestrians and drivers of vehicles including busses.
- There is no pedestrian signal when crossing from SW corner of Gibbons to the island then across to the NW corner (on the gore point between Fernside and Gibbons. Pedestrians have to guess if cars coming off High Street Bridge often at high speed are supposed to be stopping because there is no pedestrian signal telling pedestrians they can safely cross
- WORKING VERY WELL. I HAVE NEVER HAD ANY ISSUES AT THIS INTERSECTION. IF IT AIN'T BROKEN, DONT FIX IT.
- The current flow of the intersection is beneficial for Alameda residents. It reduces traffic on other side streets and minimizes unsafe unprotected left turns onto High St
- The users of this area are mindful and courteous. No changes necessary.

- Turning from Gibbons feels risky even with the lights protecting you. The right turn lane into the bridge feels risky
- Closing Gibbons would have terrible repercussions on the small adjoining residential streets, with speeders seeking alternative routes to get to the bridge, making smaller streets unsafe and endangering kids' lives.
- I don't there's any real safety issues on this street
- Turning right on red from the High Street bridge onto Fernside should be permitted, only not onto Gibbons. The speeds on High Street (coming from Alameda towards High Street Bridge - and coming out of Oakland through the High Street Bridge onto and down High Street are too high. I live on the corner of Bayo Vista and high Street, and I see kids crossing the street in the morning, families walking their pets in the evening, and couples on strolls (of all ages) that cross High Street at Bay Vista. They often have to run across, or stop in the middle of the street for a car to whiz by. There are also flocks of turkeys that use that crossing frequently to cross High Street. When the High Street Bridge is up, the traffic down High Street (again, coming from Alameda out towards High Street to leave the city) gets really backed up. People are honking and impatient, and it takes quite a few lights for the traffic to free up. I've seen cars sitting on my street, trying to take a left, waiting for quite a long time. To make matters worse, Bayo Vista is a very narrow street. Cars are often parked on both sides, and when that happens, two cars CANNOT pass each other going in opposite directions. Cars have to pull off to someone's house to let another pass. When the traffic is backed up on High Street, and people cannot turn left off Bayo Vista, then other cars cannot turn right off High Street into Bayo Vista without causing even more congestion.
- There have been many accidents at this intersection over the years. High rates of speed and driver indecision have contributed to them.
- Safety of drivers and pedestrians is of high priority to me.

Question: Do you have other comments on the intersection safety and operations analysis? Overall neighborhood traffic will be addressed in the next section.

- I don't believe this analysis is correct. C would not create more traffic. Its the same configuration which is not a problem except for the council members that live on Gibbons.
- I disagree with the "conclusion" that keeping the left turn from Gibbons to the Bridge will get worse. There are not more houses being built in the area. There aren't more businesses being opening on High to create more traffic. The "need" here is not established adequately, and the disruption created by construction and then confusion over the change will create far more problems than hat you are saying the change will benefit. Who benefits?
- Not convinced that keeping things the way they are would create more traffic
- I think with plan B, having a traffic signal there, would cause more congestion.
- A physical barrier will be necessary to stop left turns from Gibbons onto High Street, since drivers will make the turn regardless of enforcement. Unfortunately, that is the reality of how people drive these days.
- I don't understand how keeping the left turn from gibbons would add congestion. Taking away the left turn will add congestion because those folks will have to go to high st or fernside which is already backed up and now those cars will be added. Your comments make no sense.
- How would the traffic lights work? Left from gibbons through high st and then through Fernside? So the light at Fernside would have to sync with the light from gibbons to high so cars aren't stuck on high

- Why don't you put our tax money into a gondola from Alameda Point to West Oakland Bart?
- Close off Gibbons drive, make it a dead end with a small park area. This would allow space for left turn lane on the north bound side of High St to Fernside.
- people will use fernside blvd mostly, there has to be a way to get all the traffic to the high st. bridge, Gibbons is the least used, need to have 3 ways to get to the bridge. especially if we have limited off places on the island on the west end ! I think that is a bigger issue !!
- Overall, this plan is good, and is there any updates for the bike turn signals or turn signals in general?
- It's been fine for decades, with no congestion witnessed by me in 45 years of driving here.
- This study and survey seems severely biased to push towards a preselected outcome.
- Alternative C is a poor option even in the near-term, as it does very little to address pedestrian safety. The awkward and substandard three-legged crosswalk would remain unchanged, and would not be signaled in its near-term implementation. Unlike painted curb extensions installed in more interior locations in the city, at 90-degree turns, this one would be exposed to very high speeds coming from High Street Bridge, at a very wide turn. More than likely the posts would be damaged very shortly after implementation. I foresee this happening certainly during the day, but almost certainly at night, when the paint and post improvements will lack visibility at the high speeds vehicles are coming through.
- I have limited feelings on the left turn aspect. If it was maintained, it's probably only used as a left turn off peak due to back up, and then in peak people "give up" and turn right. But I'm no expert.
- Backups on high street are a much better option than severely increasing traffic volume at the Southwoods - Bayo Vista intersection. Many small school children cross this alone every day - it is already an unsafe intersection and an ADA nightmare. My father-in-law was wheelchair bound until he passed, and this intersection was the cause of several near-misses for him. Any additional traffic on this intersection is irresponsible until broader safety issues are addressed. He had no problems crossing the Gibbons/High St. Intersection as it is today.
- This is a critical artery for exiting the island. As the population of the island increases, we need to improve ability to get on and off the island, not make it more difficult
- Why would this create "more backups" on High St. if we don't make any changes? Stop wasting tax payer money.
- I go through the existing intersection regularly; I don't think it's that bad
- There are several statements made in the presentation not backed by data. There should be data to back these claims.
- Add camera that tickets people that speed and or cross a red light
- I never see traffic backed up on gibbons and I use that light on gibbons 2-3x a day.
- I think the traffic signal already with smart detection that notice with or without cars waiting on Gibbons Dr towards the bridge. It's already perfect design.
- Please place speedometers for the cars to see how much over the limit they are going; also more cop cruisers around the area
- Closing Gibbons to northbound traffic would have a detrimental impact on many more residents than those on the last two blocks of Gibbons that would have traffic on their blocks redirected to other streets. There are lower cost, more practical options that don't drive safety issues from one area to another.
- Restricting left turn from Gibbons to High Street WILL have more backups on High Street, not prevent!

- This analysis is much improved. I still think a roundabout here would also provide safety and flow improvements.
- Confused why keeping the left turn onto the bridge will result in more back-ups.
- Alt C is the preferred choice. Closing Gibbons will make our neighborhood more dangerous.
- Any other ways to slow the speeding cars in this area would be great.
- Since we're talking about severe congestion on High Street, this biased question does not mention the confusion of people coming from Gibbons Drive being forced to turn right onto High Street, and then having to find some way to then turn back around in order to go back North onto the Bridge. I also would have thought that the study would have studied pedestrian usage in that intersection to understand how many pedestrians we are considering but that was not included.
- Stop prioritizing cars over bicycles - Option A is a disaster for bikes on High St. Please consider option C
- The wording of these questions show strong bias and seem like there are set up to allow someone to cherry pick results out of context.
- There are many other ways to improve the intersection that the City is conveniently not mentioning.
- N/A
- Closing off Gibbons as an exit pathway to the High Street bridge does NOTHING but direct high volume traffic to SMALLER side residential streets that ARE NOT equipped to SAFELY manage this level of traffic
- The reports so far inadequately address pedestrian use of the intersection and pedestrian safety throughout the neighborhood.
- Need much better signage overall to make it clear when and where to drive and turn
- Essentially a near-term implementation of Alternative C is so limited it's close to doing nothing.
- You are making more problems because 15 houses are complaining. This will ruin other fernside neighborhoods.
- I know a roundabout was looked at, but please consider reviewing that again - that is generally a good mechanism to control traffic flow and speed and provide multiple ingress/egress options whilst allowing for natural variation in traffic patterns during the day.
- Your study is BULLSHIT
- What about a rotary or roundabout there? That seems like a reasonable place for one
- How does 22 accidents over 5 years compare to accident frequency in a similar intersection
- B and C are no better than A. Leave current configuration as is. Simplest thing to do.
- These are leading questions. The status quo works, it is the high speed on Gibbons that is an issue, and that can be addressed with traffic humps, lights and enforcement of speed limits.
- Leave as is. The council members in that block shouldn't be able to restrict traffic just so they can have a quieter block. Those of us on nearby, narrower streets will be adversely affected.
- This is laughable that traffic congestion on High Street would be caused by Gibbons Street! The congestion is due to Alameda Avenue traffic joining High Street traffic. For YEARS I crossed the High Street Bridge. It wasn't until K Mart (now Home Depot) was built that this traffic became an issue. Traffic from Alameda Avenue is allowed to "block the grid" which blocks High Street traffic. Study THAT intersection and to NOT blame Gibbons traffic.
- The analysis is vague and does not list specific metrics. Terms like "improves safety", "minimal increase", and "less congestion" are not quantifiable and present unclear information to the public that should not be used for analysis. In fact, the analysis in section 4.4 of page 13 conflicts with the presentation regarding "less congestion" ...the Alternative A is predicted to have the

same amount of congestion but with WORSE vehicle delay times that increase between 19-33% (which is only for the average...other delay times will have an even larger increase in wait times at this intersection as a result of this alternative. Section 4.1 on page 10 of the analysis states that "many southbound high street vehicles were observed turning on to Gibbons Drive at high speed." Subjective statements like this should be eliminated from a report like this that is supposed to present facts...unless the statement is backed up with recorded data from calibrated devices and compared with standards that dictate what speeds are unacceptable "high speeds."

- There are not congestion issues at this intersection. I travel it daily. The proposed changes will bring congestion that we don't currently face.
- The information provided in this presentation does not support the alternatives predicted.
- many people use gibbons because the light at this five way intersection is inefficient, much of that is driven by four directional red lights while the light for gibbons is green. If we remove that pause in the other four directions (Fernside and high street) they will become much more efficient.
- I prefer C because pedestrian signals shouldn't impact congestion that much.
- Make it one way.
- Do not close Gibbons. This seems like a biased survey and intended to trick people into agreeing to close Gibbons which is unsafe for the small streets where all the traffic will be diverted
- It doesn't seem as though that would be the case with Alternative C
- Restricting the left turn is the obvious solution. I get that people who live right there might feel slightly inconvenienced, but this is for the safety of everyone who uses the intersection, not the few who live there.
- Of the three alternatives, C is the best choice
- leave it alone
- I travel this intersection everyday during the morning and evening commute hours. I don't view the congestion as bad at all. Rarely do I have to wait more than one signal cycle. The confusion over Gibbon to High can be alleviated with more signage and markings so that people are aware of what to do.
- The delays and backup would move to the side streets, not disappear.
- I want to see 4 way stop at Gibbons & Cornell - Pedestrian Walk Signal at Gibbons & High Intersection - Speed Humps on Gibbons - Improved signaling and marking at Gibbons / High Intersection
- I would like to learn more about the safety concerns since I have not observed unsafe conditions either on foot or in a vehicle.
- I think I would walk/bike this intersection more if it was safer.
- I believe that the surrounding streets are too narrow for traffic apps to re-route their drivers down and will instead route them around the neighborhood completely.
- Roundabouts have been working
- consultant noted prior there have only been 2 accidents in past 15 years...spending \$600k to fix a non-existent problem is senseless
- Keep Gibbons open to accessing the bridge.
- Your proposals will make it more difficult to transit the intersection safely though it may not be as dangerous as the reconfigured intersection at Otis and Grand.
- I feel like the wording in this survey is very biased.
- I would like to see an elevated pedestrian crossing to help slow down the bridge traffic coming into Alameda.
- Why won't a roundabout work here? It seems like the right solution

- Better signage with the existing layout would be sufficient. Newer lights like the ones recently placed on Encinal are bigger for a more extensive reach. Additional markings and barriers can be used without drastically changing how traffic flows surrounding areas. Add more cross walk signals.
- Inadequate and bias operations analysis.
- The left turn is very dangerous and confusing for everyone. It's safer to remove it and make people loop back into fernside using Bayo Vista Ave.
- The traffic engineer indicated some license plate tracking but did not expand on that. I would like to understand more about it.
- It's silly to remove access points off the island. We will regret this decision during a natural disaster if we all have to get off the island.
- Left unsaid is that all of this is in support of a future bike lane project that is as of yet unfunded.
- Limiting access increases congestion in other areas and then requires cost to improving our current changes.
- I don't see how there will be less congestion going on the highstreet bridge. Closing off Gibbons will not reduce the number of cars getting on to the high street bridge. If anything, it will make High St and Fernside less safe with more traffic
- There is already a problem with speed through the neighborhoods. A project that diverts more cars through the neighborhoods is a fatal flaw.
- i'm confused by the team's conclusion and i'm not sure i agree with it. i'd rather have the status quo than insert a right turn only situation on Gibbons.
- Where is the detail on traffic collisions? from what direction of travel were the colliding vehicles/ped? how does this intersection compare to all other intersections in Alameda for collision count?
- I attended the Townhall meeting yesterday. Safety was mentioned however I did not learn at this meaning nor have I read what accidents have occurred in this intersection.
- How many people are even crossing Gibbons at that corner? If I was worried about safety, I would just cross High street and then turn right at the sidewalk. Are we trying to solve a pedestrian problem that is small volume and as a result impacting a much larger number of people driving / biking through that intersection?
- It is not a safe intersection as is...something needs to improve.
- We are creating backups on High Street by proposing to close the more direct Gibbons to High street route. However if we did change that more direct route, having a left turn would be key to maintaining traffic flow.
- No
- No data on réál past accident. This is not solving a problem only waiting tax payer money.
- Bad idea - I don't think these planners live or commute in the neighborhood
- I don't see Gibbons intersection problem as being well-defined nor with significant study over time with any specific statistics that should raise this question of this intersection redesign when compared to the "400% increase in cars through smaller neighborhood streets". The city has not made a convincing case for there being a problem at Gibbons/High intersection!
- reducing diagonal through-traffic on Gibbons, by encouraging the use of Central and lincoln (may want to add stop sign or two to southwood) would reduce the need for left turns onto high. Local residents could then use local streets to access High with little impact to existing traffic volumes on low volume streets
- Gibbons traffic moving onto High Street towards the bridge already has a separate light phase, so the impact on congestion of B and C should be neutral for ISO traffic flows. But removing this

flow is going to screw folks on Yale and Cambridge. I disagree with your analysis that a lot of traffic will move onto Bayo Vista: most drivers won't want to take a left turn onto High Street, versus the easier option of a right turn onto Fernside.

- Seriously reconsider Alternative C
- I live on Thompson Av between High and Fernside. My concern is that the proposed changes will increase speeds on High Street and the frequency and speed of "cut through" traffic on Thompson and Fairview. Speeding on High Street and cut through traffic are already a significant safety problem on High, Thompson and Fairview and the proposed plan seems likely to increase the problem.
- The need from Gibbons to high Street is about safety and signage for pedestrians, disabled people and people on bicycles. Allowing cars to turn left and work their way quickly across the bridge remains the best solution. All of the others, including the right turn options will just jam up traffic on High Street in both directions.
- I think the consulting work fails to capture the impact to nearby intersections, specifically to intersections that have a stop sign facing stop-free intersections. I fear that we see far more traffic on Lincoln than currently projected due to the calming measures, where most children are walking to/from Edison.
- Backups on High Street are fine by me, that means cars would be driving slower, which is safer for those of us walking and biking.
- I am concerned about added congestion on High from a more complex left turn off of Gibbons.
- stop focusing on the wrong problem, this is a waste when we have more important issues!!!!The actual safety issue at this intersection has not been sufficiently documented. If there actually is a safety issue, there seem to be less drastic options (speed bumps, improved pedestrian crossings) that would not increase the safety risks on other - smaller, more congested - neighborhood streets.
- I'm also concerned that the impact on neighboring streets is being framed as a separate issue rather than as part of the intersection proposal. The increases in traffic on smaller streets and thus the negative impacts on safety there will offset some, if not all, of the safety benefits expected from this change at the intersection in question, so it doesn't feel like the overall safety ROI is being discussed here.
- If Alt A is done, there will be much more back up on High St. from the neighboring streets. In the March meeting, the mayor suggested that u-turns on High St. would be allowed for Alt A, which is so illogical. There isn't room, and it would be very unsafe to do so. These are not reasonable responses to safety concerns.
- I don't think the city has adequately explained this. It seems diverting more bridge traffic onto High Street, if cars can't turn left off Gibbons, is what would increase congestion on High Street.
- I'm disappointed that staff and third party experts are being asked to put additional time, money, resources into proving their transportation methodologies. Please implement alternative A in 2026 as previously planned. My bicycling kids will have started and finished Lincoln middle school by the time 2030 has come and gone.
- Alternative B (and A) just shifts the congestion problem by re-routing Gibbons traffic onto High St (or Fernside) but before the Fernside/High intersection.
- Implement speed cameras and raised crosswalk speed bumps.
- How does it reduce high street congestion? There will be more cars on high and fernside and less on Gibbons,
- I believe that restricting a left turn from Gibbons onto High will add a minor inconvenience to SOME drivers while greatly increasing the safety of ALL travelers through the intersection

- This question also seems to be designed to provoke a specific response.
- We need changes now- I'm tired of seeing the use of this intersection as a speedway.
- Alternative B makes the most sense to me, as it discourages convenience of use and speeding to cross through that intersection East/Bridge-bound while also mitigating confusion at the light about what the correct driving behavior should be at that intersection (i.e., light-based left or right turns only). I'm not that concerned about congestion at the intersection, as the experience of congestion once or twice would likely reduce use of this intersection for those that don't 'necessarily' need to use it, over time. And, we already see some severe congestion here when the bridge is up...something that locals are used to. Better signage with flashing lights for when the bridge is up at strategic locations 'down the streets' in multiple directions could help mitigate some of this congestion by encouraging drivers to use alternate routes when the bridge is up.
- I'd like to point out that the results of each alternative are displayed in skewed way- showing public safety and traffic congestion as equally comparable. Public safety should always come first and therefore hold more weight than traffic congestion and convenience.
- Not allowing a left turn from Gibbons onto High would severely negatively impact daily commute time for those of us on the first block of Gibbons
- Your trying to fix a problem that does not exist.
- This small issue cannot be addressed without causing bigger issues elsewhere. Either completely solve neighborhood speed and traffic or leave Gibbons AS IS.
- I haven't incurred any problems with the current layout and I use the left turn from Gibbons to High Street daily.
- The traffic on High and Fernside travels far too fast anyways. Congestion is not the issue. Speeds are the issue.
- Again i don't believe the long term confession is any more of a problem than currently seeing
- Traffic circle would reduce congestion and improve safety
- Have you considered prohibiting turns into or out of Gibbons and High? Maybe it becomes a cul de sac like Eagle?
- They don't address the major Fernside crossing issue that will remain even with the future bike lane improvements.
- We need speed bumps.
- It does not mean more backups on High Street. If you build a traffic circle then traffic will flow more easily once drivers adapt. We just returned from Europe where there are traffic circles everywhere even in the smallest of country towns. Why are we trying to annoy and frustrate residents with the closing of a main artery. Because of one self-serving council member?
- Make cars on High st stop further back from intersection to reduce collision potential.
- Your selections are biased, slanted and misleading. The left turn light at Gibbons is trip activated. It only activates when there is east bound traffic on Gibbons. High Street backs up because of Fernside not Gibbons.
- Stop the traffic coming from the Airport, Oakland, etc. Fernside has become an offshoot of the highway. It is an 880 bypass in both directions. The issue is bigger than the Gibbon, High, Fernside intersection.
- Priority should be on improving access to bikes and pedestrians, not cars, even during construction. Construction on west end on Main St has made biking more difficult while construction is underway to implement bike lanes, which is not ideal.
- Leave well enough alone.
- Left turn from Gibbons onto High is merely a convenience, not a necessity.
- Make the traffic lights smarter, especially during commute hours.

- Don't change gibbons. Enforce existing speed limits. Add speed bumps/humps. To slow speeds.
 - There are many ways to this intersection safer without removing bridge access from Gibbons provides. The analysis / study failed to look at the safety issues created by trying to redesign this intersection.
 - Fine to rethink this intersection, but for the love of god please don't block that turn. It will create chaos and a very dangerous situation. Safety first please.
 - Yes, pay more attention to the right lane exit from Fernside to High/1880
 - The only reason the long term congestion would most likely come from people trying to avoid the round about in at Tilden that I do not agree with either - the studies are flawed ...
 - Again, an oddly biased question. In any event after attending the workshop, I don't think you're conclusion has complete information. The traffic study says 500 more cars will be onto bayo vista taking an unprotected left which wasn't included in the intersection study. You were just comparing congestion within the intersection itself, so your conclusions aren't a whole picture.
 - Gibbons is a street that is used for theFix the traffic signal so it is more clear for those getting on the bridge from Gibbons. If people are concerned about the safety of the intersection, they already have other options. They can choose an option that makes them feel more safe. I use it every day and am perfectly safe. As far as congestion: fine. More dangerous are ALL the cars now using all the smaller streets to get where they used to go from Gibbons. Leave it alone.
 - there is one change that can happen right now. I understand that currently when coming off high st to make a right turn onto fernside there is NO right turn on red and this is for pedestrian safety I imagine. I would suggest two changes now. 1) restrict pedestrians to cross Fernside only on the opposite side 2) Allow cars to make a right turn on red from High to Fernside **THIS change will make google maps algorithm show the travel time to be faster for those cars that making that right (since they do not have to wait for green light) and it would reduce the amount of traffic coming onto gibbons. Currently the algorithm says gibbons is faster or "similar travel time" as fernside. If you get the algorithm to show gibbons is slower (whichever way you can slow the cars down on gibbons or speed up on the other "main" st (hight & fernside) then its a win.
 - creating the same nightmare SF created. Instead of safety Alameda is creating more dangerous scenarios.
 - none of these seem perfect. Roundabouts should be considered. speedbumps on gibbons should be considered. the traffic on smaller streets that are narrow should be considered.
 - What about a roundabout? This is too confusing and will create more traffic on surrounding streets
 - I have never experienced traffic backup here except Xmas time for Thompson Ave decorations
 - Alternative C is definitely the worst. Alternative A seems best, but with some tweaks to accommodate bike access and turn movements, as described in my comments above.
 - Yes, it has limited data points, significant conjecture, and uses inappropriate assumptions and constraints while also ignoring the ecosystem. This survey's instructions have also requested respondents ignore the ecosystem in an attempt to achieve more positive results.
-
- Option C seems much better than the other options with a better ROI due to lower cost. Alternative A and B seem to just be moving problems onto adjacent streets and will make traffic at intersection much worse and less safe
 - See above.

- Signage at the signal for Gibbons could make it clear to drivers that they can cross the entire intersection.
- Please leave it as-is. We do not want to deal with the impact on side streets.
- I really don't think you're solving any problems here
- The slip lane on Fernside turning right into High is really dangerous for pedestrians.
- If you close off the Left turn onto High from Gibbons, you are going to push traffic onto the neighboring streets, which are narrow - allowing only 1 car to travel on it at a time and do not have signals to make a turn onto High or Fernside.
- Sounds like an initiative started by the residents of the Fernside.
- Close the thru traffic from High street to Gibbons
- Address the section where Fernside intersects to High Street and crossing the High Street bridge onto the street that parallels Fernside I can't remember the name of it. Is it Marina or Windsor? I'm not sure.
- I don't see that the proposals actually fix anything. Mostly they just rearrange the likely problems or make stress points worse. The last several Fernside /Fernside High fixes have just caused more stress, not eased anything.
- Yes. I am deeply concerned about how this change will impact Bayo Vista, which is officially designated as an "Environment" resource—significant not on its own, but because of its continuity, setting, and connection to neighboring elements that form a cohesive historic fabric. The safety of these streets, the availability to cross streets, have kids riding their bikes on the street throughout the day, are an essential part of what preserves that environment's integrity, character, and safety—and introducing up to four times more vehicle traffic (to turn left onto High Street) would drastically alter that balance. Has the City Engineer consulted with the Secretary to the Historical Advisory Board to assess how detrimental this change would be on this historical neighborhood? Additionally, there is significant speed on High Street (leaving Alameda and driving towards Oakland). When the High Street Bridge is up, the traffic gets even worse, and cars sit through several lights before traffic can clear. Bayo Vista is a narrow street. Cars are typically parked on either side of the street, and when two cars are parked opposite of each other on the street, cars CANNOT pass one another going in opposite directions. This means that traffic building up on Bayo to turn left onto High Street (where there is already too much speed and congestion - and kids, families, etc. trying to cross Bayo Vista at High Street), would simultaneously prevent cars from being able to turn right onto Bayo Vista off High Street. Additionally, people who live on Bayo Vista would have trouble accessing their own driveways or leaving their houses to turn right or left onto Bayo Vista. This will cause more safety issues for pedestrians when cars have to cut closer to the sidewalk or houses to "squeeze" past the line of cars that will be waiting to turn left.

Question: Additional comments on the neighborhood streets?

- Seems to have been fine for 40+ years traveling through the area daily.
- The use of soft speed bumps on Gibbons drive to slow the speed of drivers
- Cornell is a VERY narrow street. With drastically reduced parking along Fernside, Cornell will become jammed with parked cars. When cars are parked on both sides of Cornell, it is dangerous, and frequently IMPOSSIBLE (e.g., when one of the vehicles is a delivery van or truck), for vehicles traveling in opposite directions on Cornell to pass safely. This already challenging situation is made worse when children ride their bikes to and from school. Yet, all three versions of this plan TRIPLE the traffic on Cornell! If you insist on tripling the traffic on Cornell, then you

MUST make Cornell a ONE WAY street. Otherwise, I guarantee that your plans will result in increased rates of car accidents on Cornell. Please, don't make Cornell less safe! The children who live on Cornell and/or who use Cornell to ride their bikes to school deserve better! Please don't try to fix one problem by creating a dangerous situation on Cornell!

- For the most part, neighborhood streets are quite safe despite some cut-through traffic. Gibbons can feel like a speedway at certain times, especially during commute hours. The North/Southwood/Gibbons intersection is especially problematic with no stop signs, no crosswalks, and a wide, poorly designed layout. A roundabout, even a modest one with flowers or something to appease the neighborhood curmudgeons, would go a long way toward making it safer for everyone, especially pedestrians. Some drivers may try to sneak through on smaller side streets, but most people rely on navigation apps, so any increase would likely show up on larger through streets such as Lincoln, Santa Clara, Central, and Fernside.
- Do traffic/Speed High st to Cornell on Marina Dr study. Publish findings.
- Traffic, both cars, bikes and pedestrians (especially dog walkers) is already heavy on Southwood where we live. Closing Gibbons left turns onto High Street will greatly increase the traffic on Southwood. The intersection of Southwood/Bayo Vista/Thompson is a huge blind intersection. With the added traffic you will see many more accidents at this intersection.
- The streets are fine around this intersection. The more important issue is speeding on Fernside.
- I drive through the northwood/southwood/gibbons intersection daily. If there was more traffic it would be dangerous. Hard to see far up gibbons and 3 roads coming together.
- The streets on the Cornell-Versailles side are too narrow to accommodate more traffic and it is difficult to turn left onto Fernside from any of those streets. It's difficult to turn left onto High Street from any of the streets Central-Bayo Vista. The Gibbons stop light is the safest way to get from our neighborhood to the highway.
- Although I am opposed to Design A for Gibbons at High Street I do see the benefit to side streets if the High Street wait was shorter. However I believe that those taking "cut throughs" on side streets will continue to do so, not to avoid Gibbons but to avoid the Fernside and High Street intersection. I do not think the reduction in wait time vis a vis Design A will help much. There will still be congestion and cars will still cut through side streets.
- Southwood/Northwood/Gibbons is a very wild-west intersection with unclear right-of-way that causes many near-collisions and a lack of crosswalks to get from Gibbons to any other street. You cannot get to Lincoln Ave without crossing the road unprotected.
- It is important to note
- Some areas require drivers to be a bit more aware of what's going on around them, and likewise peds and bikers. Gibbons is designed as a cut-through and makes sense to maintain as such.
- Vehicle speeds are too high. Increase traffic enforcement, speed humps, added stop signs would improve safety.
- "Lack of visibility and any sort of traffic control at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood is extremely problematic and leads to many near-misses
- Cut-through traffic tends to be the worst offenders with speed, and put children in danger, especially at the high-volume crosswalk at Lincoln -- despite the crossing guard
- High speeds and lack of control at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood exacerbates lack of visibility of the crosswalk at Northwood/Buena Vista. The crosswalk's visibility is hampered by the curve of the street.
- Neighborhood streets other than Gibbons are extremely narrow -- it's difficult for two cars traveling in opposite directions to comfortably pass each other. Typically one car needs to slow to a near stop and/or pull slightly to the side to allow the other to pass. The width of these

streets therefore functions as a natural deterrent to cut-through traffic. The traffic memo does appear to take street width into account, but toward its end notes that ""traveled way narrowing"" could help further calm traffic on streets such as Southwood, Bayo Vista, Cornell, and Gibbons. This could be applicable to Southwood and Gibbons, especially in the context of studying approaches to addressing the trees and sidewalks on Gibbons -- but the city should note that Bayo Vista and Cornell are already pretty tight streets whose widths should already discourage speeding and cut-through traffic."

- Thompson Ave north of High Street is in dire need of repaving. It is a heavily traveled especially during the holidays of Halloween and Christmas.
- Streets are too wide. Not enough stop signs and cross walks. Overall people speed too much making it unsafe for all the kids esp elementary school kids walking to school. Massive intersections at non circles that should probably be circles.
- The most dangerous intersection in this neighborhood is the Southwood Bayo - this is an extremely long distance with no marking, no crosswalks and no stop signs. It is an ADA disaster. Any additional traffic on this intersection is irresponsible and a major safety concern. The proposal shows a 5x increase of traffic (from 150 cars/day to 600 cars/day). This is absolutely unacceptable. The increase in incidents will certainly outweigh any perceived safety at High/Gibbons.
- Compared to other parts of Alameda - this area should be the least of the city's concerns. Why would we be spending tax-payer dollars on this vs. some of the more critical intersections?
- There are a number of intersections without stop signs that are semi-manageable ONLY because there isn't a lot of traffic (especially the southwest intersection of Northwood/Gibbons/Southwood, although Cambridge/Buena Vista/Northwood can also be a bit tricky)
- The neighboring streets are not wide enough to support the increased traffic proposed. Gibbons is substantially wider and designed as a thoroughfare, the adjacent streets are not.
- Thompson is already a cut through speedway today. Thompson is a wider street than Fairview, Bayo Vista or Cornell. Thompson will get all the traffic from this Gibbons closure.
- The sidewalk conditions on Gibbons Drive are extremely dangerous. Please urgently schedule sidewalk repairs at intervals during the year to maintain the sidewalks.
- People are already speeding on Southwood everyday at dangerous speeds to bicycles and pedestrians. Throwing more traffic onto it will only make it worse.
- The neighborhood streets are very narrow, frequently requiring opposing drivers to pull over to pass one another. It's also difficult to turn onto High and Fernside from the smaller streets due to poor visibility.
- Stop sign adherence is extremely low, constant rolling through crosswalks.
- Closing Gibbons will make our neighborhood more dangerous.
- Google maps using a school zone on Pearl as the preferred route with speeding cars
- "Gibbons has operated as a cut-through street for decades (since before 1970), but in late 2022, the Transportation Commission created street designations in Alameda questionably classifying Gibbons as a local street like all the neighboring streets.
- However, the study confirms that ""Gibbons Drive is currently used by cut-through traffic more frequently than by local residents who travel to or from a destination within the neighborhood"".
- The study also confirms that Gibbons is 1/3 wider (10ft) than the neighboring streets. So it does not make sense that all of a sudden Gibbons expected to have a similar traffic rate as neighboring streets. The study did not look at pedestrian rates and there are a lot of pedestrians

that travel through the neighboring streets. It feels like we fixing one problem and creating a whole new set of problems."

- There are far more dangerous intersections in the neighborhood. Gobbons-High already has a signal and cross walk. There are many intersections that get significantly more pedestrian traffic, that don't have any stop signs, yield signs, markings, and are MUCH longer to cross than Gibbons High.
- Traffic calming measures are good. Making Gibbons right turn only is a really bad idea.
- Neighborhood traffic is currently used mostly just for residents. Some minor changes could be implemented.
- Just reduce speeds on Gibbons; do not make it impossible to go from Gibbons to High Street Bridge.
- Cars speeding!
- Bayo Vista and streets south of it are so narrow! Any alternative that directs more traffic there is not ok.
- Aside from Gibbons, Northwood, and Southwood- the rest of the streets are very narrow with cars lining both sides. Cars have to yield to each other to pass all of the time.
- Gibbons is a wider street and designed for through traffic. Again, just add speed bumps!
- Child crossings and school zone traffic are a major problem.
- Cut-through traffic: Drivers cutting through the neighborhood tend to be the worst speed offenders, endangering kids
- Police need to enforce traffic laws before you consider closing streets.
- This survey is ridiculous. You are only worried about Gibbons and not any other surrounding streets. It is slanted.
- Gibbons was designed as the main transitional street in the neighborhood and has a width which reflects that design. It was designed to feed in/out of the High Street Bridge, and traffic data shows it is actively used for this purposes. Let's try speed bumps on Gibbons first before spending millions on a flawed proposal.
- I fear for my life anytime I cross Gibbons between High and Central.
- The top issue for me are the new florescent yellow cross walk signs you've splattered across our neighborhood. As communicated by your PW engineer, there's no need for these signs other than his requirement to spend a budget. Wasteful. Similar are the dangerous two-way bike lanes.
- people sppeding through stop signs on neighborhood streets
- There are way MORE dangerous, unmarked, no signage intersections in Fernside. You named them above. Those are hard to see AND unclear who has right of way.
- The intersection of Pearl and Santa Clara Ave is especially perilous. Many children use this crossing. Motorists on all directions drive too fast and also drivers struggle to safely navigate the intersection due to poor visibility. Proximity to Edison Elementary means there are lots of cars on the road. Also vehicle speeds are a major problem on Pearl between Santa Clara and Lincoln as motorists speed to get to school on time. Please study this area more closely!
- Vehicle speeds are the top issue. I don't think traffic should be re-routed from the status quo.
- Don't push traffic onto narrower neighboring streets.
- Seriously - I live on Park Street and these are issues daily. They are not specific to Gibbons. We already have slow streets. Those have rerouted me TO Gibbons. If you want traffic on Gibbons to decrease, eliminate the slow streets. It looks like the streets with the most expensive houses are getting less traffic and it is being routed to streets with less expensive houses. Have you considered this as an equity issue?

- We should have been allowed to give more than 3 answers. ALL of these are issues. It's very annoying that Thompson Avenue (not Christmas Tree Lane side) is not called out. We have have been a freeway from Southwood for YEARS.
- "Fernside and Gibbons were designed to be major streets and should remain to be considered as such. It does not make sense to divert traffic from these larger streets if the result is a negative impact to the surrounding smaller streets. Even if speeding is a concern, traffic calming with speed humps should be the first method to consider given that is much more affordable and directly related to the primary root cause of the safety issue.
- Page 1 of the 28-page analysis only states that 15% of drivers on Gibbons drive at 31 mph and section 5, page 17, states that the average speed on Gibbons is 27 mph, which is 2 mph above the speed limit. There is no reference to how these speeds compare with other locations in alameda, but presumably, an average speed of 27 mph is average or better than most streets. The analysis does not even state that these speeds occur at the intersection (presumably, the high speeds occur elsewhere on Gibbons).
- The entirety of section 5 from the analysis suggests that Gibbons should be more accurately classified as a street for citywide circulation as opposed to a neighborhood local street. Gibbons was only recently reclassified to a neighborhood local street by the council in 2009. Perhaps that decision was not necessary and should be reconsidered and reversed. If Gibbons was designed appropriately (with traffic calming as necessary), the consolidation of traffic through a single KNOWN busy street (that appears to have been designed to be wide enough for this function) would be a better alternative to redistributing the cut through traffic to smaller streets, which also presents the need to install even MORE traffic calming devices at larger overall project cost and larger overall impact in the surrounding neighborhood. Simple traffic calming on Gibbons may be the most effective and affordable option to achieve the primary goals.
- Very dangerous neighborhood intersections and sidewalk conditions in this area
- People drive way too fast on all of these neighborhood streets and blow through the stop signs frequently.
- No enforcement whatsoever. Realignment won't do anything to address severe speeding in neighborhood.
- "As I mentioned earlier, Alternative A does not solve Gibbons being used as a major through fare. Other problems in this neighborhood are:
- intersections of Southwood / Bayo Vista / Fairview, Northwood / Gibbons / Southwood, and Northwood / Cambridge / Buena Vista
- Cars speed along smaller neighborhood streets (the ones that are 30 ft wide like Bayo Vista, Fairview, Thompson, Cambridge to name a few)
- Car gunning it from stoplights to stop signs along Gibbons
- All these issues decrease pedestrian and neighborhood (e.g., kids playing on lawn, running into street accidentally to chase loose ball) safety."
- They are already one-way narrow in some places yet still subject to dangerous speeds.
- The streets between Gibbons and Fernside have parking on both sides and room for one lane of traffic in the middle. All of them will be significantly congested. Gibbons is the only street designed to handle the traffic in both directions.
- I cut through this neighborhood to get to houses on the other side of High Street. Personally, traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps on Gibbons would convince me to stick to the main roads and keep me and others just cutting through out of that part of the neighborhood all together. Which I think is exactly the point and should be considered first and foremost.
- All the other streets besides Gibbons are too small to be thoroughfares.

- The neighborhood streets are much smaller than Gibbons Drive. Often requiring people to yield during 2 way traffic situations.
- People speed too quickly all over Alameda, so that's a given as a problem. Gibbons has several very weird intersections on it that are difficult to navigate as a driver or pedestrian.
- Vehicle speeds on Gibbons can be reduced with crosswalks, stop signs, blinking pedestrian signals and speed humps. The neighboring streets are at least 20% narrower and cannot safely handle the traffic going from the High Street Bridge to downtown Alameda.
- I think there is more of a safety issue for pedestrians and traffic around the various Northwood/Southwood/Gibbons/Cambridge than Gibbon and High intersection
- The streets are not comparable in terms of size or capacity. This has to be taken into account.
- "I am most familiar with Gibbons, so can't speak as well to the neighboring streets. But I have seen a lot of dangerous driving on Gibbons - folks speeding, weaving around cars they perceive as going too slowly, running stop signs and cursing at bikers.
- A couple of years ago a speeding car lost control and hit my neighbor's parked car hard enough to ram my parked car, which ended up in the shop for weeks. Thank goodness no one was hurt!"
- The side streets around gibbons are very small and are often used in a one lane manner where neighbors wait to drive through so that passing can happen in openings between parked cars. This would be a huge issue if a lot more non neighborhood traffic moved to these small side streets. Gibbons is much larger and better suited to through flow of traffic.
- "I do not see currently issues on the neighboring street. But cars already cut though on the 1900 block of Cornell Dr. from Gibbons when they see a red light at the intersection and they are heading to the bridge. This is a huge speed concern. More traffic on this block would be a NIGHTMARE!
- Neighborhood streets are narrow and only allow for one car at a time because home owners park on the street. "
- A roundabout would be a good addition at Gibbons and Cambridge
- Our streets are atrocious. They are designed like racecar tracks, with poorly-marked crosswalks and cars that ignore pedestrians, stop signs, etc regularly. These should all be fixed now! There have been two serious accidents on Northwood/Cambridge in the last few years, and many near misses. Cars drive too fast and there is no impediment.
- Increased traffic to side streets exacerbates the 2 way nature of those streets that are already skinny enough.
- Any option that doesn't allow for a left turn exiting Gibbons toward the High St. bridge will just reroute traffic thru the smaller ill-equipped side streets. This is blatantly obvious, and already an issue with people trying to save a minute who speed thru smaller streets and intersections that don't even have stop signs.
- Neighbor streets are narrow. We already pull over for cars to pass.
- Intersection of Gibbons and Cambridge needs to be changed
- Please help reduce vehicle speeds by adding speed bumps- not reducing existing infrastructure.
- The design of our streets is confusing and strange. Without proper signage and cross walks, it is a safety issue, particularly at rush hour when children are walking to school.
- "The intersection at Buena Vista and Tilden is far more unsafe than the one at gibbons and high. Poor lighting, no pedestrian signal.
- Crosswalk at northwood and buena vista is barely visible. City should put ladder striping down.
- The crosswalk at Northwood to Buena Vista is barely visible. "

- i have two small children and live on a very narrow street directly adjacent to Gibbons. I am obviously concerned that limiting traffic on Gibbons - a relatively wide street - will reroute traffic onto the street i live on which is relatively unequipped due to its narrowness.
- "Worst intersection is Lincoln/Gibbons - lots of vehicles fail to stop and blind corners due to angles. Where are the traffic cops on motorcycles that used to keep Alameda streets safe??"
- Stop sign at Gibbons and Cornell would slow things down too."
- Why would anyone even drive on Southwood, Bayo Vista, Cornell etc if you didn't live on/near these streets? You want to divert traffic to High or Fernside from Gibbons, and that will create safety issues on High due to heavy traffic already on a narrow street. Traveling in the Southwood, Thompson, Fairview etc area is confusing enough. WHY make those streets more dangerous with increased traffic with cars unfamiliar with the area? Gibbons is a through street, always has been always will be. People living on Gibbons knew this when they purchased their homes. Change that and you will have the wrath of the Fernside HOA at your door. And yes we know which council member lives on Gibbons.
- The Southwood/Northwood/Gibbons intersection is the most dangerous intersection I believe and should be worked on first.
- what is 'cut-through traffic'? don't we just need to choose a street to drive on and go that way? There are a lot of options and people just prefer different ways, that's normal.
- Bayview Dr. Traffic from drivers NOT wanting to take Otis. Crazy busy during am rush and nighttime from 4-7PM. SOOOO Dangerous, Noisy, Busy, it's like a major highway almost. Impossible to navigate. I am 74, lived here for 5 years and moving onto Court because it is so so so busy. Fear for my grandchildren's lives, as well as my pets lives. SOMETHING needs to be done ASAP.
- Gibbons is known as the largest street in the neighborhood and therefore it supports significant traffic and kids are much more careful when crossing it. This is not the case with surrounding streets which are much smaller and not expected to support heavy traffic. Even now, cars come barreling down some of those side streets and create safety issues for kids - children were almost hit by a car on Northwood recently because there are no stop signs or speed bumps on northwood. This will only get worse if we divert traffic from Gibbons, which is much better suited for through-traffic than the side streets
- The intersection of Gibbons and Northwood/Southwood near the southern end of Northwood is a safety issue and needs a round-about. If we're looking at traffic safety, that is the area to focus on, not the Fernside/Northwood intersection.
- Also, why was B not studied? I absolutely would expect B would also divert traffic to surrounding streets as it would make it significantly less direct for drivers going between the High St bridge and Gibbons. "
- You are creating problems where few exist. The roundabout planned for the Fruitvale bridge is another mid-step. Pedestrians there have safety of lights and will now be attempting to cross a roundabout. Dedicated left turn light arriving on the island onto fernside gone, replaced with a very busy roundabout. Will need metering lights like the one placed at the freeway entrance (which people speed into regardless of right of way issues). Sorry, but seems like the "problem creation team"
- I live on High Street and see dangerous vehicle speeds on High Street between Encinal Avenue and the High Street Bridge every day. People ignore the 25mph speed limit and routinely go upwards of 30-40 MPH in an area that is very residential and with many schools and daycares, often running red lights blatantly. I assume that most of the cars speeding are not local residents but are a mix of shoppers at the South Shore Mall or others that are using High Street as a cut

through to get to the south side or other parts of the island. I have also seen high speeds coming down Gibbons at the intersection of Santa Clara Avenue, and this intersection does not feel very safe for pedestrians, especially at night. It is quite large, and could benefit from daylighting or a roundabout.

- Gibbons drive doesn't even have a line in the middle it is unsafe.
- Turning left onto High Street from streets West of High is dangerous. Best to keep it at a light on Gibbons
- We have lived here in the Fernside district for over 25 yrs and the risk of most common injury have been from tree roots lifting up sidewalks on Gibbons. The other most frequent scary incidents have been vehicles on High St driving without slowing or stopping for pedestrians or bikes crossing on Bayo Vista, Fairview, or Thompson. This Gibbons/High intersection seems an odd issue to focus on compared to those issues that the city should look at more.
- The sidewalks are extremely dangerous. My stroller cannot navigate certain bumps, forcing us into the street where we've gotten honked at. Without marked crossings, even if the stroller could navigate the sidewalks we'd have to use the streets. I have also tripped several times on the sidewalk, particularly at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood closer to Lincoln by the white house.
- I live on Thompson Av between High and Fernside. My concern is that the proposed changes will increase speeds on High Street and the frequency and speed of "cut through" traffic on Thompson and Fairview. Speeding on High Street and cut through traffic are already a significant safety problem on High, Thompson and Fairview and the proposed plan seems likely to increase the problem.
- The side streets from Gibbons Drive to High Street and to Fernside are tiny and narrow compared to those bigger streets, and they are more narrow than Gibbons. Cars park on both sides of the side streets all day long. People work from home in this neighborhood, so they have to park in front of their homes. You can often only get one car at a time in each direction day or night. A truck will have profound difficulties navigating through a side street if there is reverse traffic on the street. Currently that truck can get through because traffic is rare. If traffic increases that truck is going to get stuck and then everything will get stuck. Finally, there are a lot of little kids who play on very small yards in front of their homes, working their way in and out of driveways, and if the streets are full of traffic, we're going to have more injuries.
- I cross the weird intersection of Gibbons/Southwood/Northwood very frequently and it is awful. We have to cut across it or cross it twice to get to our friends house coming from Lincoln Blvd to their house at Northwood across from the Buena Vista intersection. Making it an opportunity to reduce hardscape, increase stormwater infiltration and improve safety for peds and bikes would be amazing.
- Lack of stop signs or speedbumps on neighborhood streets like southwood, bay vista, fairviewThe neighborhood intersections listed are very scary with poor visibility and no clear right-of-way
- We need more stop signs, flashing ped signs, zebra striping, traffic enforcement.
- People drive much too fast on Gibbons, which is especially alarming with the complex intersections throughout the neighborhood due to Gibbons cutting through the grid.
- Speeding cars in general is a problem on the wider streets in the neighborhood. Terrific calming is needed on several streets
- The neighborhood streets are much shorter and narrower than Gibbons. They were never designed to accommodate the additional traffic proposed, whereas Gibbons was designed for

the traffic bc it was designed as a connector street (it is wider, longer, and at a diagonal). It seems like an obvious flaw for Option A.

- Lack of stop sign at gibbons and Cornell creates a drag race down gibbons Dr in both directions.
- Several of the intersections do not have stop signs or crosswalks and are used by children, parents and pets daily to get to Edison school and back. There are tons of pedestrians walking these streets and far less walking on Gibbons due to the poor sidewalk conditions. There is a 4 way stop on Gibbons as well. Of all the streets in the area, Gibbons is the least concerning.
- The volume of traffic using Gibbons and our neighborhood bothers me less than the speed and recklessness of the driving. If we had improved infrastructure to minimize potential harm we could accommodate the number of people wanting to use this area for driving through, walking, and biking.
- Attempting to slow traffic on Gibbons and other streets should be attempted, with stop signs, speed bumps and the like, before a drastic plan like closing Gibbons to a left is enacted. The Southwood/Northwood intersections are just as bad and confusing as the Gibbons/High/Fernside one, much less controlled and much more used by pedestrians, especially children -- and will get much more traffic if Plan A I enacted. The city should do a pedestrian study to confirm what is well known in the neighborhood.
- Vehicles speeding down Gibbons are dangerous between High/Fernside/Gibbons and the first four way stop. We could use more traffic calming measures (paint is useless but at least a visual cue for people driving to slow down). The intersections at Southwood and Northwood are dangerous for all people regardless of whether they're in a car, bike, walking, or in a wheelchair. Please improve the safety at these confusing intersections.
- Implement speed cameras and raised crosswalk speed bumps.
- SAFETY should be the #1 concern for ANY neighborhood streets.
- The combination of (1) speed on Gibbons; (2) cut-through traffic on Gibbons, which is where a lot of the speeding comes from; and (3) poor and unclear intersections like Northwood and Buena Vista and Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood are a recipe for disaster. When I first moved to Gibbons in 2023, I had so many near run-ins with cars while on my bike that I almost stopped riding altogether. Drivers are so focused on speeding to their destination that they don't pay attention to intersection right-of-ways.
- "I would like to see similar surveys done for neighbroods that are not historically 100% white.
- I have never seen a survey about neighborhood streets from the city like this in other projects
- 600 cars per day is considered both nominal and not worth discussing in other neighborhoods, and the plan for the neighborhood greenways allows for that many cars per day on the preferred bike routes.
- Overall, I'm fairly confused by the goal of this question and a bit worried it sets the standard that historically white neighbroods should expect elevated street safety vs other parts of town.
- Other parts of town are told that we should not expect traffic calming on neighborhood streets per the active transportation plan. "
- We need speed humps and 4-way stop signs on Gibbons at Cornell and 4-way stop signs at Bayo Vista and Cornell. A roundabout at the Southwood, Bayo Vista, Fairview intersection would also be really helpful, as well as better traffic direction and right of way/yield line/area painting and signage and traffic calming measures (e.g., bulb-outs and crosswalks) at the Gibbons, Southwood, Northwood intersection. High street could also use a 4-way stop sign at Thompson and a short one-block two-way bike lane on the Northwest side of High Street between Thompson and Lincoln to provide safe access for cyclists that currently have no safe option to

navigate between the Fernside neighborhood and the Encinal/Otis-bound neighborhoods directly adjacent.

- gibbons - northwood intersections are especially wide, prompting higher vehicular speed
- Right now Gibbons is used as a cut through and traffic needs to be routed around it to the bigger streets that can accommodate these speeds.
- We have requested help with the sidewalks many times
- "Police need to issue tickets to speeders. I never see a cop issue a speeding ticket.
- What the hell has happened to traffic enforcement. Need meaningful fines."
- Roundabouts are needed at the "wild west" multi-street intersections in the Gibbons neighborhood. Speed calming, and pedestrian safety tools need to be placed on High Street.
- Versailles Ave needs speed bumps Encinal to Central Ave.
- Once you restrict traffic on Gibbons people will use other neighboring streets. When there was construction on the bridges traffic patterns changed and more traffic went down fernside. And some permanent traffic patterns emerged.
- There are two massive intersections on northwood that need traffic calming to reduce speeds. Traffic circle seems ideal
- The speeding and reckless driving on Fernside is out of control.
- Continuing to keep some streets closed for car traffic does not make sense as it pushes traffic to other streets.
- There are no mechanisms to maintain or slow drivers down. No stop signs or speed bumps. Also the Northwood/Southwood intersections are very confusing
- The items listed are all considerations.
- drivers running stop signs and stop lights
- "Cars run the stop sign at Gibbons and Lincoln.
- Cars speed on Lincoln straightaway to High."
- "Slow streets has been effective at lowering thru-traffic speed on Versailles ave.
- Cambridge would benefit from lower speeds, even more so if Alternate A is implemented,"
- Many of the residents in this neighborhood already walk or bike as much as possible, diverting traffic would force non-resident car traffic onto these streets and create more congestion as well as bike and pedestrian accidents.
- The intersection at High Street is a launching pad for speeders entering Alameda. Both on Gibbons drive and High Street. Drivers routinely use Bayo Vista to connect to Cornell and cut across Gibbons to Fernside making the Gibbons/Cornell intersection more congested. Everything you propose will do nothing to little to address these issues.
- See previous. Traffic flow via Gibbons, Central, and Fernside is a nightmare.
- I don't perceive much wrong with the status quo at all. Seems to me this initiative is motivated more by the self-interested desires of Gibbons residents than anything else. If safety is indeed an issue along Gibbons methods address to address it without screwing over neighbors.
- Don't change gibbons. Enforce existing speed speed laws.
- "Neighborhood streets are narrow and NOT designed to move cars on and off the bridge.
- Half the residents on my block work from home and cars are always parked on both sides of the street. More cars are projected to park on side streets once the Fernside bike lane is installed. "
- Cars fly down Fernside. Does the 'your speed' thing record data or just tell the speed of the person driving by? I'm curious what the data is if possible. Are speed bumps on Fernside an option?
- Main issue is fernside

- I often observe high speeds of cars traveling on Central from High Street to Broadway. Very excessive speeding with no stop signs or traffic slowing jumps.
- We see speeding on our streets off of Gibbons already without additional Gibbons traffic redirected to them. Gibbons residents know of the traffic patterns when they moved there, much like homeowners in the path of the airport.
- There are so many crazy intersections with no crosswalks, stop signs, etc. Please don't put more traffic on these without doing something about it.
- Gibbons was not planned for this much traffic.
- The Fernside proposed changes reduce on street parking there by 40%.....so cars will park on these neighborhood streets, thus jamming those streets, on Thursdays and Fridays especially during street sweeping towaway times.
- We need traffic enforcement if Alameda is still short on officers and speed bumps - site visit other cities - Menlo Park, Palo Alto, San Mateo, Redwood City Etc they are very effective
- When the developers originally build Gibbons, they designed it as a cut through street. And it is still used that way, because all the City did was change the land use designation and then haven't done anything to actually change the physical use of the street (And I understand that is coming now that the traffic study did show such impacts). To do that, the city needs to take a step back and look holistically at what can be done for the entire neighborhood and not work backwards from making Fernside a right turn only. With that goal in mind, it seems like deterring people from entering at Gibbons and Central or Santa Clara would make the most sense. And then adding in more stop signs and or speed bumps on Gibbons. I am not sure roundabouts would actually slow traffic down although it would make the intersections safer. Especially at Gibbons northwood southwood area.
- Looks like Fernside has too much traffic. Not Gibbons. I like being able to go left off Gibbons to Fernside (not High Street Bridge). You fail to mention the increase on Fernside after the change or High Street either.
- Why is Gibbons traffic considered "cut through traffic?" It's a Main Street!! Is it because the houses likely have wealthy owners? Is traffic on Santa Clara and Central also considered "cut through?" Alameda's most beautiful tree lined street makes a beautiful entrance and statement in Alameda for all to drive through and enjoy.
- Lincoln Street has very high speeders.
- Very dark at night. Easy to get lost if you don't live in the neighborhood
- If Alternative A is implemented the top issues would change dramatically from things that can be easily addressed with long-deferred maintenance and some gentle easing traffic jumps that will not damage vehicles of neighborhood residents while maintaining safe speeds with neighborhood traffic. Also, the proposed removal of significant parking on Fernside will amplify the negative impacts of the city's proposal. There are other safe options that can easily be used without this enormous cost. Those funds should be used instead to address aging infrastructure that has not been sufficiently maintained. This neighborhood's infrastructure has been disintegrating over the last decade.
- Many (bikes, cars) use Gibbons on their way to High Street Bridge.
- Sidewalks on Gibbons are treacherous and need fixing, given proximity to schools - lots of kids on scooters and strollers
- Fernside was expanded to accommodate the traffic from HB. Now it's too much traffic and the City is considering more housing on HB. Makes no sense.
- Overbuilding in Alameda had continued at an alarming rate. How many council members live within the yellow boundary?

- Closing Versailles and now a circle intersection at Tilden is going to force traffic onto smaller side streets. Crossing Fernside from Marina should be right turn only. Cars cut through to avoid intersection at Fernside and High
- There should be a stop sign either at Gibbons or Northwood. It is hard to see traffic coming from Gibbons if driving along Northwood.
- I love walking on these streets but I have to avoid some with a stroller.
- Please leave the situation as it exists today. We do not want the High Street and Gibbons traffic diverted to our quiet streets. Kids bike and play in the intersection. Speeders go through our streets now, endangering us and the kids. We do not have enough police to provide coverage for these traffic incidents in the current configuration. The drivers do not care or pay attention to the safety of our neighborhoods.
- The intersection of southwood north wood and gibbons is the more dangerous intersection from a safety perspective in my experience in both cars and as a pedestrian
- We desperately need some safer intersections at Northwood & Buena Vista (and prominent route to walk to school for many kids) and at Cornel and Gibbons, especially for cars coming from high street bridge.
- Vehicle speeds on central and Santa Clara. "Cut through" on gibbons is a misnomer. It's a street. People can drive on it.
- The crossing between Southwood/Bayo Vista is horrible. There are no marked crosswalks and no curb cut outs. Those intersections are long and no one really knows who has the right of way. The same can be said for Northwood/Cambridge. This intersection is nearly a blind intersection and there are always children crossing those streets. My friends have had their cars totaled as people come speeding down those streets.
- Don't mess with the trees! As for the rest of the City, stop hiring tree butchers. Instead, hire a firm that has some aesthetic taste. And plant more while you are at it. Climate change, after all.
- "there is virtually no cut thru traffic on any other street and those that cut through are often speeding (I've seen people passing other cars) and oversized vehicles (Brink's trucks) that come from Oakland. We also need a speed bump on gibbons between high street and Cornell and a stop sign or traffic circle at cornell
- Before the base closed, there was considerable traffic on Gibbons, especially at commute times. Closing Gibbons will force people traveling from Central Alameda to fan out into the neighboring streets. I can assure you, the result of short timing the light at Gibbons in the '70s resulted in a one block speed way on Yale. The same thing will happen now, but people are more self centered, so probably will be even worse. I noticed that no traffic studies were done for Yale which is the natural 1st alternative. Why didn't you go look at the figures from when there was high use of the area? Did you look at the original PUD for Fernside? Gibbons was intended to be the through street for the development. That's why the developer built his own house on a different street.
- Bayo Vista is a narrow street. Cars are typically parked on either side of the street, and when two cars are parked opposite of each other on the street, cars CANNOT pass one another going in opposite directions. Kids, families, couples (of all ages) and even wildlife (turkeys) cross Bayo Vista at High Street throughout the day. Adding more cars to that intersection by forcing cars through Bayo Vista to turn left onto High Street will be dangerous. One of the reasons traffic volume may be low is likely because the street is so narrow that cars cannot pass each other without having to pull off to the side and wait.
- Incoming and outgoing traffic needs to be slowed on Gibbons. Vehicles have been traveling at high rates of speeds. And it's been dangerous for both pedestrians and those operating vehicles.

- Traffic has been moving thro Traffic calming is needed sooner rather than later through the intersection much too quickly.

Question: What other comments do you have on traffic diversion and neighborhood traffic calming?

- southwood / bayovista / fairview would be a dangerous intersection if traffic increased even moderately
- Santa Clara is a speedway especially between High and Gibbons. Very dangerous for kids going to Lincoln Park or to and from Lincoln Middle School. Much more dangerous than Gibbons.
- Please rethink this. It is not a good use of tax dollars and will create far worse traffic trying to get to the bridge.
- No speed humps!
- Speed humps on all streets. Add bike lanes to Gibbons to add a safe car-free option, encouraging less car use at the intersection
- I cannot support any plans that so obviously creates a dangerous situation on Cornell. Cornell is MUCH TOO NARROW for a tripling of traffic. This chance WILL CAUSE ACCIDENTS ON CORNELL,!
- Get speed cameras. Enforce the speed limit of 25 mph. It's not 30, 35, or 50. Stop the problem, don't try to push it into my street.
- ROUNDABOUTS!!!!
- Speed humps on Bayo Vista and Cornell. Traffic circles seem like a good idea too.
- Marina dr High st to Versaille is at freeway speeds. Lots of children in danger.
- Speed humps on Southwood
- Put speed humps on Fernside enforce speed limits.
- Please do not divert traffic to the streets between Cornell-Versailles. Those streets are not wide enough for two cars so with oncoming cars, one has to find space to pull to the side, which often means pulling to the curb where children are playing. It's dangerous to have more traffic on those streets.
- Speed bumps on Bayo Vista and Fairview between High and Southwood would help reduce speeders I think. A roundabout at the e.g. site mentioned is also good to slow down speeders that come through several times a day. These changes would be essential if the City goes ahead with Design A at Gibbons and High.
- Close off Gibbons Drive at High St.
- Speed humps on Fernside.
- Northwood/Southwood/Gibbons desperately needs some traffic diversion - a traffic circle would be very helpful. The same is true for Northwood/Cambridge/Buena Vista. I would also welcome one at Gibbons/Cornell to slow the additional traffic that is anticipated to use Cornell to avoid the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection.
- Bayo Vista and Yale/Cornell will likely need calming since traffic will be diverted through there from Gibbons.
- There can be raised crosswalk, chicanes, narrower parts of the street for a moment to reduce speeds, and having smaller intersections by removing the parking space area next to the intersection and adding concrete or bollards.
- If you'd stop restricting every street that makes sense to drive across Alameda on, then none of this would be an issue. Side streets are not meant for increased traffic this would create.
- Do NOT close of Gibbons are force more traffic onto less safe streets. People still need to get to the bridge, and this would force them to make less safe turns, like a left turn from Bayo Vista on to High St. This will also increase congestion. Alternative A is incredibly flawed and should not be

considered. Guaranteed this will lead to more traffic accidents, just so some powerful people on the 3100 block of Gibbons can have less traffic on their street -- they should be ashamed.

- A neighborhood traffic circle is very much needed at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood. Speeding cut-through traffic along Gibbons doesn't much respect stop signs as it is, and new crosswalks are unlikely to help. Because people like to speed along Gibbons as much to make the green light as for the visual effect of watching the tall trees fly by -- neighborhood traffic circles should really be installed at every Gibbons intersection in order to prevent people speeding for its own sake. Curb extensions and perhaps a raised crossing are needed at Northwood/Buena Vista in order to mitigate the lack of visibility caused by the street's geometry; this is very important because it's a crossing for segment of the neighborhood's children going to Edison.
 - A traffic circle is much needed at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood to slow cut-through traffic, since stop signs alone aren't effective.
 - Blinking lights at pedestrian crosswalks
 - The current traffic on Gibbons (2200) is already lower than the upper limit for local streets which is 4000
 - Gibbons is 33% wider than other smaller streets that would take significant traffic. Bayo Vista, for example is only 30 feet wide, vs. Gibbons at 40 feet wide. The proposal would increase traffic on Bayo Vista by nearly 300% - this street cannot handle two opposing cars currently, creating significant congestion. Gibbons, on the other hand, two cars can easily pass without one needing to pull over.
 - In general think everything should be a both and to decrease speed and intersection size, but wouldn't want to limit one action until a second action was done because the result ends up being nothing ever gets better. Will take the half steps.
 - I drive high st. in Oakland every day. Speed humps have made a HUGE improvement on traffic calming.
 - Changes simply move the problem. Increased enforcement is the answer.
 - I'm all for slowing down traffic on Gibbons, maybe adding another stop sign or two, and incorporating traffic circles. But quadrupling the traffic on Bayo Vista (skinny road) and I assume Southwood also, and tripling the volume on Cornell is too drastic a change.
 - Speed humps on Gibbons to slow traffic seems to be the obvious first step.
 - Adding an additional stop sign with a speeding camera.
 - Speed humps on Southwood Drive
 - Southwood, bayo vista, north wood
 - Throwing more traffic onto surrounding streets is not traffic calming except for the few that live on Gibbons Dr like Councilperson Jensen!,,
-
- Comparing the small streets in Fernside to other neighborhoods or "average" traffic of neighborhood streets is a false equivalence. The Fernside streets are narrower than those in other neighborhoods, and would be more severely impacted by increased traffic.
 - All of the above, but assuming we can't afford everything, I'd prioritize traffic calming on Gibbons, where there are known problems. Also, Gibbons is at least 5 feet wider than adjacent streets, so invites more speeding.
 - Have you thought about when the bridge goes up? There is still some leeway on gibbons for people to turn around. This would be non-existent on the side streets.
 - Closing Gibbons will make our neighborhood more dangerous.

- Speed traps would be helpful, at one point they were common here. Speed humps on Pearl as it's a school zone and direct to lights at Tilden
- Again, very biased framing and doesn't include the facts in the study. It is "relatively low", but is it "relatively low" for streets of that width? Why are they comparing to Pacific and San Antonio which are NOT in the area in question and are not similar types of streets? It says it would increase traffic, but does not mention it would increase it by over 300%. Stop signs on Gibbons should also be considered. The study also doesn't mention the safety hazards of forcing 500 cars away from a protected left turn light on Gibbons with crosswalks; to an unprotected left turn from Bayo Vista onto busy High street where there are already NO crosswalks for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Traffic calming is very necessary
- Speed humps work great in Oakland. The Oakland City engineer have proved this on many roads. Why isn't Alameda using speed humps?
- Traffic volume on Gibbons is already within acceptable limits, as it's a wider road. Increasing traffic by four times on small narrow streets like Cornell and Bayo Vista, where it is a challenge for two cars to pass each other will lead to UNSAFE CONDITIONS for kids biking to school and pedestrians. What does ANY OF THIS have to do with the Fernside project. This seems like it's an inside job from politicians and appointed officials who live on the 3100 block of Gibbons. The political pressure here should be investigated. This keeps getting rejected by the citizens and some keeps trying to sneak this back into a project.
- Horrible and unnecessary. Existing conditions do not justify changes.
- Cornell and Bayo Vista are not safely able to handle the projected traffic. Focus on the actual problem which is vehicle speed on Gibbons.
- Do not redirect traffic to smaller streets. You are just moving a problem and creating more problems that what you're trying to fix, which honestly isn't super clear as it is.
- If speeding is an issue, enforcement is the solution.
- Any plan that encourages unprotected left hand turns onto High or Fernside seems very unsafe for everyone (pedestrians, bikers and cars)
- Speed humps slow people down, they are very effective. Also equating numbers of cars on Gibbons vs Cornell is comparing apples and oranges. Cornell and the similar streets are so much more narrow. Really the "study" is not objective at all.
- Traffic circles and speed bumps are the obvious remedies.
- Please please please do not add more speed humps - road diets, particularly reducing width of intersections will naturally slow traffic without the need for speed humps
- Speed bumps are hard for bikes
- Don't put traffic on narrower streets.
- Cambridge and surrounding streets
- In general I think the problem is overstated. Some minor tuning (a speed bump or two on Gibbons), and perhaps a roundabout at Gibbons/High/Fernside would address the primary points of speed variance. Many of the streets in Fernside are narrow and don't accommodate increased traffic volumes well. There is a street (Gibbons) which was designed and built as a traffic collector for the neighborhood; some modest traffic calming measures seems like the best approach - very cheap so should have a high cost/benefit analysis
- "The new traffic would still be relatively low and similar to other local streets in Alameda." This is a bullshit statement, please show proof.
- Councilperson Jenson should and must recuse herself if this proposal comes before the city council

- There is significant traffic safety concerns along Gibbons due it being used a short cut. Gibbons left turn restriction is needed immediately. I am also interested in finding ways to reduce overall traffic in the neighborhood to increase safety for everyone.
- I have concerns with the biased and limited information that is being presented. There is not a problem for anyone other than Tracy and her neighbors who live on Gibbons. This is not how leaders are supposed to lead, nor is this how government is supposed to work.
- traffic circles better than speed bumps
- The narrow streets that are 30 feet across can't even accommodate traffic going in either direction at the same time. Pushing more cars down these arteries would be a disaster.
- I believe current conditions reflect original plans for area streets. No compelling reason to fiddle with flows.
- Thinking that the narrow side streets can accommodate traffic with a turn restricted Gibbons is not reasonable. These streets are narrow, generally have cars parked on both sides and typically need one car to pull over to allow two oncoming cars to pass one another. To think that the streets could do this with 400% more traffic volume is not acceptable.
- Suggestions: Stops or signals added to Pearl at Santa Clara. Speed bumps on Pearl between Santa Clara and Lincoln. Traffic enforcement presence at Broadway and Santa Clara.
- I do not support a turn restriction on Gibbons. The other streets that would experience a significant increase in traffic are more narrow than Gibbons, many cannot accommodate two-way traffic in spots where cars are parked on both sides of the street. Gibbons is and always has been a superior route to access the Fernside and High Street intersection because it is wider and more direct. Rerouting traffic is dangerous and unfair to residents of the streets that will suffer terms of safety as they have not been designed for the increased volume.
- None. Why can't Gibbons handle the same traffic as other streets?
- Cornell Drive? Really? I travel Cornell FREQUENTLY. The traffic on Cornell versus Thompson is MINISCULE.
- More data should be provided that specifically show metrics that meet the root cause issues for this study in the first place. For example, it is not acceptable to increase traffic at smaller neighborhood streets in order to reduce traffic on larger thoroughfare streets like Fernside and Gibbons that were designed to handle this traffic. There will be way more traffic accidents on these smaller streets, likely involving pedestrians if this plan is carried out, due to the number of quick turns at stop signs that vehicles will end up attempting to navigate in order to find the best alternative route. Also, the number of vehicles traveling north vs south on gibbons was not specified, so it is not possible to truly understand the impact of the proposed changes (the report only notes the total quantity change, but doesn't specify the change in each direction). Page 4 of the analysis presents 3 key questions. Question 1 restates the above goals to "simplify the intersection, shorten pedestrian crossings, reduce vehicle speeds through the intersection, and reduce traffic signal wait times." As presented, there is no data presented that these specific goals have any root cause issues at this intersection that warrant a re-design. Question 2 asks for the effects of the cut through traffic on Gibbons and parallel neighborhood streets. Again, the analysis makes no mention that vehicle cut through is an objective for this project, and should not be used in the evaluation. While there is decent data from the 4 hours of while data collected, there is no data presented on the number of pedestrians or bicyclists that crossed fernside, high st, or Gibbons. In order for a comprehensive analysis to be used to compare apples to apples, data should be collected for pedestrians and bicyclists on the same day as vehicles. How many crossings were there from pedestrians and bicyclists during the hours of 7-9am and 4-6pm on May 21, 2025?

- Consider stop signs at large intersections
- Santa Clara Ave, Central Ave, Pearl Street
- Let traffic flow as designed on Gibbons as a connector street. Don't divert traffic unnaturally onto smaller neighborhood streets. This continues to be a problem for small neighborhood streets impacted by "temporary" slow streets that has not been addressed
- ENFORCEMENT!!!
- Drive traffic to the "Island Arterial" streets such as Fernside, High, Broadway, Central), deter traffic through Gibbons. Neighborhood streets cannot absorb the additional traffic because a) its too narrow and b) it is not safe (alot of them have kids playing in front). If traffic increase on neighborhood streets SOMEONE WILL DIE. I've seen and have been involved in too many close calls.
- WHY CAN'T WE HAVE TRAFFIC CIRCLES The intersection at Northwood/Southwood/Gibbons is worse and scarier than Fernside/Gibbons/High, which at least has traffic lights. There's not even a yield on Northwood and the traffic from southwood can't see them coming. Cars come down Cambridge and Gibbons already like they're on fire, there's no safe or easy way for pedestrians to cross the streets safely and so the merge is a big problem. It's already marginal with close calls; If you driving any more traffic through there without addressing it someone is going to get hurt.
- Clinton, San Antonio and Pacific are wide enough for parking on both sides and two way traffic in the middle. The comparison streets are misleading.
- I would like to see the city study this in the future and consider additional changes that prevent cars from using gibbons as a cuthrough and redirect them to use Fernside, high street, Broadway and central to get to the high street bridge to/from other parts of the island.
- The grid shows "extremely low" traffic on Bayo Vista and Cornell because those are more narrow streets and even similar streets in the area like Moreland has this type of traffic. Pacific and San Antonio don't compare! 4-500 more cars should not be treated like a minor increase.
- Streets between High and Fernside need calming measures. They are long and straight so people use them as a cut through to avoid the lights on High street
- It is not acceptable to change Gibbons just to divert traffic elsewhere
- More stop signs, more flashing pedestrian crosswalk signals, better signage and traffic flow markings, more excessive speed enforcement
- Gibbons is 20% wider than the neighboring streets. It was designed to accommodate larger volume of traffic.
- No roundabouts. A few days ago, I was in a huge traffic jam in Berkeley because of a roundabout at a very busy intersection. Cars on several sides could not even enter the roundabout because of the number of cars going through. This would lead to even more traffic back
- I travel Gibbons / High intersection everyday during the morning and evening commute hours. I don't view the congestion as bad at all. Rarely do I have to wait more than one signal cycle. By pushing traffic onto narrower and even more confusing intersections (Northwood / Southwood) I believe you're putting perceived congestion over neighborhood safety. There are a lot of kids who walk and bike to Edison who will be exposed to more vehicle traffic at more intersections.
- Fernside
- We have been told that we can't have speed humps on Gibbons because it is a main artery for emergency vehicles. If this has not changed, then this is not a viable option to offer.
- Do not force more traffic onto narrower side streets
- I think the change at Gibbons/High should happen regardless, but I also think traffic calming efforts are needed throughout, and particularly at the intersections referred to above. I also

think they will be needed on the side streets, in order to mitigate the impact of additional traffic they might receive!

- The reason traffic is low on these streets is because many of them are narrow and therefore slower to travel when there are cars going both directions.
- I believe that traffic will be diverted around the neighborhood rather than through it on the smaller streets.
- Every street that that will see increased traffic should also be closed to through traffic - they are too narrow. You can't close Gibbons to bridge traffic and expect smaller streets to take that traffic flow. Just close all the streets to through traffic or close Gibbon at feeder streets so traffic does not come on to the street.
- Clearly, you are attempting to justify your salaries by searching for problems that don't exist and whose predetermined solutions absolutely can not justify the significant squandering of taxpayer funds, be they local, county, state or federal. The ultimate source of the "grants" are taxpayer pockets.
- Roundabouts are best. Speed humps are bad for emergency service vehicles. More stop signs to prevent speeding cars.
- Every efforts should be put in place for bridge traffic whose destination is not the bounded area to be High, Gibbons, Central.
- Why not all of them? Let's make it hard to drive fast. Stop signs don't work. Cop cars can only sit at so many intersections. We need to slow this stuff down now. Why wait?? Speed humps on Northwood/Southwood are a no-brainer, unless we can get a roundabout on Northwood/Buena Vista/Cambridge and Southwood/Fairview/Bayo Vista.
- People cut through on Cambridge to avoid gibbons. It is a problem because it is so narrow. I hope you have taken in your consideration if the cut through roads can handle the extra cars
- Diverting traffic from Gibbons to other streets is not acceptable. These other streets are smaller and many already have existing issues (e.g. the Cambridge/Northwood intersection). Gibbons was clearly made to be the thoroughfare for this neighborhood. Granted, traffic was different then, but diverting it to smaller streets is not a safe solution. Add stop signs to Gibbons and/or speed humps. Utilize new AI technology to catch speeding cars. At the intersection at High replace the current street lights with the new, larger ones like were installed along Encinal in the last 12-18 months. Those likely allow for different/better light placement and additional signage. Install bollards near the crosswalks and make them the vivid green with reflective elements. I welcome speed bumps on any other street (item above said to list street, I'm open to any).
- Don't solve one problem by causing multiple others. Alternative A which would obviously benefit the 3100 block of Gibbon will just cause issues on smaller streets
- I'm not sure why there are comparisons to San Antonio, Clinton, etc. Those streets are also wide - like Gibbons.
- Cornell and Bayo Vista are narrow in some areas, I have concerns about these streets handling and increase in cross traffic
- Thompson is already too busy, narrow and has many school children walking to and from school
- Adding additional volume to smaller streets is just shifting the issue to other streets. Not acceptable
- I think we should have four way stop signs and crosswalks at every intersection, especially the weird ones.

- Speeding seems to be a problem (on Gibbons, High Street, and Fernside). In addition to roundabouts, in the short term, could more police presence change the behavior of people speeding on these streets?
- speed humps on Harvard Dr. not sure why it wasn't mentioned.
- Lincoln is a straight away speedway and analysis says it won't get any traffic diversion. Seems unlikely since some traffic down Gibbons originates on Lincoln from Edison..
- Ticket the speeders! More police! Alameda has long had a reputation for handing out speeding tickets, what happened? We also have a bad rep for hare-brained schemes like this one.
- I'm definitely against speed humps. The cause additional pollution, cause accidents and make a neighborhood look and feel more industrial.
- It doesn't make sense to divert traffic from Gibbons, a wider street with a logical path to/from the bridge to the rest of the island throughlines (Lincoln, Santa Clara, Central) and instead divert those drivers on smaller streets that don't even allow 2 cars to pass each other and don't have any traffic guidance (stop signs, etc). This seems like residents on Gibbons trying to change the street that they chose to live on. Find other ways to slow traffic first and then reassess the impact.
- Northwood Dr. intersection at Southwood and Gibbons DANGEROUS! I have a 1,3,and 5 year old grandchildren living on that intersection. Extremely dangerous, no-one seems to know who has the right of way. I cannot tell you how many times I have almost been hit. Someone is going to be killed there. The cars come flying by - especially in the commuter times of morning and 4-7 PM. Extremely Dangerous to the community. ROUNDABOUT NEEDED YESTERDAY!
- Northwood desperately needs speed humps or stop signs. Cars go fast and children have almost been hit by car speeding around the Northwood turns, where there is not good visibility around the curve and no speed bumps or stop signs anywhere. I imagine Southwood has the same issue.
- Just stop
- Speed humps should be implemented on High Street between Encinal and Fernside and possibly on Santa Clara Avenue. High Street could also benefit from smaller roundabouts.
- Humps on cornell, southwood, bayo vista
- DO NOT DISTURB THE EXISTING GIBBONS/HIGH INTERSECTION! It works well.
- High Street needs more controls on speed. Motorists regularly exceed the speed limit and often do not stop for pedestrians entering cross walks.
- The comparison, suggested about other neighborhood streets needs to be accurate. The neighborhood streets that would be important to look at are those which pass between higher traffic streets. Other small neighborhood streets are being used just so that people can get from the higher traffic street to their homes. Essentially, all traffic that is on Gibbons that is trying to make its way to the bridge is going to have to go through a side street if Alternative A is implemented. All of it. That's ridiculous. Also, there is no way that the changes to the end of Gibbons should be implemented until we can see the impact of the traffic calming features described above. More cars coming from the bridge will likely choose to proceed on Fernside or. High if they know there will be a slowdown due to humps.
- I cross the weird intersection of Gibbons/Southwood/Northwood very frequently and it is awful. We have to cut across it or cross it twice to get to our friends house coming from Lincoln Blvd to their house at Northwood across from the Buena Vista intersection. Making it an opportunity to reduce hardscape, increase stormwater infiltration and improve safety for peds and bikes would be amazing.
- if you put roundabouts on Gibbons, Southwood, Cambridge it will divert more traffic than you projected on to Southwood as people will take 1st exit

- High Street speed humps would significantly improve speeds on that street
- All of the above and the previous I mentioned.
- Speed humps wherever redirected traffic will likely flow. I LOVE the idea of traffic circles at those complex intersections!
- People speed down Northwood all the time. There has been a fatality from a speeding car in the last 5 years and another crash where someone drove directly into a parked car at 5pm at excessive speed. The road is strangely wide AND curved making it especially dangerous for kids around the neighborhood trying to cross the street for school
- Narrowing roads and adding dedicated bike lanes, wider sidewalks, or even a neckdown like on Kirkham in SF
- Gibbons may not be classified a major thoroughfare, but it is much better equipped to handle traffic heading toward the High Street Bridge than the other neighborhood streets. These are major increases in traffic on Cornell and Bayo Vista -- where kids and senior citizens walk frequently in the mornings, and where there is limited ability for cars to pass each other -- purely for a traffic reduction on Gibbons. I am mystified as to how this makes any sense.
- Fernside speed humps. Cross walk paint at Fairview Ave
- I'm also disappointed that the language in this survey is extremely biased towards Option A. There are a lot of leading questions that I think are going to make the public question the validity of the responses.
- It is mind boggling to hear that implementing Alt A is for safety, while that pushes so much traffic onto much less safe streets. There isn't money budgeted for the amount of traffic calming that would be needed. Also the streets are too narrow and traffic calming won't change that.
- Improving the situation at intersections on Northwood and Southwood with clear stop and yield signs would help mitigate conflicts that already occur. For example drivers coming from Cambridge to Northwood often assume that they have right of way. I assume Northwood, as the continuing street, has right of way. That intersection confusion combined with a crosswalk could mean drivers are distracted about merging (or not merging) traffic instead of watching out for pedestrians in front of them.
- I don't know that there is room for a traffic circle at those intersections but would welcome improvements. There are routinely near-miss accidents (and maybe actual accidents) because it is hard to see approaching cars. There also seems like there could be additional stop signs on Gibbons and elsewhere. Cornell and Bayo Vista are too narrow for additional traffic. Cars routinely need to pull over to let a car in the opposite direction pass by. Streets used for traffic comparison purposes are longer and wider. It will also be difficult and potentially dangerous to turn left onto High or right onto Fernside to access the bridge with no traffic lights.
- I support all traffic calming for the safety of the community.
- More raised crosswalks and speed bumps on Fernside Blvd
- I believe that traffic that typically travels along Gibbons to make a left turn onto High Street would, after some minimal period of time, realize that the better alternative is to maintain course on larger streets (e.g., Central) to get onto High Street. The surrounding streets near Gibbons and High (Bayo Vista, Cornell, etc.) are very narrow and difficult to navigate and cars will not want to travel on those streets once they get used to the changes.
- Gibbons Drive is noticeably wider than most of its neighboring streets which makes it safer for vehicle traffic
- Streets like Bayo Vista and Cornell are already very narrow and have lots of stops signs, which acts as a traffic calming measure. I would like to see more crosswalks on Gibbons- especially where there are no stop signs like on Gibbons and side streets (e.g., Gibbons and Cornell). We

100% need traffic circles at confusing intersections like Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood and Northwood/Buena Vista. It is unclear who has the right of way, it's a long distance for pedestrians to cross, and with driver speeds, these intersections are very unsafe on what should be a neighborhood street.

- This is a lot of extra work for a historically white neighborhood. I would like to see equitable street design in other parts of town.
- Speed humps and traffic calming on Cornell, Bayo Vista, Fairview, Southwood, Northwood, Harvard, Fremont, Cambridge and Yale should be considered and installed at appropriate strategic locations.
- Some parts of Santa Clara Ave, specifically the neighborhood side
- Again, this is presented in a way that shows public safety and traffic congestion as being equitable when they are not.
- Stop trying to help. You're making things worse and uglier
- High Street needs speed calming. Gibbons neighborhood must have traffic circles.
- Speed bumps on Cornell
- Fernside Blvd needs speed humps! Or more stop signs and crosswalks. Something needs to be done on Fernside between High and Otis
- Stating that significant optics to neighboring streets is acceptable because other streets have higher volumes is disingenuous. So increasing traffic on these streets is ok because it exists elsewhere? Fernside needs calming but continues to get more traffic with all these "solutions". Stop trying to fix things that don't need fixing. Add a turn light on the High Street Fernside intersection and be done with it.?
- Speed bumps are annoying and don't address the intersections which are the biggest issue
- Fernside Blvd
- Speed humps on Cornell, Yale, Bayo Vista
- Stop signs too. Roundabouts can be confusing for drivers
- High Street and Fernside need speed bumps
- Roundabouts do not work bc drivers do not yield while driving through the roundabouts. Talk to people in Berkeley about roundabouts danger.
- Born and raised in Alameda, and this ugliness keeps resurfacing. We have lived at Cornell and Fairview for 35 years and we are tired of this BS.
- Why are there no counts for bikes and pedestrians in the study?
- I'm surprised Cambridge isn't on the 'Change in daily traffic' table above. It's currently used as an 'escape route' for autos from the Gibbons & Lincoln intersection. (we do not live on Cambridge).
- Including traffic circles with stop signs would also be more effective than simply traffic circles
- All way stop at Cornell and Gibbons and a mini traffic circle for Southwood and Bayo Vista.
- It seems like people are not considering the big picture. Why isn't there a study regarding the increased traffic through Alameda. Speed and traffic circles and new crosswalks won't address the issue of over traffic. Where are these people coming from and going? They aren't enhancing life or the economy in Alameda. They are using the streets as a superhighway vein. If you close off Fernside, then all of your other proposals would make sense.
- No speed humps!!!
- Alameda should have a city wide 25mph speed limit (everywhere) and enforce it aggressively. The funds from these tickets should be used to further add safety features throughout the island, such as more lighted crosswalk signals and automatic bike sensors.
- I believe this traffic study is inclined to support what Gibbons residents want more than anything else. If approved there will be a lasting residue of mistrust and recriminations.

- Signs at the beginning of Gibbons at Central indicating no direct access to High Street bridge from Gibbons so that cars go directly onto High, instead of using small neighborhood streets to cut through.
- Reopen slow streets. Pandemic is over. Not fair to other streets.
- I would never have bought a house on a major thoroughfare, and your proposal puts me on one without consideration for neighbors outside of Gibbons drive. It is already a problem with speeding on side streets, this will only make it worse.
- Don't change gibbons. Enforce existing speed limits.
- As a resident of this area and daily witness To the traffic patterns, I do not agree with the street traffic projections. I believe the last block of Gibbons will drop to near zero. Very few cars use Gibbons to turn right onto High St. With the realignment of Gibbons into High St, cars coming from the bridge will tend to stay on High St rather than turn right into Gibbons. I believe Cornell will see a much higher traffic increase than projected - it is the most direct route. I believe the city would be sacrificing the residents on Cornell for the benefit of the residents on the last block of Gibbons.
- Speed bumps on Fernside.
- Cornell and Bayo Vista
- Take away temporary slow street Barrie's first. These have cause many close call accidents!
- Lincoln and Broadway also needs some traffic calming as it is a very dangerous intersection for pedestrians currently
- You should paint crosswalks between Garfield and High on Fernside, put in yellow crosswalk blinking lights, set up the large speeding displays which we see on Fernside between High and Fruitvale. You are going to have a real mess on Fernside after all your proposed changes there and the side streets are going to receive more parked cars and through traffic. I feel that the planners did not look at the whole picture, and that they are doing this piecemeal.....and they are scared to look at a big change by trying to reduce "through" traffic from outside Alameda to 1880.
- Windsor Drive, either speed bumps or access blocked at High Street
- Alameda Police traffic enforcement
- I am a bit frustrated here because it is unclear how or why certain streets were selected to compare to for traffic volume. Or how the other streets compare city wide. You're drawing conclusions based off comparing to Pacifica avenue for example which is a wider street that crosses the entire island. And many of Pacific is a slow street now. Same for San Antonio, another long and fairly wide street. If you had other narrow streets with traffic volumes on them to compare to that had low accidental levels than this would make more sense to me.
- speed bumps on Fernside and high. Bike lane on high street.
- Gibbons, High, fernside, Santa Clara, central, and Lincoln could all use speed humps and more stop signs. Everyone needs to slow down!
- Lincoln
- This must only be a commuter problem. Whenever I drive the route, I haven't noticed speeding or congestion. Pedestrians are few and far between. Seems like another public works project looking for a justification.
- Since the city has disinvested in police, thoughtful traffic calming that doesn't harm residents (like gentle speed bumps that won't damage residents' vehicles) are the best controls. Alternative A creates more problems than it solves, as does the reconfiguration of the bike lanes. The city should not be seeking to out bikes on its fastest and most congested streets. Or like

Clement, bone-headed ideas like combining truck routes with bike lanes. Put the bike lanes on streets with lower traffic, for everyone's safety.

- ONLY at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood
- Speed bumps are not a viable solution, except in parking lots
- Speed humps will be responsible for more problems than they will solve?
- Law enforcement on street ticketing unlawful drivers. The e-bikes, scooters and skateboards that fly down in the bike lanes. Many without helmets and under 16
- Speed humps on Fernside would be helpful, along with additional crosswalks. If you actually implement the Gibbons plan, having speed humps along Bayo Vista and Monte Vista would be absolutely crucial otherwise we have frustrated drivers speeding through our neighborhoods and endangering us.
- Speed bumps fucking suck and this plan is idiotic also I am very pro traffic circle if designed well but you're not turning this place into Berkeley
- As stated above, we desperately need some safer intersections at Northwood & Buena Vista (and prominent route to walk to school for many kids) and at Cornell and Gibbons (not just speed bump, but stop sign since many people cross there), especially for cars coming from high street bridge. We also need to make sure less cars enter Gibbons at Central - and instead go to Fernside.
- Santa Clara and central will carry lots of extra traffic. Cars go too fast. Paint some crosswalks on Santa Clara.
- Put a stop sign at Gibbons and Cornell! And don't compare Bayo Vista/Cornell to Pacific - sheesh. That's a "slow" street. Also, Pacific is nearly 3-4x longer of a street. So making that comparison is not equal. You're talking about increasing the number of cars in a 2 block section by a factor of 4, that's a HUGE increase in a very short distance.
- We also need to slow traffic on Santa Clara and High Street. Crosswalks or speed humps would help.
- please consider gibbons and Cornell to slow cars after they have entered the neighborhood streets
- 4 way stop at Cornell and Gibbons- would slow traffic and make a safer cross at that crosswalk
- I'd like you to use our money to re-stripe Tilden way from Lincoln to the Fruitvale bridge which desperately needs definition, and leave the intersection of Fernside and High alone. I think you are desperately trying to find a place you can twist into being the problem that will fit a solution you want to build rather than solve an existing problem.
- It is frustrating that Alternative A is being recommended, or at least considered as the top recommendation, without any consideration, thought, or assessments into how forcing traffic onto neighboring streets (like Bayo Vista) will be impacted. Slowing traffic through speed humps aren't going to resolve the future safety issues on Bayo Vista where the build up of traffic to turn left, unprotected, on a street where cars already speed in both directions, will be disastrous. This is especially so because the street is so narrow that cars cannot pass each other, so while cars are in line to turn left, cars leaving High Street to turn right onto Bayo Vista will likely not have enough space to turn and will then cause even more congestion. I do not support a turn restriction at Gibbons/High/Fernside.

Question: What other comments do you have about the phasing recommendation?

- Looking to fix something that isn't broken.
- You need to use the funding delays to reconsider safety on Cornell!

- The speed on Fernside is THE MAJOR PROBLEM. Get rid of the passing lane in the middle of the street. Force traffic from BFI to leave via High St.
- Coordinating with parallel projects makes perfect sense. Delaying until 2030 or later only reduces the chance of getting anything done. If the funds are in place and the plans are ready, move forward. Residents will always find something to be upset about when fear overrides reason.
- Please, no speed bumps on Gibbons!! This is still a major thoroughfare.
- Overall, there should be a balance, and option 1 would bring not much improvements. Also, the traffic exiting Gibbons Drive and heading north would cause issues and more congestion and reduced safety compared to number 2 and 3.
- Gibbons should not be closed off. Improvements and markings and signage could have a much more positive impact and outcome, would be less expense, and could be implemented faster. Frankly, this is not one of the "high injury" intersections in the City and the City should focus on where the greatest improvements can be made first. This is not an urgent issue.
- "Neighborhood traffic calming throughout the neighborhood would be very welcome, but most neighborhood streets like Bayo Vista already have built-in traffic calming because of their very narrow width. As noted earlier in this survey response, it's difficult even for one car to pass another without one of them pulling over.
- The conservative estimate in the traffic memo diverting some Gibbons traffic to Southwood and Bayo Vista is perhaps overly conservative, and leaves this factor out.
- Implementing a temporary Alternative C in 2026 is very near to doing nothing at all. As I noted earlier, those posts are likely to be damaged or knocked over very quickly because of the high speeds from the bridge, and the wide angle of vehicular travel.
- Instead of relying on the installation of neighborhood traffic calming measures as absolute prerequisite to installation of Alternative A: install street signage to proactively direct through traffic out of Neighborhood Local Streets and onto streets designated for Citywide Circulation. Work with Google Maps and other map apps to respect this signage, similar to strategies the city employs elsewhere. This would enable quick implementation of Alternative A in 2026, and may even prove out a scenario where speed humps aren't necessary on streets like Bayo Vista or Cornell -- therefore preserving capital resources for more general improvements to neighborhood safety, for example a traffic circle at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood."
- Slowing traffic down, via crosswalks, stop signs and speed humps on Gibbons, Fernside and High Streets is the most important and urgently needed safety measure you can take.
- "This intersection cannot be treated in isolation. The only changes that should be made should address the entire corridor and neighborhood safety.
- Simply making one of these changes without addressing safety of other intersections is reckless and dangerous and will create a net decrease in neighborhood safety. "
- I strongly urge the city to reconsider any change to this intersection. It is reckless without a plan to address the broader East End corridor.
- Just start making stuff better even if it's steps, it's still better

- This project cannot be done without addressing the Southwood - Bayo Vista intersection. That is a major safety issue.
- Completely unnecessary
- What about timing of the other alternatives? I don't think Alternative A should EVER be done.
- I disagree with the concept and believe that the intersection should stay as is. Adding speed humps to Gibbons is an excellent step.
- Use the funding elsewhere like Fernside Blvd adding a stop sign at Cambridge (direct flow from Edison school traffic)
- Please install humps on Gibbons Drive; please add crosswalks at Gibbons at the intersection of Southwood and Northwood; create a consistent schedule to keep repairing damaged sidewalks from tree roots
- Leave it alone. Add better crosswalks or signals. I have lived in this area for close to 50 years. There is less traffic now on Gibbons than when I first moved here.
- This change is a waste of time and money.
- There is no urgent safety concern regarding Gibbons northbound traffic - traffic accidents at this intersection are due to cross traffic on High and Fernside. Some inexpensive modifications to improve pedestrian walkway visibility would be beneficial.
- "By doing Alternative A in 2026, rather than in 2028 or later, we'd get a full two years + of safety benefits. It's unfortunate that we can't have everything we want all at once, in 2026, but we can layer in traffic calming in 2028 for additional safety benefits. Stalling on a significant safety improvement like Alternative A because we can't have all the traffic calming happen along with it doesn't really make sense to me.
- I'm not clear how much benefit there is to coordinating with the sidewalk and tree project, or the Clement/Tilden/Fernside project, but am skeptical that it would outweigh the safety benefits."
- Closing Gibbons will make our neighborhood more dangerous.
- The study recommended after 2030, but staff is still recommending to rush this project. Given the public feedback and this biased survey, it seems staff is motivated for other reasons to use city resources until 2030 to find a way to make this happen at the expense of broader safety in the surrounding streets.
- This needs much more research, and the overall neighborhood traffic issues need to be addressed.
- This seems criminal to implement a closure at Gibbons, and especially to try to implement it would put addressing the projected impacts to all the other neighborhood streets. It makes no sense to close Gibbons. It would be reckless and hazardous to do this. There are much lower impact things that could be done to improve safety. Implementing the Gibbons closure would make things overall much less safe.
- City has not conducted enough studies. City has used biased limited contrived hypothetical scenarios
- N/A

- Alternative A seems unworkable because it encourages unprotected left hand turns onto High and Fernside and directs traffic onto very narrow streets that will always but narrow regardless of other safety improvements.
- I don't want this.
- "Ideally, traffic circles should be at multiple Gibbons intersections to reduce the "straightaway effect" that encourages drivers to speed.'
- Enforce traffic laws.
- The phasing timing sounds OK, but Alt A is closing a major artery (let's face it, that's what Gibbons is) from traffic turning left on to High (where there are higher profile dangerous intersections, see previous comment) seems to be in service of some larger politics. Don't punish the residents of Fernside with this.
- Rationale for any changes is not adequately explained in this survey. As far as I can tell, streets are working fine in our neighborhood.
- I think speed humps and other efforts to reduce speed should be the preferred solution.
- The only thing that is URGENT is to address that Liquid Amber trees uplifting the sidewalks on Gibbons Drive. A law suit waiting to happen.
- This project is a waste of money, and appears to be an attempt to railroad through to approval without appropriate dwell time or detailed data for the public to review the detailed impacts. The only necessary changes should be the addition of speed humps on gibbons.
- This should not be scheduled until less intrusive traffic calming alternatives (speed humps, stop signs, etc.) are implemented and their effectiveness assessed.
- I'm confused about the question. It looks like the option is to build all 3 phases one after the other. Or is it to just pick one of the three?
- As I mentioned, this does not solve the problem of reducing traffic along Gibbons. Gibbons should be made into a neighborhood street, made smaller and slower, deter folks from using as a cut-through, all the while not increase traffic through smaller neighborhood streets.
- I would like to see the speed humps, or traffic roundabouts implemented more quickly, they should be a part of any solution to slow the traffic on gibbons and on any timeframe.
- Feels like we are wasting time and money until 2030 to make this work when it just creates more problems.
- What are the economies of scale here by aligning the projects. I can't tell if there is stuff getting ripped up in just two years between 2 and 3
- I think more immediate and less costly action could be taken to improve safety in the area.
- Traffic calming is the single most important safety issue.
- leave alone
- Do not activate Alternative A
- Sooner is better, but also don't want to have too much of a negative impact on our neighbors - so I say wait until we can also impact traffic calming

- I think start as soon as possible, do a trial with street barricades and cones and signs to get people used to the idea right away.
- save money on all projects and just put in new signage, cross walks and markings and speed cameras which will be available soon
- I think adding speed humps on Gibbons is a good idea (Alt C). I am not in favor of eliminating the left turn option onto High Street.
- You should consider quick build options that are closer to the Alternative A outcome of cul-de-sac gibbons until this is possible.
- Why can't we do things faster?!?! There is no urgency and it's depressing to see problems just sit there. There are so many near misses, it's a matter of time until another person is killed. Probably a child.
- What were the conditions of the traffic study?
- Unless you can show data that supports this as a truly dangerous intersection then our tax payer dollars should not be used for anymore than traffic calming on Gibbons.
- Other streets in neighborhood need paving badly. I have lived on Thompson for 42 years and it has never been paved
- I think neighborhood traffic calming is needed BEFORE any changes are made to that intersection.
- "A lot of the problems relate to unmarked or poorly marked crosswalks.
- Speed wasn't a problem when APD was patrolling for a speed. "
- i think we should probably not do anything (other than adding speed humps), but if we do something i strongly believe that we should wait until 2028 when the left turn removal can coincide with traffic calming strategies.
- Wait 40 years I'll be dead by then, if Trump doesn't kill us all first. Honestly this is just insane. I see no safety issues at all at this intersection. There was a terrible accident on Fernside at Cambridge where a young man lost his life due to some inebriated driver running a stop sign. I do not see how this horrible tragedy would have been prevented by any changes to Gibbons and High. Police work is what is needed. Obviously
- What has been mentioned many times is the speeding on Gibbons. There is speeding on all Alameda streets especially Fernside Blvd. It's been rumored that some influential citizens live on Gibbons who are the ones mostly pushing for this change. Also, I don't recall seeing cars speeding on Gibbons on a regular basis. The street is just big enough for 2 cars to pass unlike Fernside which is very wide.
- I'm ok with phase 1, don't do phase 2 or 3. I don't think it's urgent at all -- the speed problem on Gibbons can be addressed with the other methods listed previously
- I believe we should not implement Alternative A at all.
- 2026 - you've got to be kidding to even list that. Do you realize what a mess getting on/off the island will be with the Fruitvale bridge roundabout project?!?
- I'm inclined to leave scheduling up to city staff here, as they have oversight of the all the road work being one in the city.
- There are much more urgent traffic issues in Alameda that need to be addressed - just review the safety data.

- Any changes to the intersection of Gibbons and High need to be combined with other traffic calming and safety measures in the neighborhood to avoid exacerbating speed and safety issues on surrounding streets. Speed bumps on Thompson and Fairview and a 4-way stop intersection at the corner of High and Thompson would provide significant calming and improved safety.
- You need to get community buy in and diversion data before you just start. Do option C first! There is no harm there
- Civil construction is slowwww
- I 100% want the additional traffic calming measures in place before or with the changes to Gibbons.
- It feels like the City is rushing this at the expense of our neighborhood. I'd support delaying any recommendations/approvals to close off the Gibbons left turn until after the Tilden Way/Fernside Roundabout, Fernside Traffic Calming & Bikeway Project, and neighborhood traffic calming measures (on Gibbons and local neighborhood streets) have been implemented. Then once the road changes are made, a holistic traffic study (including vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic) that represents the actual future conditions around Gibbons can be conducted. Once there is real representative data, then the City Council can make an informed decision on shutting off Gibbons.
- "The project is being rushed to be included with the Fernside project and it is irresponsible to do so just for money! Money is not more important than human lives. More studies are needed, more community input is needed.
- I Do NOT agree with it and think it is very irresponsible to try to push this through. It is not taking into consideration the safety of many many more residents in the surrounding neighborhood. It makes no sense at all that smaller side streets without stoplights and crosswalks would be suggested as a safer alternative. Traffic will be terrible, but the lack of safety for the children in this neighborhood walking to Edison and Lincoln is shameful and anyone voting for Alt A does not care about the safety of our streets. "
- A phased approach increases the likelihood that this never happens due to funding reductions. A major benefit of implementing now is the usage/rerouting data on the surrounding streets to inform how traffic calming should be approached.
- Implement the changes to Tilden and neighborhood traffic calming on Gibbons and elsewhere in the neighborhood, and then assess the impacts before any closure of Gibbons is even considered.
- My children live on Gibbons with high speed vehicle traffic today and will begin to ride their bikes to Lincoln Middle through a confusing, high speed intersection starting in fall 2027. The timing is urgent.
- The dynamics of the Fernside/High intersection will change significantly after traffic calming, the 2-way bike lane and other changes are made. A new traffic study and analysis of the cause of accidents should be made before deciding on major changes to the Gibbons intersection.
- Implement speed cameras and raised crosswalk speed bumps. on Fernside Blvd

- I don't support the plan, and think it will negatively impact the side streets significantly more than your estimates. If you are going to do this, start with the side streets first. As soon as work starts Southwood and Bayo Vista become a drag strip.
- Earlier implementation solves safety problems now, and I don't understand why we would delay safety implementations we can see today. We should address the most unsafe conditions as soon as possible, while also addressing corollary safety concerns in tandem. Waiting is putting the cart before the horse. Conditions are unsafe, objectively. They should be addressed as expediently as resources allow. Traffic calming measures on neighboring streets are implicitly solved by narrow streets. Signage can be introduced to alert travelers of preferred routes.
- We need to implement what we can now. 2028 is too far to wait and would prioritize construction convenience over kids' safety.
- "There are many higher priority projects in other parts of town impacting student safety. This is, at best, a handout to a historically white neighborhood.
- Do not let it jump the queue.
- 2028 for final build form is fine, but cant there be soft hit posts that emulate the shape of bulbout to deter incoming traffic to gibbons? Slow streets designation to neighborhood streets like pacific ave as a form of neighborhood traffic calming should also be feasible in short term?
- One thing that can also be done is posting official city signs at the bottom of Gibbons that says "no bridge access" Traffic routing maps would have to take this into account and route people around the neighborhood, which is the new normal of how people drive. Even if they know where they are going they route it to give themselves a time estimate of when they will get there. Traffic routing maps are used more and more and they are toting them up Gibbons.
- I use the intersection daily without problems. I think this is the least important priority because it is basically a non-problem .
- The speeds of drivers on Fernside Blvd between High Street and Otis needs to be addressed ASAP. This is a priority over any concern about Gibbons.
- Major construction changes should be coordinated with other changes if they are to happen. So don't tear up roads every year for the next 3 years to create short and long term headaches.
- 2028 is laughable. This needs to happen as soon as possible.
- I like the long term Fernside plan with separated bike lane and median, and would prefer to get this asap.
- The safety issues on Gibbons, High, and Fernside have only been getting worse every year. Discussions to address speeding on Fernside have gone nowhere while people have lost their lives. The sooner the better to make some safety improvements.
- NOT OPTION 'A' EVER! Gibbons is a main artery of Alameda. So sorry that its inconvenient having cars coming down the street. Suck it up. Also, your data is weak.
- The study is incomplete. Need traffic information on surrounding streets that provide alternative cut-thru options like Lincoln and Cambridge need to be included.

- You're only adding more traffic onto Fernside from Cornell to High Street. You'll also take even more parking away from that area. Making it even tougher on the people who live in those 7 homes.
- I am concerned that many of your current traffic improvements are more auto averse than bike friendly. East end automobile traffic is challenged by High Street. Gibbons drive has been an accepted and long term alternative to efficiently move automobile traffic entering and leaving the island. It should regain its status as a collector and used better for automobile safety.
- Close off Fernside! Study the traffic volumes and patterns. Who are using our streets? Clearly the wealthy home owners on Gibbons are getting heard over the reality of Alamedians' safety for all. Money talks, again.
- No speed humps!!!
- Prefer to see bike and pedestrian improvements implemented first. Making more roads with faster/easier travel times will only encourage more car traffic. Making biking easier will actually reduce car traffic by encouraging people to not drive and bike instead.
- This project needs to be slowed down as an imperative of maintaining comity. Step one should be a second opinion traffic study.
- Don't want option A. So no phasing in of option A.
- Don't change gibbons. Only benefits 15 family's but screws over hundreds of other family's on all the surrounding streets.
- I believe in safety as do all the resident of this neighborhood. But this is not the solution. No recommendation should be made at this time. Current projects should be completed and new traffic patterns studied focusing on overall safety of the neighborhood.
- There are much more urgent needs in the city. How about a plan to reduce speed on High St. People speed like crazy down High St. Super dangerous.
- Solve slow steer wood barriers first. These have been up for way too long! They cause confusion more than Gibbobs!
- None of the alternatives address the problem of the right turn lane from Fernside to High/I880 which is a significant component of this intersection.
- I do not support option A - this survey forces option A on anyone filling this out -
- The quick build makes sense and then study what happens. I don't think the city should commit to an option without first studying the quick build.
- Would be interested in hearing stats about deaths and accidents on Gibbons. How does this compare to bad intersections where there are often accidents, like High at Santa Clara by Lincoln park or Lincoln at Broadway?
- Stop executing all these projects simultaneously. Streets are always torn up disrupting parking and business.
- Implementing less costly changes like gentle speed humps, simple traffic circles with things like yellow bumpy dots in the center (in the shape of a sunflower or fern leaf inside of a circle to stop sideshows), fixing sidewalks and cracking streets, directing cyclists to preferred routes on less busy streets, and adding crosswalks at key intersections for school pedestrians will be more effective at creating a safe environment

and maintaining the character of the neighborhood while being more fiscally responsible.

- None
- I think we should take a minute and see how all these other road changes impact traffic.
- Please leave everything as-is.
- Sooner is better to reduce speeding on Gibbons and support the community of children that are walking there every day.
- No matter what, you need to more thoroughly to into consideration the people in the neighborhoods affected by these decisions. You also need to consider if you did this project at the same time as the round-about, you are limiting the routes off the island and pushing all traffic to Park.
- This phasing make sense. I would like to see the city commit and not back out on the 2028 portion.
- There are changes that can be made that have been articulated by many that staying with plan 3 with less costly changes would be the best for the safety of the neighborhood as a whole. Gibbons the wider street is our best option for traffic in this residential neighborhood.
- This project is urgent and needed now. Traffic comes into Gibbons Drive at high rates of speed and goes out at higher rates of steeped because people are trying to make the light. Safety is a prime issue, so it needs to be done now. Or as soon as possible..
- This is serious and is desperate for an upgrade. It has been dangerous for a long time.

Question: Do you have any further comments on the design alternatives, neighborhood traffic analysis, or project timing?

- Who is pushing for this? What is the motive? Have there been more accidents lately? Cannot better marked bike paths, signs, speed bumps, and enforcement achieve the goals of safety without the severe disruption promised by Alternative A?
- Curious if replacing the traffic light with a roundabout was considered? They work really well in Europe, especially in high traffic corridors.
- Please do not make Cornell unsafe. You are just going to get the city sued because this change will cause accidents in and around Cornell.
- Putting speed bumps on Gibbons will push all through traffic onto Cambridge. It is a much smaller street, and cannot handle the additional traffic. There are already significant problems at Cambridge & Fernside. I have had parked vehicles hit 3 times by careless drivers.
- We are all getting older, so let's keep these projects moving. Surveys like this one are useful for public input and, of course, a little griping. But at the end of the day, it is time to move forward so everyone can enjoy the results.
- Don't overdesign these intersection. Roundabouts will just confuse local drivers with no experience in such a maze.
- I believe that this whole project was pushed by a city council member who lives on Gibbons and wanted less traffic on this street.

- Stop adding bike lanes and creating congestion everywhere in Alameda. You continue to build massive housing projects but reduce traffic flow. It makes no sense.
- I think and hope I have said it all. Feel like I am the Colorado Rockies with a record losing season. That said I appreciate the opportunity to address the plans and discuss.
- Closing Gibbons Drive could be a better alternative.
- More cars coming to east end bridges because only have one access for all the cars on west end....more energy and money need to be put in addressing that problem !! so that we can have less cars using east end exits.
- I think at least painting some crosswalks or adding a stop sign at Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood near Lincoln Ave is more urgent. Kids cross there every day and it's an unstructured mess.
- Overall, this would be a good design for Option A, with a staged rollout of the various features. The closure of the right turn slip lane is important, since this can be done very quickly with immediate improvements.
- I think our city money could and should go to other areas--and possibly more police patrols to stop drivers from increasingly doing whatever they please instead of following laws.
- This entire process has seemed cooked from the get go. There should be an investigation into the roles of Tracy Jensen and Andy Wang in using their positions of power to unduly influence the outcomes of these studies. The recommendations do not make sense.
- Gibbons is and will always be a main artery to and from Alameda. The homeowners have been trying to close it for years. They knew it was busy when they moved in !! Keep open!!!
- No changes should be made to the intersection without a full Gibbons corridor plan.
- "There are much more dangerous intersections in Alameda where \$600,000 would have a much bigger impact on Island Safety.
- While the data shows this, we must realize these intersections are not on the same street that Andy Wang and Tracy Jensen live on - so it would seem that is why the city has decided Gibbons is a higher priority."
- The only reason it seems to be against this is fear of traffic on other streets increasing (including where we live). The answer should be also taking steps elsewhere, not taking steps nowhere.
- Add a 4 way stop sign at Gibbons & Cornell. This is the cheapest and most effective way to slow down traffic on Gibbons.
- see above. Maybe first try some low-cost items (an additional stop sign on Gibbons, add a couple speed humps) then re-evaluate.
- This plan makes no sense from a traffic or safety standpoint and looks to be a substantial waste of taxpayer funds.
- More planning around Edison school and bike traffic to LMS
- It is time for the City to make a decision before the end of 2025. The City has collected all the data it can and sufficiently gave opportunities to voice the citizens' ideas.
- This traffic analysis only studies traffic on Gibbons and not other streets. Did they look at implementing speed bumps on Gibbons to deter speed and traffic? Southwood, bay

vista intersection has NO stop signs and no speed bumps now. With an increase of projected 600 cars here what's the plan to deter deaths and accidents here??? Keep the left turn on gibbons and put better signage and speed bumps on gibbons, don't push your problems to other streets that are less equipped and less wide to handle your problems.

- Thank you to everyone that is trying to make Alameda safer and more accessible for all residents. These projects need to consider knock on effects that impact residents outside the immediate construction zone.
- Closing Gibbons will make our neighborhood more dangerous.
- The money for this project could be used for other more pressing issues.
- Individuals on the Council and the Planning committee that live on Gibbons took positions in 2022 and 2023 and are prioritizing calming traffic on their street over other priorities including actual high-injury intersections. Furthermore, Gibbons was designated as a Neighborhood Greenway in 2022 when it's not clear why that street was selected given the bumpy road systems.
- Please do not do this and please stop wasting tax payer money on pet projects for a Tracy Jensen and Andy Wang, who live on the one block that stands to gain from this.
- I have many suggestions. My major complaint is that the City is forcing change to a neighborhood that is happy with its current conditions.
- This study ignores the safety impacts of additional traffic on Cornell and Bayo Vista. Such a study needs to be taken.
- No
- Presenting this like a scientific analysis vs the spin it really is is beneath the city. I vote.
- Please consider natural planter bollards and other road-narrowing approaches to slow traffic and avoid more speed humps and roundabouts. These approaches, plus better signage and signals will significantly improve safety without limiting turn options
- Concern for school traffic and children
- Instead of waiting for speed humps and other permanent calming measures, start by installing signage to guide through traffic to appropriate Citywide Circulation streets.
- This is ridiculous. You are going to ruin Cornell, Bayo Vista and other streets to make 15 home owners happy.
- This survey is slanted. You should be ashamed of yourselves. Do better please.
- "Re-consider roundabout for High St/Fernside/Gibbons intersection
- Strongly consider the value of modest changes to existing Gibbons St traffic flow such as speed bumps on the 3100 block, or stop sign at Gibbons / Cornell or Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood
- Consider reverting Gibbons classification back to Collector status - I think the current classification is not correctly reflecting its neighborhood purpose as a primary artery in/out of the neighborhood."
- I think it's telling that the commission has members who live on Gibbons that would benefit financially from the realignment at the cost of the safety of the surrounding families.
- Please do not create a new problem by attempting to fix this one.

- Am totally opposed to the Fernside/Gibbons/High Street intersection change represented by any alternative. Any benefit of a change that would accrue to one group of residents will be at expense of another. This desire to make a change therefore is just wrong. We are near an elementary school, and we have children, pets, seniors and families. Changes proposed will compromise our neighborhood's safety.
- The traffic analysis by Parametrix was performed in the middle to end of June after school was out, which is a very different traffic profile than the school year, so likely underrepresents the traffic, let alone when the bridge is up. The analysis also didn't measure foot traffic within the neighborhood. Foot traffic during the school year is significant, especially at Southwood - Bayo Vista, which is a MUCH longer crossing distance with no signals, signage, or crosswalks. The proposal to turn restrict Gibbons increases traffic volume 5x at that intersection, which the traffic engineer noted was less safe than Gibbons/High. This entire survey appears biased towards pushing the Gibbons closure at the safety expense of the rest of the neighborhood, when traffic calming measures (speed bumps or stops) to slow traffic on Gibbons has not even been tried.
- I live near the intersection at Santa Clara Ave and Broadway. There is a lot of bad driver behavior there -- motorists putting each other at risk by speeding and running red lights, constant honking of car horns is a nuisance, drivers are ignoring right of way rules. Pedestrian traffic is constant here and I think pedestrian injury is an inevitability. Please study this intersection and improve the safety of this very busy thoroughfare.
- Tripling traffic volume on narrow streets around Gibbons is not a good solution. Gibbons can accommodate two-way traffic appropriately - it is wider and has better visibility. Its greater width can accommodate close to the width of additional car as compared to neighboring streets. Gibbons has approximately 37.5% more usable driving width when compared to neighboring streets -- neighboring streets are typically 30' across, leaving approximately 16' of driving space when cars are parked on both sides of the street. Gibbons is 36' or more across, which means there is 22' of driving space when cars are parked on both sides, an increase of 37.5% - Gibbons is the much safer street for cars to drive on. I recognize speed is an issue on Gibbons, but measures like speed humps and traffic enforcement are the better and more cost-effective approach for the community.
- This whole project was kept very secret. WHY? This appears to be VERY political.
- "The executive summary, page 1, or the analyses states that there were 22 crashes at this intersection between 2017 and 2021, 55% of which the primary cause was "improper turning". This analysis should further break down the location of each of the accidents caused by improper turning. Were the majority of these at the Gibbons left turn approach, or somewhere else in the intersection? This is important data in order to best identify the most effective solutions. Additionally, how do these crash statistics compare with other intersections in Alameda? Was this intersection prioritized because it was the worst? If it was not the worst, why was it selected over other intersections in Alameda? How does recent crash data compare from 2021-2025?
- The background section on page 3 of the analyses states that the intersection has "a layout that allows high vehicle speeds." How does this differ from any other intersection

in Alameda where the speed limits are identical? Is this statement specific to any single approach to the intersection? Please clarify and provide the detail that explains the exact features and locations of this intersection that make it susceptible to high speeds any differently than other intersections along fernside, Otis, high st, broadway, central, oak, etc. Noted that section 4.1 is the only other section that mentions specific vehicle speeds on fernside, with 15% of vehicles traveling 10 mph or more above the speed limit. However, again, there is no comparison to how these speeds compare with other typical intersections in alameda where the speed limit is 25 mph. There is also no mention of what the average speeds are on fernside and no mention of any speeds of vehicles traveling on high street through the intersection.

- The background section on page 3 of the analyses states that “staff and community members” identified the intersection as “an important location in need of safety and operational improvements for people walking, biking and driving.” Please elaborate on the data that makes this intersection unsafe for people walking and biking...as stated on page 1, the only data provided was for vehicular accidents between 2017-2021. Section 4.1 on page 10 states that only one of the 22 crashes in that 5 year span involved a pedestrian and another single crash involved a bicyclist. The details of these two crashes would be important factors in determine the best recommendations for this intersection...specifically, at which approach(es) did these two crashes occur, and what were the factors that led to the crashes? Also, how does the rate of crashes with pedestrians/bicyclists at this interaction in that span compare with other intersections in alameda? Please provide the additional data that suggest this intersection has issues with these types of accidents, and provide the comparison that makes improvements at this intersection more important than others in Alameda. For comparison, there central avenue project reports 63 collisions over a similar 5 year period.
- The background section on page 4 states that the Alternative A design “aims to simplify the intersection, shorten pedestrian crossings, reduce vehicle speeds through the intersection, and reduce traffic signal wait times.” First, the root causes that were used to justify these improvements at this intersection has not been clearly documented. Page 1 only states that there were 22 crashes, without providing sufficient detail to suggest that the intersection needs simplification (as compared to other intersections), and it very briefly provides data that suggests that pedestrian safety is a current issue (with one such accident in a 5 year span). No data is presented that suggests that vehicle speeds through the intersection are an issue (as compared to other intersections in Alameda), nor that traffic wait times are an issue.
- Furthermore, this analysis shows that AT BEST, the average vehicle delays during peak commute time will INCREASE by 19-33%. This alternative will NOT reduce traffic wait times, and even uses misleading statements like section 4.4 on page 14 that says that Alternative A “largely maintains existing intersection service level” without referencing the % change of the Since the same amount of traffic will still need to cross high st on fernside, as well as the same amount of traffic needing to cross fernside on high street. The amount of traffic at this intersection will not change and does not suggest that traffic wait times will decrease. It is concerning that this analyses only “aims” to accomplish these goals, without clear data or evidence that those goals will actually

become a reality. In fact, the traffic wait times will likely increase for the southbound left turn lane and the northbound right turn lane from Fernside towards the high street bridge due to the increased traffic in these lanes as a result of the redistribution from Gibbons as well as the shortening of the right turn lane and elimination of the long right bend that will now back up the northbound traffic when waiting to turn right and not being able to. The left turn lane on fernside towards the high street bridge also appears to be shorter from the existing configuration, suggesting that congestion will be even worse at this location due to vehicles that want to go straight on fernside but cannot because they will need to wait until the left-turning vehicles ahead of them have been awarded a left turn arrow and vacated the lane that goes straight across high street. Lastly, the addition of a dedicated signal phase in the proposed separated two-lane bikeway will also add time (essentially making this intersection again a 5-way approach).

- In fact, section 4.4 on page 13 confirms this, demonstrating that one of the goals of this project already fails. Alternative A will actually increase average vehicle delays from an existing average delay of 31 (21) seconds for AM (PM) peak commute to 37 (28) seconds. The analysis does not state what the specific vehicle delays will be at each of the legs after implementing alternative A, but it should be known that the single worst specific delay in the existing configuration is 50 seconds for the eastbound fernside traffic (presumably due to the long left turn wait which appears like it will only worsen under alternative A). In order to truly compare traffic signal wait times between the existing configuration and alternative A, Please list the vehicle delay times specific to each approach under alternative A, similarly to the existing vehicle delays shown For the specific approaches in table 1. And most importantly, this analysis of operations should clarify if the higher predicted vehicle densities of the future are included in the long term alternatives or if the study only used the same total vehicle density that was collected in 2025 to inform the existing vehicle delay calculations. The use of an overall increase in vehicles that could be expected in the future, and with the larger vehicle delays as a result of these alternatives, warrants the inclusion of an environmental study in order to determine the greater community impacts of these changes. "
- DO NOT CLOSE GIBBONS TO THROUGH TRAFFIC DURING IMPLEMENTATION
- The Council should consider the potential conflict of interest for members of the Council who would personally benefit from diversion of traffic from their own streets. Property owners on Gibbons knew it was designed as a connector street when they chose to live there.
- Need more traffic and speeding enforcement
- "Develop a holistic plan to make Fernside neighborhood safer, as mentioned in previous comment boxes:
- add stop sign to Cornell / Gibbons, Bayovista / Gibbons
- make intersection safer Gibbons / Southwood / Northwood, Southwood / Bayo Vista / Fairview, and Northwood / Cambridge / Buena Vista,
- Narrow intersection of Central / Gibbons / Versallies
- Add speed bumps on Gibbons

- Goal is to drive traffic to Island Arterial of High, Fernside, Broadway, Central. Deter folks from zooming / cutting through Gibbons, and making Fernside neighborhood safer. "
- "WHY CAN'T WE HAVE TRAFFIC CIRCLES
- The intersection at Northwood/Southwood/Gibbons is worse and scarier than Fernside/Gibbons/High, which at least has traffic lights. There's not even a yield on Northwood and the traffic from southwood can't see them coming. Cars come down Cambridge and Gibbons already like they're on fire, there's no safe or easy way for pedestrians to cross the streets safely and so the merge is a big problem. It's already marginal with close calls; If you driving any more traffic through there without addressing it someone is going to get hurt."
- This is one of the most biased and leading "surveys" I have ever read. Only the staff's conclusions are presented as acceptable.
- I think the city needs to better explain to people on the side streets that connect to Gibbons that the goal is not to redirect cut through traffic to their streets, rather to prevent any cut through traffic from entering this area bordered by high st, Fernside, central and Broadway
- I would like further study on the roundabout. The I-80/Gilman roundabout seems to have been successful in preventing crashes, where it previously was to be dangerous in the past.
- "Other options include more stop signs on Gibbons, clearly marked pedestrian crossings and flashing crosswalk signals, adding speed humps on Gibbons, better traffic flow signage and markings at Gibbons and High Street, more excessive speed enforcement, etc.
- Directing more vehicle traffic to narrower side streets would only further reduce pedestrian and vehicle safety throughout the entire neighborhood. The issue seems to have more to do with distracted driving and speed, which should be addressed with more traffic/speed enforcement, not moving the hazard to other streets, which easily become congested with just one stopped delivery truck."
- I think this was very well thought-out and believe option A is the clear winner. People living in the neighborhood will naturally try to fight it because nobody likes change, but this clearly would improve safety and only create a minor inconvenience for very few residents.
- The reconfiguration in A will cause unnecessary back up on High St. This is unacceptable. The intersection can be made safer with audible pedestrian signals.
- I am tired of changing all of our major roads across the island to accommodate bikers. There are already bike lanes all over the island and a very small percentage of our population uses them. Bikers already have enough ways to get around the island and all of this traffic calming has done the opposite. Sitting at a light in a long line of cars for 2 or 3 green light due to recent calming construction just makes people angry and impatient. While sitting there feeling frustrated there might be one bike that goes by and most of them do not abide by the rules of the road. I am also tired of the slow streets and think that they should go. People can walk on the sidewalks and play at the many parks on the island not in the middle of the street.

- Please listen to the neighbors on the small, side streets and the Gibbons neighbors who oppose this. The surveys and plans continue to come out without any indications that the concerns are being heard.
- Putting more traffic on narrower side streets is a very selfish desire of Gibbons property owners who sit on city boards.
- It seems likely that people will instead travel up Northwood to Cambridge which has an easy right turn onto Fernside as a very likely alternative route. Cambridge is very narrow and there has already been 1 fatal car crash due to high speed traffic at the Cambridge/Fernside intersection. I am sure we will see a lot more dangerous traffic on side streets where a lot of kids ride their bikes to school. This is a terrible idea. So dangerous
- "I'm disappointed that the language in this survey is extremely biased towards Option A. Why have a survey at all if the survey language continually tries to convince participants to choose Option A?
- It also makes little sense that the impact on neighboring streets is being asked about as a separate issue in the survey. The increases in traffic on smaller streets and thus the negative impacts on safety there will offset any safety benefits expected from this change at the intersection in question, so it doesn't feel like the overall safety ROI is being discussed here. "
- Get this done ASAP!
- Please work on intersections that are proven unsafe. The problems at this intersection can be fixed without these major changes.
- Why bother? It's clear that this survey is simply an attempt to gain support for your ill-conceived project. Most of the votes to proceed will be coming from BWA.
- Please ask Oakland to make a double left hand turn lane onto northbound 880 for the love of God!
- Gibbons is a much wider road than other neighborhood streets and is better suited to traffic than the surrounding streets. Adding speed humps would decrease speed and improve safety. Eliminating the left turn option at Gibbons and High will cause more problems than it will solve. I particularly worry about all the kids who walk to school on neighborhood streets that will have increased traffic.
- Get it done now. Thank you.
- I find it inappropriate that a member of the Planning Commission (Andy Wang) and City Council (Tracy Jensen) are involved with this as it's my understanding that they live on Gibbons. I think there's no good reason to spend an excessive amount on Alt A (or B) when Alt C can make substantial changes with considerable savings. I also find the data collected about how many cars will be driving on the streets to be poorly collected, as the report says it was collected on a Wednesday. One day! Do I think the safety of this intersection can be improved? Sure. But, diverting traffic from Gibbons to other streets is NOT the solution. Should the residents of Gibbons demand better controls on their road to calm traffic? Absolutely. BUT, they live on a road that was intended to be a thoroughfare and is a wider street than all others in the area. In reading all the reports, I see nothing that indicates that this intersection has a higher accident rate than others in

town. Yes, it cites 22 crashes between 2017 and 2021 (dates would be helpful here, is that 1/1/17 to 12/31/21?), but how does that compare to the intersection at Grand and Otis? Tilden and Buena Vista? This is really feeling like the residents of Gibbons (two who should excuse themselves due to a conflict of interest) are trying to limit traffic on their road and doing it under the guise of safety improvements at this intersection. If the goal is to make that intersection safer, Alt C will satisfy that.

- Need a more thorough neighborhood traffic analysis.
- I know that Gibbons seems a priority but diverting traffic to smaller streets is not acceptable
- If the concern is really about pedestrian safety, please add stop signs on Fernside between Liberty and High, and increase traffic enforcement.
- Adding more infrastructure adds to confusion and congestion.
- Do not go forward with this project without a full plan for the rest of the neighborhood. Streets like Cornell and/or Southwood/bayo vista simply cannot handle a 400% increase in traffic without new safety measures.
- "Traffic Analysis was flawed. Took only 1 day of data from a Wednesday. That is the shortened at Edison and most Alameda schools. (oops!)"
- Traffic Analysis failed to show anything about pedestrian patterns and volumes. "
- Obviously, in my view there is no need for this to be implemented. You want to slow traffic? Stop signs and flashing lights work.
- Leave everything as is and bump out the curbs to shorten the desk and walks and narrow driving area to reduce traffic speeds.
- Again, I'm not sure I understand the severity of the problem at the intersection. Where is the problem that this is trying to solve? How many accidents? How many complaints? How many traffic incidents?
- The whole area of Alameda would benefit from Round A bouts. Cut down on safety issues, traffic congestion, speeding, etc
- Looks good to me.
- In Alternative B, why not expand the junction so that the only stop light as you move along High Street towards the Fernside intersection is the one before Gibbons. That way Gibbons gets to keep its phase for left turn onto high street, but you get the other benefits of rationalizing the crosswalk and reducing speed of traffic moving from High St to Gibbons. Congestion impact is neutral to what we have today. Congestion is not identified as problem in the current project's problem statement, but the Alternative A you're proposing is going to make it a problem on Cambridge and Yale, and raise new safety issues.
- Any changes to the intersection of Gibbons and High need to be combined with other traffic calming and safety measures in the neighborhood to avoid exacerbating speed and safety issues on surrounding streets. Speed bumps on Thompson and Fairview and a 4-way stop intersection at the corner of High and Thompson would provide significant calming and improved safety.
- This is being rushed. Traffic calming changes and time for repeat users and commuters to see the change is needed. More bus service is needed. Rushing this change through will

commit the City to what could be a mess, and only breed cynicism in the City Council and Planning commission. Given that members of both groups live on that last block of Gibbons, but apparently are not planning to recuse themselves from voting has already made me quite cynical about the whole situation. This is a time in the country for local government to do things right and not ram things through.

- I could see adding a painted bike box for people coming from High and Gibbons would be great. It looks like bikes on those sides were forgotten. Granted it SUCKS to bike on High Street and I typically ride the sidewalk especially with my kid.
- This is getting rushed through.
- Decreasing speeds on High St is important to me as well so adding traffic calming elements or additional stop signs or speed humps would be amazing.
- Do you anticipate further changes on the intersections along High and Fernside that will have new traffic diverted to them?
- Thank you for your thorough review of the traffic redirection risks of each of these alternatives. It seems like your team is considering all of the concerns that I came into the meeting with today. Thank you also for having the meeting during lunchtime on Zoom for ease of access.
- "Rather than the greater community impacts being an afterthought, I'd love to see community outreach and transparency on ALL impacts, not just that of this specific intersection. Good urban/transportation design means considering how a community interacts as a whole, rather than just at one intersection.
- Further analysis needs to be completed regarding pedestrian safety. The traffic study needs to be done at different times of the year as well as multiple days. This is lacking a lot of detailed information.
- There was a collision of two vehicles in front of my house on Tuesday evening, September 30th --two houses down from the intersection of Gibbons and High Streets. A driver approaching Gibbons from the Fernside intersection clipped the side mirror off of a parked car while a driver was seated in the front seat. The drivers called 911 and fire trucks came to respond. The current street design is dangerous. We should implement traffic calming measures in 2026 at the latest.
- "Alternative A would cause more HARM than good for the following reasons:
 - The projected 4 times increase in traffic on the side streets will make it much more dangerous for the neighborhood children that now ride their bikes, fetch loose balls and cross the streets there.
 - Eliminating the most direct and shortest route to the High St. bridge would cause drivers confusion and delays. For instance, taking Bayo Vista Ave. would force them to make a Left turn onto a very busy High St. causing delays for drivers on both streets.
 - The side streets can barely handle 2-way traffic today without one car stopping to let the other car pass. The risk of accidents is much higher with the increased traffic.
 - Diverting to narrow side streets will make it impossible for residents to get out of their driveways during backups like when the bridge is up, when cars

are waiting to turn left, when delivery vehicles are also blocking the street, etc.

- There have already been several accidents in the last 12 months where parked cars on Bayo Vista Ave. have been dented or sideswiped due to the narrowness of the street. Increased traffic will only make this worse.
- There will be added pollution and noise on the side streets.
- Alternative C is my preference because it is the Safest, Least Disruptive and Cheapest alternative. "
- Implement speed cameras and raised crosswalk speed bumps. on Fernside Blvd
- How about a traffic circle at Gibbons and Santa Clara. That 4 way stop is a hazard at all times of the day and night.
- Please address safety concerns for the benefit of MOST people rather than delaying or changing plans for to prevent inconvenience and fears of a few.
- Gibbons is the widest and most direct street in this area. Closing it to inbound traffic will force traffic onto narrower nearby streets. Any of the options which remove the outbound traffic light at Gibbons will also mean that people who currently travel on Gibbons will be making turns onto High or Fernside without the benefit of a light. Both of these things seem like decreases in safety.
- I feel like this is a waste of taxpayer money. I'm sure there are other traffic projects that would provide more safety.
- Appreciate the proactive approach and strategies to calm traffic.
- "Prioritize student safety in other parts of town"
- great alternatives, but dont let permanence/ perfection deter speed of implementation. Too often municipalities wait untill fatality occur to fast track safety improvements
- One thing that can also be done is posting official city signs at the bottom of Gibbons that says "no bridge access" Traffic routing maps would have to take this into account and route people around the neighborhood, which is the new normal of how people drive. Even if they know where they are going they route it to give themselves a time estimate of when they will get there. Traffic routing maps are used more and more and they are toting them up Gibbons.
- Gibbons is not the biggest issue. It just has the squeakiest wheels. Solve safety issues on High Street and the roundabout needs on Southwood etc first.
- We keep working on elaborate traffic calming solutions when the cheapest , easiest to implement, and most effective would be to enforce the existing 25 mph speed limit.
- Implement traffic calming now and put in a traffic turn signal at high/fernside and see what effect it has on overall traffic flow.
- The most important thing for safety is keeping cars below the speed limit. Circles and other non speed bump traffic calming is the best way to do this
- We need more traffic policing NOW on Fernside Blvd
- Think sensibly. You do not need to recreate the wheel here. Use AI to study how Europe does it. We were there for three weeks. The way they manage their city traffic makes total sense.
- How did a Fernside project scope get expanded to be Gibbons Drive traffic project?

- It's obvious that the city is all for plan a.
- Addressing Gibbons drive was a scope over reach in your Frenside Traffic Calming Efforts. I places everything proposed by staff in a new perspective which should necessitate a full revisit of the entire program.
- Close off Fernside -- see previous comments. If you aren't going to close off Fernside, then find ways to stem the flow of traffic, which is used as a means of getting to and from Oakland and San Leandro. 9,000 cars on Fernside should be all you need to consider here. The only thing you should be addressing. Seem to be missing the point.
- I am very excited to see Alameda continue to invest in more bike transportation infrastructure and reduce multi-lane vehicle streets to more multi-use friendly and sustainable layouts.
- Leave well enough alone.
- Is there any reason not to start implementing some of the traffic calming measures now, like speed bumps to improve safety due to speeding. If these are implemented, people may see alternative streets which are meant for higher traffic. I don't believe any of the streets in the outlined neighborhood are divided, whereas Central, High, and Broadway are.
- Smarter signal lights. Bolder flashing No Turn On Red signal would help a lot.
- Just add 4way stops, speed humps and enforce the existing speed limits. Which is not done in the fernside area or on high st with any regularity.
- "No matter what the city calls it, Gibbons functions as a critical part of how cars travel on the island. The safety of residents of the island depends on Gibbons function. The narrower side streets cannot meet that function unless you widen those streets.
- Alternative A is a bad recommendation for the neighborhood as a whole. "
- Solve slow streets barriers first!
- Because Fernside proposal is presently unfunded, please do the following: 1) install ped xings at Fernside intersections with Thompson, Fairview, and Montevista, include painted street xings and blinking lights; 2) place trailered speed indicators on both sides of Fernside between Garfield and High Street; 3) increase police speed enforcement on Fernside between Garfield and High st. Do these less costly things now, evaluate their impact, at least on the reach of Fernside between Garfield and High. In the long run, DO NOT do things which force more cars and traffic into the interior side streets. They all are narrow, and unsuited for through traffic, this is just a fact, please do not ignore this!
- "Traffic enforcement- consequences
- Speed humps / bumps
- Lower the speed limit on high st
- Stop forcing option A on people that live here i do not support option A "
- Yes, I strongly support Alternative B or a variation of it that keeps Gibbons in line with its original intent of the road. If the city does want to change a 100 year old throughfare street, it should be done through a wholistic look at the neighborhood and not a wholistic view of just the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection. Because Gibbons is still a cut through street even with the right turn gone, you're still going to get a lot of traffic volume through the neighborhood where it is going to be put onto smaller streets where

two cars can't even pass each other. It really doesn't make sense. You're also putting a lot of cars onto bayo vista where they will be taking an unprotected left which was not studied. The intersection currently has a light for cars and despite its flaws it is still controlled. What this will do is cause a lot of unsafe left turns off of bayo vista which increases accidents. You're also going to have people blowing through the stop signs taking a right onto fernside off of Cornell. Honestly, I don't understand the city staffs tunnel vision on this intersection without a broader look and that should include studying change within fernside to arrive at the best intersection alternative instead of working backwards from just changing the intersection.

- High street does not need more traffic. It's a narrow street with lots of parked cars. A major street crossing for Lincoln park. And has multiple schools. Rising star preschool, private catholic school, language Academy. High street does not need more traffic!
- Those yellow bump strips are really hard to push a walker over! Add a clear space in the center for mobility aid users.
- The bike lane prompting the millions in spending is not needed and is creating many follow on issues. The design alternatives are narrowly scoped and do not consider the larger environment in which they are taking place. They create far more problems than they are solving, and are supported by studies that have insufficient data and ignore several critical factors - including using aspirational street classifications rather than actual street widths (by the city's and consultants' own admissions). The whole premise is wrong-headed, and if the excuse is that it is in the approved strategic plan, that is lame. The strategic plan never does sufficient research to understand whether all recommendations are wise. That would be cost prohibitive. Instead the plans are sold in the fact that if they are wrong the research at time of implementation will identify that and stop the city from wasting resources on poor ideas. In this case the research is telling you that it's not a good idea. It's causing more problems than it solves. The community is pointing out several issues completely missed by the city, the Transportation Dept and Commission and the consultants. And the city's response is to ask the community not to talk about that stuff in the survey and communicate its smugness that it knows better. We have seen this "wisdom" before, like when Shoreline was made more dangerous, with more fatalities and serious accidents and rescue vehicle delays, as well as an unmaintained eyesore. And all the while precious city funds are being wasted on studies to be funded by grants that the federal government will never pay under the current autocrat.
- "Seems like an attempt by homeowners on gibbons to reduce traffic on their streets at the expense of people who live on nearby streets.
- Other measures like speed bumps, more crosswalks, etc would be more effective at improving safety without moving safety and traffic onto other streets."
- No comments
- Overbuilding has and will continue to have negative impact on the entire city.
- Please do not take away the left turn onto high and over engineer the neighborhood.
- Is this change engendered by the fact that a City Council member lives on Gibbons?

- Not sure why you're saying some streets are "local" and others are for through traffic. Cars are allowed on all streets. Traffic/speed calming is critical on high and Santa Clara and central.
- There are more simple and far cheaper solutions to the issues you raise. Stop making a mountain out of a mole hill.
- I think more study is needed on the secondary effects of this project. I am worried about new traffic pushed to High Street where my kids have often been almost hit by cars -- esp. at the Santa Clara Ave turn north onto High Street at the light. With more cars there and at the smaller streets, there will be more accidents unless traffic calming is implemented AT THE SAME TIME. Do not wait to address the secondary effects if you push cars to these areas that already have problems at current volumes. People drive way too fast down High Street as it is.
- See comments above.
- Help out neighbors understand that traffic calming efforts will make Gibbons less desirable to drive thru and will therefore take traffic out of our neighborhood, not re-direct it to side streets.
- "Does not present as an unbiased survey."
- This project has been delayed too long. It is urgent. The safety of the public is at risk.
- Completing the project sooner rather than later is important. It is of greatest urgency.

Gibbons/High/Fernside Design & Phasing Survey

The City of Alameda is considering safety updates to the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection and planning how it will function with the long-term plan for Fernside Blvd. We want to hear from you! Please fill out this survey to share your experience and priorities for the intersection and neighborhood streets. This survey follows up on the shorter one done in fall 2024.

If you'd like more background before responding, you can attend the [9/25 open house](#) or [9/30 virtual workshop](#), or review the [project and analysis overview slides](#). The [intersection analysis/traffic study memo](#) also provides more detail.

Project Location



Study Intersection:
Gibbons/High/Fernside

Nighborhood traffic study bounded by Central Avenue, Broadway, High Street, and Fernside Blvd.

First, please tell us about your relationship to the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection and the study neighborhood.


How often do you travel through the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection by the following mode(s)?

Questions	Less than once per week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	Daily
Walk	☒	☐	☐	☐

Questions	Less than once per week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	Daily
Bike	☒	☐	☐	☐
Drive or ride in a vehicle	☐	☐	☒	☐
Bus	☒	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐

Where do you live?

- ☐ Gibbons Drive
- ☒ Another street in the area bounded by Central Avenue, Broadway, High Street, and Fernside Boulevard
- ☐ Elsewhere in Alameda
- ☐ Outside of Alameda



What do you think are the most challenging issues at the intersection? Choose three.

- ☐ Safety of people walking or using a mobility device
- ☐ Safety of people biking
- ☐ Safety of people in vehicles
- ☐ Accessibility for people with disabilities
- ☐ Traffic congestion
- ☐ High auto speeds
- ☒ General intersection complexity and confusion
- ☒ No issues or only minor issues
- ☒ Other

Other:

I have lived on Thompson Ave for 25 years and was not aware of any issues with this intersection prior to this discuss

If you think the intersection has safety and accessibility issues, which do you observe as the most problematic? Choose up to three.


- ☐ Long pedestrian crossing distances
- ☐ Long bicycle crossing distances and mixing zones with vehicles
- ☐ Lack of accessible pedestrian signal and signal phase crossing Gibbons Drive
- ☐ Conflicts between vehicles (e.g. left turn yielding)
- ☐ Speeds coming from High Street Bridge
- ☐ Speeds generally (all directions)
- ☒ I don't think that there are safety issues
- ☐ Other

Additional comments on the Gibbons/High/Fernside intersection?

Design Alternatives

The recent traffic analysis evaluated intersection safety and operations with three design alternatives. The evaluation accounted for the long-term Fernside Boulevard project, which will add a new two-way bikeway on the north side of Fernside Boulevard. For more details and explanations of the study findings, please review the [project overview slides](#) and [analysis memo](#).

ALTERNATIVE A




Description:

- Realigns Gibbons at High Street
- Restricts Gibbons exit to right only on High Street
- Shortens long pedestrian crossings
- Reduces turn radius onto Gibbons

Study Findings:

- ☒ Safety: Improves safety
- ☒ Operations: Less congestion in short term; minimal change to existing condition in long term

ALTERNATIVE B



Description:

- Realigns Gibbons at High Street
- Allows Gibbons exit right and left on High Street with a new signal
- Shortens long pedestrian crossings
- Reduces turn radius onto Gibbons

Study Findings:




Safety: Improves safety



Operations: More congestion in short term; severe congestion in long term

ALTERNATIVE C



Description:

- No change to Gibbons alignment
- Adds a pedestrian signal crossing Gibbons Drive only in long-term implementation
- Reduces turn radius onto Gibbons with painted curb extension

Study Findings:



Safety: Addresses some issues



Operations: No change in short term; severe congestion in long term

Draft Recommendation

Based on intersection safety and operations, the staff and consultant team recommends Alternative A. Unfortunately, the team does not consider B and C viable options for the long term. (Staff recommend implementing traffic calming in the neighborhood with the intersection update, which will be discussed in the next section.)

How would Alternative A compare to the current intersection configuration for safety? Consider walking, biking, and driving safety at the intersection specifically. Neighborhood traffic diversion will be addressed separately.

☐ Much better

☐ Somewhat better

- ☐ No different
- ☐ Somewhat worse
- ☒ Much worse

Please describe the reasons for your response.

Removing the option to make a left on High St from Gibbons redirects traffic to sides streets that are much narrower and not intended for increased traffic patterns. We already have to move to the side when two cars are coming from opposite directions. This situation will increase substantially which is a caveat that I doubt the surveyers have considered in their evaluation of the resulting increased congestion on the side streets.

Alternatives B and C allow a left turn from Gibbons Drive onto High Street, but would cause severe congestion in the long term, resulting in long delays and backup on High Street going north toward the bridge. Given this analysis:

- ☒ I would prefer maintaining the left turn from Gibbons Drive onto High Street even if it means more backups on High Street.
- ☐ I would prefer restricting the left turn from Gibbons Drive onto High Street to prevent more traffic backup on High Street.
- ☐ I need more information about the traffic diversion analysis.
- ☐ Other

Do you have other comments on the intersection safety and operations analysis? Overall neighborhood traffic will be addressed in the next section.

There is already an existing 2nd traffic light for cars coming from Gibbons onto High St. Alternate B simply relocates

SECTION 2. NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC

This section addresses overall traffic considerations in the area bounded by Central Avenue, Broadway, High Street, and Fernside Boulevard. The survey will present study results for the effect of the turn restriction in Alternative A on neighborhood traffic. Note that Alternatives B and C were not studied because they do not include a turn restriction and therefore would not be expected to change traffic circulation patterns in the neighborhood.

Existing Conditions

Study Area



What do you think are the top issues on neighborhood streets today? Choose up to three.

- ☐ Safety: vehicle speeds on Gibbons Drive
- ☐ Safety: vehicle speeds on other neighborhood streets
- ☐ Cut-through traffic on Gibbons Drive
- ☐ Cut-through traffic on other neighborhood streets
- ☒ Neighborhood intersection safety (i.e. Southwood/Bayo Vista, Southwood/Northwood/Gibbons, Northwood/Cambridge, etc.)
- ☐ Finding parking
- ☒ Sidewalk condition (including tree root uplift)

- ☒ No or only minor issues
- ☐ Other


Additional comments on the neighborhood streets?

Gobbons/Southwood/Northwood intersection is too large and needs a resolution

Neighborhood Traffic Projections

The traffic study projected changes in traffic flow with the left turn restriction in Alternative A. The analysis used distance, number of turns and stops, and other roadway characteristics to assign what percentage of drivers currently turning left from Gibbons Drive onto High Street would take various alternate routes. Detailed results are available in the study report and presentation (LINKS).

CHANGE IN DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES WITH ALTERNATIVE A COMPARED TO OTHER STREETS IN ALAMEDA



The resulting traffic volumes on neighborhood streets are relatively low compared to other Neighborhood Local streets in Alameda and still much lower than on Gibbons Drive. However, the increase in traffic would be different from the existing, extremely low traffic volumes on these streets. In addition, drivers sometimes speed on Gibbons Drive and may continue to do so on other routes.

Because of these potential effects for other neighborhood streets, the project team recommends implementing Alternative A alongside traffic calming treatments in the

neighborhood.

NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC CALMING EXAMPLES



Speed Humps



Mini Roundabouts/Traffic Circles


Alternative A would decrease traffic going northbound on Gibbons Drive and increase it on neighboring streets including Southwood, Bayo Vista, and Cornell Drive. The new traffic would still be relatively low and similar to other local streets in Alameda. What do you think of this change?

- ☐ Acceptable for safety benefits at Gibbons/High/Fernside
- ☐ Acceptable only if changes at Gibbons/High/Fernside are implemented together with other neighborhood traffic calming
- ☒ Not acceptable - I do not support a turn restriction at Gibbons/High/Fernside
- ☐ Other


Which of the following neighborhood traffic calming features would you like to see in the study area? Check as many as you like or suggest other ideas.

- ☒ Speed humps on Gibbons Drive
- ☒ Speed humps on other streets (specify below)
- ☒ Neighborhood traffic circles or roundabouts at large intersections (e.g. Northwood/Southwood/Gibbons, Southwood/Bayo Vista, etc.)
- ☒ New marked crosswalks
- ☐ Other


What other comments do you have on traffic diversion and neighborhood traffic calming?



2026: Alt C* Quick-Build Updates with Annual Paving + assess adding speed humps on Gibbons



2028: Alternative A at SW Corner with Neighborhood Traffic Calming



2030+: Alternative A at full intersection with Long-Term Fernside Project

**Without adding pedestrian signal across Gibbons*

How urgent do you think it is to implement safety improvements at Gibbons/High/Fernside as soon as possible?

- ☐ Very urgent - prefer implementation in 2026
- ☐ Somewhat urgent - ok to implement in 2028
- ☐ Not urgent - ok to implement in 2030 or later
- ☐ Not needed at all
- ☒ Other

Other:

I have no opinion about timing, however, aligning with planned construction of a bike lane on Fernside to save costs

What other comments do you have about the phasing recommendation?

What is the phasing plan for Alt B? Of the options shown above, Alt C would be my choice. If Alt A is built, cars will force the awkward left on High St anyway causing even more problems.

Do you have any further comments on the design alternatives, neighborhood traffic analysis, or project timing?

Reconsider Alt B. More of the neighborhood homeowners have an issue with this recommendation (Alt A) than those that are in agreement with it.

Virtual Workshop Q&A

#	Question	Asker Initials	Question Time
1	Hello JB is here	Staff	9/30/2025 11:43
2	just testing everything out, I see you and Lisa	Staff Warner	9/30/2025 11:43
3	QUESTION	DS	9/30/2025 11:46
4	I have a question	Staff	9/30/2025 11:47
5	For me too?	Staff	9/30/2025 11:47
6	I see no answers	Staff	9/30/2025 11:48
7	Does anyone needs anything else from me?	Staff	9/30/2025 11:50
8	<i>[redacted identifying information unrelated to topic]</i>	BR	9/30/2025 11:55
9	breathing on thier mic	BR	9/30/2025 11:59
10	I can't mute	DS	9/30/2025 12:00
11	What makes you think that any of the changes will make this safer? The accitends as communicated by your team are caused by excessive speed entering or leaving the island... your changes don't change this dynamic.,	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:05
12	What is the imact on air quality by moving traffic away from the trees on Gibbons in to side streets with much smaller trees?	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:07
13	Why do you call this calming? This is enraging the community. Over the past year my wife and I have seen more road rage incidents in Alameda. The changes do not calm traffic... they create traffic. As a result, drivers rage. Multiple times, we've been honked at for stopping at stop signs. As we've stopped for pedestrians at cross walks, we've had multiple vehicles try to pass us in a fit of rage nearly killing the pedestrians... please stop making our city more dangerous.	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:13
14	In a previous Parametrix presentation it showed the breakdown of the 22 accidents; it turns out the 22 were over the ENTIRE Fernside corridor and only 5 were at the Fern/High/Gib, only (1) was vehicle/vehicle, which was an collision between two drivers on High St (one turning onto	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:17

	Fernside). Can you please clarify how closing off the left turn from Gibbons improves safety when there is not significant safety issue there, and then push all traffic onto small streets where Edison kids walk/bike		
15	Can you please confirm the details that lead you to classify this a dangerous intersection? We heard 22 accidents at the workshop... is that per year? Seems high... can you please clarify the time period for the 22 accidents?	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:17
16	Your removal of the left turn. Puts more traffic onto Cornell Dr and then add even MORE traffic on to Fernside toward High Street. 🙄 with the Fernside Project you will removing at least 6 parking spaces from the corner of Cornell Dr up to the corner or High street 🙄 What's next will you be removing one side of the street parking on Cornell Drive? In order to handle the new traffic that will be now traveling down it? I'M FOR KEEPING THE LEFT TURN!!!	CM	9/30/2025 12:18
17	We are not opposed to reworking the intersection itself to improve bike and pedestrian safety and traffic flow. However, the proposal to close the left turn from gibbons is unrelated to improving the intersection and presents more risks and complications. For example: - Restricted Emergency Access to bridge. In event of fire, earthquake, tsunami etc, you are making it harder to leave the island if you remove left turn. - Traffic Diversion to Narrow Residential Streets - Increased Risk to Children and Families who use side streets daily to go to school. We respectfully urge decision-makers to explore alternatives that enhance safety without creating new hazards for the community. For example: - Keep the left turn and improve the intersection itself - If you want to slow traffic on gibbons (outside of the stop signs already there) add speed bumps - Consider round about option again at intersection, just a smaller one	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:20
18	What is the relative cost difference between obtaining the right of way for a roundabout versus all the many intersection	GW	9/30/2025 12:20

	roundabout improvements that Scott talked about throughout the Fernside neighborhood that would be needed for traffic calming to support shutting off the Gibbons left turn.		
19	Where can we find the EIR/NOE for the Fernside Project? Was the closure of Gibbons included in the initial EIR/NOE/mitigated declaration. What is your CEQA plan to have the Gibbons closure?	GW	9/30/2025 12:22
20	Why do you say two-way bike ways are safer? I've ridden bike lanes in Alameda my entire life, I've never had an issue. I rode your Clement two-way bike lane once traveling West bound and was nearly hit by someone turning left. People do not look for traffic on their left when turning...Two-way bike lanes are only safer if there are no vehicle crossings like driveways. This is a terribly dangerous idea. Have you used these new dangerous bike lanes? I will never use them again... false sense of safety. Please stop before people are killed by your lack of awareness.	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:23
21	Where can we get a copy of all the questions/answers from the open house last Wednesday?	GW	9/30/2025 12:23
22	has it been considered instead of letting traffic enter gibbons only allow traffic in.	BR	9/30/2025 12:23
23	sorry out	BR	9/30/2025 12:24
24	what is the high street volume?	JT	9/30/2025 12:25
25	How can you say that closing off the Gibbons left turn will improve safety without studying pedestrian/bike traffic. You are showing you will increase traffic 400% through the smaller streets that the children and bike and walking to Edison?	GW	9/30/2025 12:25
26	it would cover the need for egress in an emergency	BR	9/30/2025 12:25
27	only let traffic out but not in	BR	9/30/2025 12:26
28	Who led the change to reclassify Gibbons? It is very clearly different from all other streets in the neighborhood. It should retain the load of traffic as it is wider and can handle the traffic.	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:26
29	your designs don't account for someone leaving the area in an emergency	BR	9/30/2025 12:27
30	Could we add speed bumps to Bayo Vista and Cornell to reduce speed of cars going through those alternative routes?	MD	9/30/2025 12:29
31	How will diverting 1 car per 40 seconds to take left turns onto High Street from Bayo Vista/Fairview/Thompson be safety on High Street? How does High Street compare with Fernside in	GW	9/30/2025 12:31

	terms of being a high injury corridor? How is having people take an unprotected left turn onto High Street safer than a protected turn at the Gibbon/Fernside/High intersection?		
32	It seems like the real issue here is added congestion. What would be the typical wait time if you proceed with the Fernside project as planned, but not eliminate the left turn from Gibbons?	GW	9/30/2025 12:33
33	Could the neighborhood traffic calming provide an opportunity for increasing planting in the mini roundabouts instead of just hardscape?	LW	9/30/2025 12:33
34	What has been done from an enforcement standpoint over the past few years at this intersection? I recall 10+ years ago there used to be a motorcycle officer that would set up next to the bridge. Seems like this became a "dangerous" intersection after you stopped enforcement efforts.	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:35
35	Please clarify when Gibbons was reclassified as a "local street" from a Transitional Collector. How is it possible that Gibbons is not a local collector road?	GW	9/30/2025 12:35
36	You're just adding even more traffic to the 3100 block of Fernside! And with the Fernside Project, you're moving all the traffic to the same side of the street your new traffic will be on. Nice way of adding to our misery of leaving our homes on Fernside.	CM	9/30/2025 12:35
37	This intersection is not dangerous, yet the proposal is to make several other intersections dangerous. First let's be real that you just want more time at the traffic signal. But second you're creating more safety issues. How many accidents, injuries or deaths will this create? How many have occurred at this intersection at this exact intersection? How were these calculations made?	LZ	9/30/2025 12:36
38	I am concerned about the increase with speeding vehicle to other neighborhoods. Similar to what happened to Pearl St when Versailles was blocked off.	BR	9/30/2025 12:36
39	For Alt C is Gibbons still part of the traffic light sequence or do people turn onto High first?	MD	9/30/2025 12:36
40	What is your margin of error on the "from the neighborhood" and traffic counts? I saw you here. You were hardly here at all counting, and the methodology sounds very error-prone.	LZ	9/30/2025 12:37
41	Was Edison Elementary drop off from 8-8:30 included in the morning traffic study?	MD	9/30/2025 12:37
42	Can High St be considered for these traffic calming options like speed humps?	KB	9/30/2025 12:37

43	Gibbons is 40 feet wide, and the surrounding streets are narrower by 5 to 10 feet than Gibbons. Since street narrowing is a well known safety countermeasure to reduce speeding, isn't it less likely that diverted traffic will speed on those streets like they do on Gibbons? Drivers on Gibbons are also sometimes racing to get through the traffic light at Fernside...since that's not an issue for streets surrounding Gibbons, wouldn't this make speeding less likely on those streets?	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:38
44	Why the rush to waste money on this now? This ruins the neighborhood and clearly makes it more dangerous for school children.	LZ	9/30/2025 12:39
45	Instead of the current phasing could we do more studies and do traffic calming BEFORE the major intersection changes (i.e., do the smallest, quickest, and cheapest mitigations first). Proposal: Phase 1. 2026: Complete the repaving project without changes to this intersection. 2. Design, get funding, and implement neighborhood traffic calming measures throughout the neighborhood 3. Re-study the intersection and then (and only then) consider one of the major intersection options	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:40
46	Can Alt A block illegal left turns out of Gibbons right turn only lane?	MD	9/30/2025 12:40
47	This intersection has been functioning fine for a hundred years. How much higher are the crashes here versus similar ones, like say Park St bridge or Webster St.? Seems like the answers so far are just partial answers.	LZ	9/30/2025 12:42
48	I read the traffic study and, as I understand it, the recommendation is not to do anything at the intersection until there is funding and budget to calm the traffic impacts on the neighborhood side streets. Can you please explain the current thinking about the sequencing of this project? If no funding materializes for traffic calming on neighborhood streets, would the City nevertheless proceed with the changes to the intersection?	GV	9/30/2025 12:44
49	I'm concerned that the survey the city has on this is heavily biased. There are many leading questions, red herrings, and double-barreled questions. It unfortunately could take any support for a safer intersection (no one is against safety if you don't present any trade-offs) and misinterpret that as community support for option A. Can you say more about how the survey results will be used? Could we also request	CT	9/30/2025 12:44

	that ALL survey comments be published publicly in-full rather than summarized?		
50	How will option B and C which keeps Gibbons left turn open increase diversion? If people want to divert to side streets today they still can, nothing is stopping them.	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:46
51	Can you please compare the street widths when you talk about how many cars? The cars cannot pass if cars are parked on either side. Saying it's not many cars fails to recognize the totality of circumstances. Other streets near the other bridges have sufficient width for cars to park and cars to pass. That is not the case on these neighborhood streets.	LZ	9/30/2025 12:46
52	I think this shows incredible poor planning. All I am hearing is that this is about safety, but the data do not support that blocking off the Gibbons left turn will improve safety, but it only pushes traffic onto the small streets where there WILL be safety issues. What I am really hearing is that this is about traffic congestion caused by the new bike lane. Why wasn't this congestion considered with the Fernside project? Did all the Council members realize they were essentially voting to close Gibbons off when they voted for the Fernside project because of the congestion?	GW	9/30/2025 12:46
53	Why you don't think the increase in traffic on Cornell or Bayo Vista would add more safety issues to those streets? The traffic study acknowledges that cars will move down Cornell and Bayo Vista at increased speeds. Those are narrow streets, not designed for through traffic. These are also streets that are full of kids who walk and roll to school, and I'm really concerned that this is a very dangerous proposal for kids.	GV	9/30/2025 12:47
54	Diverting traffic from Gibbons to side streets that are 6' narrower increases safety risks and congestion on those streets, which have very high pedestrian traffic (also consider movement of delivery and emergency vehicles). With the main driver of closing off northbound traffic from Gibbons being alleviating traffic congestion caused by future High/Fernside intersection changes (i.e., Long-term Fernside Project), how would traffic calming measures impact diversion from Gibbons without eliminating northbound traffic from Gibbons?	EB	9/30/2025 12:48
55	What Scott just described as safety improvements for closing off Gibbons, can he please compare improvements from closing off the left turn, versus Alternative C of making intersection improvements without closing it off.	GW	9/30/2025 12:48

56	Why are you working against what the community wants? We purchased houses in this neighborhood because we like it the way it is. We do not believe you and we do not want these changes. .	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:48
57	Also, hi Sarah! I am really struggling to figure out the timing/sequencing here and I really respect Ms. Ott's clarification. So is the idea now that we're approving the intersection, subject to financing for neighborhood traffic calming? Or we're approving the intersection and then we'll try to figure out the traffic calming later?	GV	9/30/2025 12:49
58	If you can't separate the differences between closing off Gibbons and not closing off Gibbons, then why would you suggest this as the preferred alternative?	GW	9/30/2025 12:50
59	What would cause the increased congestion that you're referencing on High St with Options B & C? Can't there be ways to mitigate congestion (light timing, position of traffic lights/signals, diverting traffic to other connectors/arterials) that don't require taking away the right turn onto High from Gibbons? I'm curious why the congestion on High trumps congestion on other local streets like Bayo Vista that would result from Option A.	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:50
60	It appears the big reasons alts b and c are not being recommended is related to cumulative impacts with the two-way bike lane. Fernside is quite wide and as a biker is a very comfortable street as is. Has there been any consideration of keeping the bike lanes as is? It feels like bike lanes on fernside are less important than the safety of families and children on the neighborhood streets.	JK	9/30/2025 12:52
61	Even though the increase in cut-through volume may not increase as dramatically on Cornell as you one might expect, your own estimate is almost a 3x increase AND it is a narrow short street that cut-throughs already speed on and enter the wrong side of the road. What specific measures would you be considering implementing in order to mitigate cut-throughs and speeding/wrong-way entry Northbound on Cornell (the Fernside improvements look like they would help mitigate issues Southbound)?	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 12:52

62	Hello, I have comment, rather than a question. This past Friday morning (Sept. 26) about 9AM, I was driving down High Street towards Fernside and had to preemptive stop before the intersection, because TWO cars coming from Gibbons ran the yellow and then the red light in a rush to get on to High Street to cross the bridge into Oakland. The second car came to an abrupt halt as the light to cross Fernside was red. I'm lucky I saw them coming and had time to give them space. These close calls are common. I've seen drivers coming from Gibbons towards the bridge appear to confuse the diagonal light repeatedly. When approaching this intersection from Fernside with the intent to turn up High Street, I am very careful when turning to watch for vehicles coming from Gibbons who wrongly think they have right-of-way. This intersection is dangerous and confusing. This safety work needs to happen. I am in full support of the proposed Alternative A to realign and restrict the left turn from Gibbons. Thank you.	ER	9/30/2025 12:56
63	How does the 1 added car every 40 seconds turning left of High St line up with the delay it takes to turn left on High street. Depending on traffic, that turn can take a minute or two. Won't this cause congestion on the side streets? Won't that add "more congestion/road rage/etc" that the Parametrix consultant was saying about keeping Gibbons open.	GW	9/30/2025 12:57
64	Since High St is a high injury corridor (and Gibbons/Fernside is not), why would be betting to put more traffic to take a left turn on High St. Does the Mayor know you are making things more unsafe for her citizens?	GW	9/30/2025 13:00
65	We've heard the new roundabout near Encinal High School is a miserable failure... assuming this is the same team that messed up that neighborhood...what happens when this project fails as well? What can be done or undone to correct your biased bulldozer approach to "working" with communities?	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 13:01
66	Those delays don't seem that significant.	GW	9/30/2025 13:02
67	What time of year? Was school is session	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 13:03

68	City documents online indicate that the street classification was change in 2022, NOT 2009. In 2009 it was a transitional collector. Please provide documentation to support the 2009 reclassification, as opposed to what the City's documentation show as a 2022 reclassification.	GW	9/30/2025 13:05
69	And also southwood	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 13:05
70	Where will the funding for neighborhood calming come from?	GW	9/30/2025 13:05
71	Put the street calming speed bumps on the last block of gibbons	CM	9/30/2025 13:07
72	LOL, if you are dedicating police to the high injury corridors, why are we not decidating our capital improvements dollars to those corridors instead of City Councilwoman Tracy Jensen's pet project?	GW	9/30/2025 13:08
73	Alameda police are NOT ON FERNSIDE ENOUGH! For the street having 8,600 cars every day we should have more police presence	CM	9/30/2025 13:09
74	(revised) LOL, if you are dedicating police to the high injury corridors, why are we not decidating our capital improvements dollars to those corridors instead of an area and intersection that are not considered high injury?	GW	9/30/2025 13:09
75	If the City is saying that the Fernside Project has not gone through any CEQA review yet, that's extremely concerning. CEQA requires environmental review before approving or advancing a project that could have a significant impact, and that includes traffic, pedestrian safety, and circulation changes. If the project has already been approved without CEQA review, that's a serious violation. If it hasn't been approved, then no part of it should be moving forward (not in planning, not in funding) until CEQA compliance is documented. The public deserves full transparency here. I'm formally asking the City to produce the CEQA documentation (or confirm in writing that it doesn't exist), and to pause all work on this project until proper environmental review has been completed and shared publicly.	GW	9/30/2025 13:11
76	Why is it critical to place a two-way bike corridor at great expense on Fernside rather than, for example, jogging to the	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 13:11

	right one block where there is virtually no traffic from High down to Tilden?		
77	Can you please include the full zoom transcript with the answers to the questions	GW	9/30/2025 13:14
78	How many people use the 70' crossing guiding you to change this intersection?	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 13:18
79	Do the diversions to other neighborhood streets account for the increased congestion as cars will be attempting to turn onto streets without stop signs? or the safety dynamic of these intersections?	JT	9/30/2025 13:20
80	boooo.... please stop. We hate what you are doing to our city!!!	Anonymous Attendee	9/30/2025 13:22
81	What will you be doing about calming traffic on High?	TG	9/30/2025 13:22
82	Thank you!	MD	9/30/2025 13:23

Community Open House Presentation Question Cards and Comment Cards

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

WHAT IS MISSING FROM A & B GRAPHIC IS WHAT IF ANY
CHANGES AT GIBBONS & CORNELL INTERSECTION BESIDES
POSSIBLY A DEAD END SIGN?

THESE OPTIONS WILL POSSIBLY CAUSE A LARGER SAFETY ISSUE
WITH PEOPLE MAKING 3 POINT TURNS WHEN GET TO DEAD END,
PLUS INTERFERES TRAFFIC.

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

HOW HAVE YOU ANALYZED DECREASE IN SAFETY IN
NARROW ALTERNATIVE STREETS, GIVEN THOSE STREETS HAVE
32-37% LESS DRIVING SPACE AND CANNOT SAFELY ACCOMMODATE
TWO-WAY TRAFFIC WHEN CARS ARE PARKED ON BOTH SIDES.
GIBBONS IS THE SAFEST STREET TO ACCOMMODATE THIS TRAFFIC.

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

How many cars do you expect to be deferred from entering Gibbons?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

~~Why do the traffic light go on A#?~~
Why do you think cars won't go up Cambridge from Gibbons to turn right on Fernside?
to avoid unsignaled lefts onto High St
Would you plan to put in the roundabouts before Gibbons is closed?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

How was the potential impact on Santa Clara estimated?

To the extent that the ~~f~~ alternative streets next to Gibbons do not have a signal at High while Santa Clara does, wouldn't this potentially drive more traffic onto Santa Clara? ~~esp if more traffic coming~~
~~on~~ And ~~the~~ worsen speeding & intersection risk at SC & Gibbons?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

(Bayo Vista) 150 to 200 cars/day is significant, esp if these cars will be turning left - on unprotected left onto high street.
Has there been any assessment on that congestion on Bayo and onto High Street? ~~There is~~
a

Presentation Question Card

M

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

The intersection already has a traffic light directing cars from Gibbons toward the high st bridge ^(ie left turn). How does the redesign of that light in plan B ~~and~~ change High st traffic if the light already exists?

We are an island. We need routes off of the island in case of emergency evacuation. Was this studied? Will we be able to evacuate safely with fewer streets leading to the bridge?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

If my arithmetic is right, Alt. 4 will drive a 3 to 4 times increase in traffic on Bagollista/Southwood and on Cornell. These streets are 10' narrower than Gibbons. How is any of this safer?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



The city can improve safety at the intersection in question without having to divert traffic to neighboring streets (and thus decrease safety in those other streets) - this should be the priority to maximize safety ROI of the community as a whole, not just of the intersection. I'd like to see alternatives to options C & D that do this. Gibbons is the only ^{long} diagonal street in the area so is simply better designed to be a collector street vs. the neighboring streets which are all shorter & narrower and not designed for that purpose.

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

① How does pushing more traffic (400% increase) onto more narrow streets make the overall conditions safer for pedestrians and bikes in the neighborhood?

② How will this project address pushing more traffic onto more dangerous/less controlled intersections like Southwood/Farview/Bay Vista?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

In alternative A you ~~indicate~~ for the addition of traffic on Cornell, Southwood, Bayolista, etc., this will result in unprotected lefts onto High at ~~big~~ intersections w/ many pedes. Have you studied the effects?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

Isn't this a plumbing question? Where the volume (V) is fixed (both the fluid - cars and the pipes - street) are? Do you propose to change volume? If you restrict the pipes, any one pipe, doesn't the pressure go up on the others?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

Current proposal to "close" gibbons is shocking as the effect of "slow streets" still has not been quantified. Premature to "close" gibbons AND do "slow streets" puts massive impact on the other streets. How does that add up?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

You only offer options A, B, + C
I have many other ideas for intersection that the city has not yet discussed.
At least as citizen offered option D. yet
I have told to Scott W at least 4 improvements not being considered

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Questions

1. Please explain the collisions data. What were the turning errors? What direction of travel caused most accidents?
2. How many accidents do you expect to add with traffic diversions on High? ~~and~~

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

- ① Would the pedestrian crossing from A.H.C be beneficial to Alt A also, and then have a similar effect on congestion?
- ② Is it dangerous to move 500 cars from protected left turn to unprotected left and no crosswalks?
- ③ Why comparing long term traffic on Cornell & Bay Vista to Pacific and streets not in Fernside?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Alt A means 400x more traffic on the small streets w/ no signal lights for left turn onto High St.

What about wait time for the smaller streets?
You shorten wait time w/ Alt A, but didn't consider the wait time for the increased cars passing thru those streets, waiting to turn left onto High St.

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

Was there any study done about the effects on High Street and how it will affect residents there? As a 12 year resident there, ~~as~~ when High Street gets affected by the bridge, drivers start diverting to narrow roads on streets with no stop signs (i.e. Bay Vista & Monte Vista).

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

CAMBRIDGE DR - A VERY NARROW ST - WAS
NOT MENTIONED. PEOPLE already speed down
on street - 2 accidents & one fatality in last 2
yrs. What are you going to do about CAMBRIDGE?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

① How do you know the traffic congestion delay
with ALTC without a pedestrian traffic study?
If there were minimal/low pedestrian traffic would
congestion w/ALTC be any different than it
is today?

② Since
Congestion was not identified as an issue at
this intersection at the onset of the project, why would
~~not~~ no change in congestion be the rationale to
throw out ALTC?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

For Alternative B:

Where is the extra signal and what is the purpose?

For Alternative A:

Should width of Bay Vista & Cornell considered?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

How will this affect
Southwood Dr. during the
holidays.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



MORE stop signs on Gibbons

AND with CROSS WALKS,

AND Include SPEED Bumps

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your clarifying question on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

1. Could you please clarify the before and after traffic counts by direction? (Right now, I only see the total counts. We need to see the directional counts.)
2. What is the estimated reduction in southbound speed on Gibbons after the intersection change (under alternatives A, B, and C)?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

How does this impact school routes?
You seem to be diverting traffic to where
our kids cross streets to get to school.

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

Why ARE The MEASUREMENTS of
STREETS NOT INCLUDED AS A
FACTOR IN THIS DESIGN?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Why was the traffic study done in the summer
when there is a lot less traffic, bikers and pedestrians?

- traffic calming alone

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

The goal should be to stop cars from using Gibbons
as a cut through. what else are you able to do?
For example, diverting traffic from entering at central
and Gibbons and encouraging use of Fernside,

Also traffic circle at Gibbons & corner

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

① How does it ~~not~~ improve safety by forcing cars to take an unprotected left turn onto HighSt versus a controlled traffic light at Gibbons/High/Fernside?

② Is it reasonable to go with ALTC and not make things worse through the rest of the neighborhood now, given funding is uncertain for the traffic culming in the rest of the neighborhood? (see #3 & 4 on Back)

3) DOES THE CITY AGREE WITH THE FINDINGS OF THE PARAMETRIX REPORT THAT ALT-A SHOULD NOT BE IMPLEMENTED WITHOUT NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC PLAN? EG. SOUTHWOODS - FAIRVIEW - BAYO?

④ How did/what would the consultant do to adjust the traffic study results ~~for the~~ that were collected during the summer for traffic patterns for when school is in session?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

Speeds on Southwood are already excessive (30+ mph) and going toward High St, no marked lanes, intersection of Janview, Bayo Vista, Thompson are blind. Will contribute to unsafe conditions on the model A width streets. They aren't designed for excessive traffic.

I already see people turn left onto High St from the Right turn lane.

Have you ever tried to turn left onto
High St. from these feeder streets? It is
very difficult and visibility is not great.
Also unsafe

Would the feeder streets also get traffic
calming (speed bumps) on Southwood, Northwood,
Thompson, Fairview, Bay Vista, Cornell, Yale?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

- ① Of the 22 accidents that have occurred at the Fernside/High/Gibbons intersection how many accidents involved a ~~east~~ vehicle coming from gibbons going towards the High St. Bridge?²⁰
- ② Who from the City Council/Commissioners directed staff to ~~ask~~ investigate Gibbons being included in the Fernside Study?

① Why are speed humps in the near term being considered for Gibbons, and not the rest of the neighborhood, when Gibbons drive itself is not part of the Terrace Project?

What would need to be done related to voice and integrals

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

You mentioned this is a high-injury intersection.

Are these car or pedestrian accidents?

How many over what period? Where does it rank citywide?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

1. Why only check traffic on Wednesday → frequent work-from-home day
2. Cambridge sees a lot of cut through traffic from Northwood → Cambridge
→ Fernside, very high speed^{straight shot}. It must be included in analysis.

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your clarifying question on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

Will there be public record once we leave this meeting and go downstairs for the workshops?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



If we fill out the survey online, do we still need to make comments here?

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

What are the causes of the accidents that lead you to claim this is a dangerous intersection? What direction are involved cars coming from? Is traffic from Gibbons causing collisions? I have never thought of this intersection as a problem.

Presentation Question Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your **clarifying question** on this card and the moderator will compile to read aloud after the presentation. All comments written on question cards will be saved and recorded, but not all will be read aloud. You will also have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments during the open house.

① How many of the 22 accidents that have occurred at the Fernside/High/Gibbons intersection involved a vehicle that was coming from Gibbons going towards the High St. Bridge?

② Who from The City Council/Planning Commission/Transportation Committee directed staff to investigate changes for Gibbons as part of the Fernside Project?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



JUDY JUDY = 1817 YALE DRIVE

WILL JUDY

ESIE JUDY

CÉCILE JUDY

PLEASE DO NOT CLOSE OFF GIBBONS!

THAT STREET IS BIG ENOUGH TO HANDLE THE TRAFFIC
THE SIDE STREETS ARE NOT = IT WILL FALSE THE →

TRAFFIC 400% // AS STATED ON YOUR WEBSITE

WITH YOUR STATS. PLEASE CONSIDER SPEED

BUMPS / DIPS. LOOK AT THE MIRROR IN SAN

LEANDRO. LOOK AT THE FLD AND SO CAL.

IF YOU WANT PEOPLE TO STOP SPEEDING LIKE

YOU SAY YOU DO THEN PUT IN SPEED BUMPS /

DIPS. THAT WILL SOLVE WHAT STOP SIGNS, STOP

LIGHTS, AND STREET CLOSURES WON'T. IF YOU

LOSE CARBONS RATE WILL STILL SPEED. IT

WILL BE AT THE DISCREPANCY OF CHIEF.

IT IS NOT WHAT THE COMMUNITY WANTS !!

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Smaller streets can not support
this traffic - even in one direction.
The people living there might be
driving the other direction!!
Two way traffic is not supported on Cornell.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



with Alt. A - how do you
suggest getting onto High St. Bridge?
- rt on High - left on Fairview?
then left on Fernside?
- If you use Bayo Vista, Cornell on
Fairview, how do you expect to take a
left onto High St. to go over Bridge?
- This is a BIG issue Bc the line of
cars on High St. will not allow cars
to get in queue to cross Bridge!!

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



I Support the neighborhood traffic calming measures
on the streets surrounding gibbons, especially the circle at
gibbons / northwood / southwood.

we should not remove the gibbons left turn onto
high street, especially not before these neighborhood measures
are complete.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



50-40 cars lined up to make
Left Turns is a ~~LARGE~~ line of
cars to contend with -

How do you get out of you are
a person on these affected streets!!

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



With ~500-600 more cars anticipated to make a left turn (unprotected) from Bayo Vista onto High Street, how will the city mitigate the traffic and safety impacts? Right now all of those cars have a protected left turn light, which ensures traffic flows and is controlled from both directions. What you're setting up will be the Wild West or Mad Max! And it will be even worse when the High St. Bridge is up and traffic is backed up for 15-30 minutes!

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Thank you for tonight's event at City Hall.
I generally support any speed reductions along Fernside and Gibbons - drivers should slow down and should be ticketed if they speed.
I do not support option A or option B for the Fernside/High intersection and instead support option C. The intersection is fairly straight forward as it is, and neighbor complaints are usually about danger from speeding cars.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Why is it so difficult to install
speed humps on Southwood Dr. &
Gibbons Dr. # of cars not
as important as speed.

Such an easy fix.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Why not try the low cost
alternative before making a major
change to the neighborhood?
Try alternative C and then move
onto ~~Alternative~~ alternative A if
the intersection remains bad.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Try stop signs & speed bumps on
Gibbons before closing Gibbons to bridge
traffic. neighborhood

The predicted diversion of traffic to narrow ~~stop~~
streets - and through other dangerous intersections
frequented by school kids - is going to create more
problems than it solves.

Janine Hayward, 1705 Cornell
510-641-6088

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Southwood and Northwood are crazy
streets / intersections that currently have near
misses. How will they be safer with the proposed
plan.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



I live on Southwood which I believe may be wider than Gibbons. It ~~cars~~^{cars} are diverted to Southwood, ^{there} ~~there~~ has to be calming measures installed. Is this an option? Has it been discussed? Areas of particular importance are Southwood and Thompson, Southwood and Fairview.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



IF THE PRIMARY CONCERN IN THE INTERSECTION
IS SAFETY, WHY NOT CONSIDER SPEED BUMPS AND
CROSSING LIGHTS ONLY?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Are you committed to doing
traffic calming not only on
Gibbons but all the
neighboring streets BEFORE
anything else?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:

alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Traffic Calming on Gibbons
must be studied and tried
before any closure recommendation.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Thank you for continued consideration. What would anticipated speeds be on Cornell & Bayo Vista after implementation? What are speeds right now? The 31 mph 85th %ile on gibbons is well above safe limits, I hope the ~~the~~ smaller side streets would be slower.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Proposal: Accelerate neighborhood traffic calming,
then re-assess. Decrease in cut-through traffic
may ~~not~~ take care of biggest concerns.

Also — for option B — maybe set the light to be really long at
Gibbons. Would discourage cut-through traffic and reduce
High St. backup, but still provide local traffic an okay
route to get to the High St. bridge.

Anna-Marie Blinn

amblinn
~~amblinn~~
gmail.com

- Prefer Gibbons as 13 to speed traffic out
- People already speeding on Fenside - make
- 300 Gibbons - speeds are higher
- Have big trucks on Street
- Cross with Gibbons / network
- Squirrels to Santa Clara
- This intersection is not a priority bc it's not a High Crash Intersection
- More data about collisions what caused them
- Affected data is a problem
- Survey was biased

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:

alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



- Back up where people stop in
the Gibbons a little further

back

- ~~Bay~~ Causing a wait for
Neighborhood traffic coming
is stop creep.

- Remove Gibbons Ped
crossing - Add one @ Bayo Vista

- Bayo Vista - ^{school} kids cross
@ High @ Bayo Vista

- Stop sign @ Cornell / Gibbons
- Speed humps in Gibbons

Visa Foster notes

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



The plans presented do not take in consideration
that Right turns onto Fernside are much easier
than left turns to High St. together the Island
Streets Cambridge, Harvard, Flent, Cornell are very
narrow & will cause congestion & accidents.
Please look at why the Consultants didn't
look into those divergent traffic

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



The residents of the Fernside neighborhood who took time to come to this meeting were not permitted to talk. Moreover, there was no mention of key streets like CAMBRIDGE - where there was a recent fatality and another injury crash. This process is deceptive and fraudulent.

Natasha
415.518.8480

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



- ① sound system awful?
- ② what are Oakland's plans in all this?

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



How much space will be available to cue from
the west side of Fernside for a right turn
onto the High Street Bridge? It looks like
it will take very few cars to create a
substantial back up there.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:

alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



Thank you for addressing this confusing and problematic intersection. As a parent of 2 students, the improvements cannot come quickly enough. I was hoping that staff would continue to recommend the Gibbons/Fernside/High intersection be improved with the Fernside 2026 improvements. Delaying until 2030+ will be after my kids have completed middle school at Lincoln as cyclists using this corridor. Still support long term improvements to safety for all! Thank you!

Megan Murphy
meganolizabethmurphy@gmail.com

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



If you close Gibbons at the end,
you must divert traffic from feeder
streets. Basically, just close Gibbons.
Don't let traffic flow to all other
streets - even with calming measures.

Comment Card

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study
Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



If Gibbons is now a local street
why not close the end of Gibbons + High, so
no traffic can come onto Gibbons from the
bridge + High, or go out. This way folks would
have to find other alternatives to get bridge, and
hopefully not the other local streets near by.

Comment Card

FRANK STRONACH "MAGA
Group"

Gibbons Drive/High Street/Fernside Boulevard Intersection Design Study

Community Open House: September 25, 2025



Write your comments on this card. You may also fill out the survey at the project website:
alamedaca.gov/GibbonsHighFernside



REMEMBER the Little Dog

"HIGH Street"

She is the symbol for


"MAKE BERKELEY A Verb"

WAR STARTS AT HOME — SO DOES


PEACE!

TREX

Where do you see a need for neighborhood traffic calming?




Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood (Southern Intersection)




Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood (Southern Intersection)

Top layer removed




Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood (Southern Intersection)


Top two layers removed




Fairview/Bayo Vista/Southwood




Northwood/Cambridge/Buena Vista




Gibbons/Santa Clara




Thompson/Southwood



Gibbons/Northwood/Southwood (Northern Intersection)



Gibbons/Cornell



PLEASE
ADD YOUR
COMMENTS

Speed Humps on Southwood Dr.
and Gibbons are a no-brainer.
Should have been done years ago
if it wasn't for inefficient gov't.

I support revisiting
the decision to designate
Gibbons as a "local street"
rather than a "connector".
This decision just doesn't
seem grounded in reality
and the limits of
the current ~~the~~ street
design.

Gibbons, esp @ Northwood + Southwood
But will be needed elsewhere if bridge traffic
is diverted to narrow neighborhood streets

Northbound bike connectivity from
Gibbons to Farnside should be
smooth.

We need a pedestrian study for
the entire surrounding community of
before/after affects, not just an
intersection study on its own. Pedestrian
safety is a major concern with
option A, as the high increase
in traffic on roads that are ~~not~~
much shorter/narrower than ~~Gibbons~~ Gibbons
has not been considered enough. Safety
at just one intersection shouldn't
trump safety of the entire neighborhood!



NO ONE MENTIONED
CAMBER DRIVE WHERE
WE HAVE HAD PEDESTRIANS
A DEATH. YOU CAN DRIVE PAST A CAR
ON THAT STREET WITHOUT
PULLING OVER. NO ONE LET
US TALK

Pearl Street