



Estuary Crossing Study

creating connections • linking communities

phase two workshop report

MAY 2008

PREPARED BY



Moore Iacofano Goltzman, Inc.

phase two workshop report

In May 2008, the City of Alameda held the second in a series of community meetings to help identify potential alternatives for a bicycle/pedestrian estuary crossing between downtown Oakland and west Alameda.

The meetings, funded by the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA), Caltrans, the City of Alameda, and the City of Oakland, were held on Saturday, May 17, from 10 am to 12 pm at the Jack London Aquatic Center in Oakland and on Wednesday, May 21, from 7 pm to 9 pm at City Hall West in west Alameda. Nine participants attended the Oakland meeting and 21 participants attended the Alameda meeting.

workshop format

At the May meetings, community members had an opportunity to learn about and weigh in on each of the alternatives being considered.

Both meetings began with a brief presentation by the project team on the project background and potential project alternatives. Participants then had an opportunity

to ask any questions they had. The meetings closed with an opportunity to visit with project team members and view maps and other graphic information more closely in an open house format.

The two meetings featured identical content to ensure that all participants received the same information and had the same opportunity to provide feedback. Refreshments were served at both meetings.

participant feedback

FEEDBACK SUMMARY

- Consider all user groups and types of uses when considering and evaluating crossing alternatives
- Provide an alternative that contributes to its setting, takes environmental factors into account, and is safe and well-maintained
- Connect access points to transit and circulation systems
- Frequency of service should match comparable transit systems and should be reliable
- Potential funding options and partnerships will aid in the implementation of the crossing project



Above: Alameda Supervising Civil Engineer Obaid Khan welcomes participants to the workshop.

POTENTIAL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Overall

- Important to broadly identify target audience and to not parcel out audience
- May need more than one solution to meet diverse user needs
- Should be water-oriented!
- Evaluate project in terms of entire travel time
- Contribute to natural setting and assets

Short-Term/Long-Term Options

- Consider that users may have difficulty switching from riding a bicycle to walking, and vice versa
- Build user base and infrastructure in short-term
- Short-term solution will take less time and support long-term solution
- Better predictability in short-term
- Bus with bike facilities, increased ferry service, more user-friendly Tube walkways, water shuttle, or amphibious vehicle could be good short-term solutions
- Long-term option: used Coast Guard island?

Tubes

- Tube seems dirty, it is not being cleaned temporarily
- Tube is not used
- Wall off walkway with access areas
- Open Webster Street walkway

to the public

- Could make each tube walkway (Webster and Posey) one-way, but difficult to regulate
- Rehabbing the tube would be expensive for a small gain, but may be a good short-term solution
- If tube is ever rebuilt, add bike access
- Improve ventilation in Tube

Bus Service

- Bus will still be subject to traffic congestion so it is inefficient
- Cheaper to drive than take the bus
- Bus does not allow for bicycle trailers
- Consider ultra low-floor buses for bicyclists
- AC Transit may be an unrealistic partner; may not be beneficial to have more bus service
- Consider different types of bikes, such as senior tricycles or bike trailers

Amphibious Vehicle

- Could be an issue with the Coast Guard
- Would be quicker than bus service that accesses Tubes

Bridge

- Transport bridge is not that attractive and could detract from existing estuary beauty
- Emeryville Amtrak crossing is a model

Ferry

- Increase ferry frequency as a short-term solution

Below: Participants discuss alternatives at the Oakland workshop.



ISSUES TO CONSIDER

User Groups

- *Alameda workshop:* Recreational use (eight people), commute (ten people), and both (majority)
- *Oakland workshop:* Recreational use (ten people including seniors), commute (two people), and both (majority)
- Bicyclists, pedestrians

Access Points

- Water's edge entrance/exit is not necessarily important
- Place in a beautiful setting such as Estuary Park
- East of 880 in Oakland
- Access adjacent to water is attractive and serves recreational purposes
- Access point at Jack London Square: frequent trains

Connections/Routes

- Connect to and have access points near transit, including BART and Amtrak
- Connect to existing bikeways such as Oak Street
- Address harbor-bay connections for bicyclists
- Using Grand Street would be the shortest and cheapest crossing
- Connect to Downtown Oakland
- Consider extending 23rd or 29th Avenue—but wouldn't connect to West Alameda
- Provide easy car access/create a connection close to existing parking structures



- Parking at Amtrak or Jack London Square?
- Take advantage of TDM shuttles

Bicycle and Pedestrian Amenities

- It varies between bicyclists to have an elevator at 120 feet
- Crossing should provide amenities for bicyclists
- Stay near flat area to facilitate bicycling
- Edgartown Crossing in Mountain View is a model

Safety

- Should be safe, bike and pedestrian friendly!
- Need security to protect people if solution is a new tunnel
- Concerns with encampments
- Public perception of safety is a reality!

Above: Workshop participants view potential crossing maps.



Above: Participants listen to a presentation at the Oakland workshop.

- Could be on-demand
- Environmental Elements**
- Consider weather and wind when evaluating projects and entrance/exit alternatives
- Affordability**
- Consider that there are a diversity of income levels among users
- Future Considerations**
- Future users are not here yet!
 - Future developments should contribute to building landings and parks
 - Future buildout at landings
 - Port of Oakland is planning to have longer and more frequent trains
- QUESTION & ANSWERS**
- Would roads near landings be repaved? *Maybe in the future, but beyond scope now.*
 - What roads does the feasibility study look at? *Existing road networks and conditions.*
 - What is being considered as end points? *Only conceptual, no associated designs yet.*
 - Is there a third tube? *No.*
- ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**
- Put case studies on website
 - Bring Wind River into conversation
 - As gas prices increase, people may turn to alternative transportation
 - Individual boats could create legal issues
- Maintenance**
- Maintain areas; keep them active
 - Consider maintenance issues with elevators
- Funding**
- Issuing bike licenses could help to fund project
 - Toll crossing to pay for maintenance, etc.?
 - Need associated funding mechanism; do not rely on City funding
- Frequency of Service**
- 10-15 minute frequency, 20 minutes if enjoyable mode of transportation
 - Match BART schedule, use suburban BART as a model for station location
 - Commute hours are key, off-peak hours are less critical
 - Needs to be reliable