

Comments Received on the Draft Piedmont Safer Streets Plan


Comment #1

Draft plan looks good. I generally like the prioritization list on page 54 though would love to see the Grand/Lower Grand/Greenbank/Cambridge zone scored higher due to the high speeds on Grand (& 100 block of Greenbank). I live on the 100 block of Greenbank and want to state my concern for the vehicles speeding downhill on Grand--definitely faster than 25mph--who take the turn by Lower Grand at what seem like high speeds. It is unnerving to turn left or right onto Grand, or to go straight across Grand onto Cambridge from my block when I'm driving or on my bike. When I'm on foot and walk to the crosswalk at Grand & the 200 block of Greenbank, the cars are still traveling at what seems like high speeds. I would love it if there could be traffic calming devices for those downhill Grand vehicles and a mirror posted in the median so that 100 block Greenbank drivers/cyclists can see if there are vehicles/bikes about to enter the turn. Thank you.

Comment #2

I am very concerned about the safety of pedestrians crossing Moraga at Mesa. I submitted comments before this draft plan was written. I see in the draft plan that you discuss the need for traffic calming on Moraga, and have two intersections (Red Rock and Highland) where you intend to make improvements, but I have doubts that this will help the situation at Mesa because it is just around a turn for the traffic going west, and they will pick up speed after Red Rock. For traffic going east on Moraga, perhaps the Highland Ave improvements will help, but those cars need to reduce their speed, too. There is documentation of accidents and sideswipes on both sides of the street in that block. Will this draft plan help resolve this situation?

Comment #3

I have reviewed the safer street plan and am excited by the new developments to make our city safer. I do not see currently any solutions to make Mountain Ave safer in the report. Currently there is no way for pedestrians to get from  Mountain Ave to Sea View. Sea View is a popular street to walk on and kids are trying to get to Hampton field. With the blind corner I would often have to walk further for visibility and then run my stroller across the street. Even walking blocks out of the way in either direction there is no clear path to get to a crosswalk. Is this being addressed? I see with the survey results I am not the only one with this concern.

Comment #4

come down Oakland Ave, make a R on Olive Ave, race down the street & go around the corner & down Sunnyside to Grand.

This is a commuter short cut & allows them to skip the lights @ Oakland Ave & Grand Ave. & avoid any back-up of cars on Oakland Avenue because of the light.

I have lived on Olive for 43 years. During that time I have requested 'speed bumps' & was told that Piedmont does not allow 'speed bumps' yet I saw something similar to slow traffic on Greenbank. The 'Slow Children' sign was hit & tipped six (6) yrs ago & we were told Public Works would straighten.

Come & look.

PLEASE DRIVE IT. We are part of Piedmont.

Comment #5

I'm writing to request a relook at the safer streets plan and its omission of the La Salle / Lafayette / Woodland Way Intersection. This is a 3-way intersection is with **no stop sign, yield, or crosswalk**. Many children walk across this dangerous intersection to get to school and there have been many very scary close calls. Additionally, because of the lack of traffic control, cars drive very fast in this area. Thank you for reconsidering this location.

Comment #6

There are no appendices attached that I could find in this July draft. Did I miss something?

Comment #7

I am surprised that the plan omits the La Salle / Lafayette / Woodland Way Intersection from its initiative and kindly request that the City, at minimum, install a crosswalk at that site.

As you know, this 3-way intersection lacks a stop sign or **crosswalk**. My two children, along with many other children from our neighborhood, walk across this dangerous intersection on their way to school each day. Thank you

for reconsidering the addition of traffic control at this location.

Comment #8

I reviewed the draft Piedmont Safer Streets Plan, and appreciate all the time and care that went into it.

On page 54, there is a list prioritizing the locations for enhanced street crossings.

I wanted to lobby for the inclusion of improvement to the crosswalk for Oakland Avenue at Sunnyside Avenue as a high priority. On page 31, you note that improvement of this specific crossing was the most "upvoted" comment by the public. I was one of the "upvoters".

Cars coming in both directions on Oakland Ave only rarely stop for pedestrians attempting to cross Oakland Ave at the corner of Sunnyside Ave and Oakland Ave (at the end of the bridge part of Oakland Ave).

Sometimes a car will stop in one direction, but the cars on the other side/ direction of Oakland Ave will not stop, creating a really dangerous situation for pedestrian & cycle traffic crossing Oakland Ave.

This is a high pedestrian / bicycle traffic-path of people (including many children) going to Beach School and the Linda Ave dog park.

I have personally witnessed several dangerous incidents here. A few months ago, I saw a pedestrian (with baby in a stroller and toddler in hand) start to cross. The car coming uphill on Oakland Ave stopped, but the car behind it did not, rear ending the stopped car. The accident pushed the stopped car into the crosswalk, nearly hitting the stroller & pedestrian. Fortunately, no one was hurt, though I think one of the cars was likely totaled.

I am not sure what the solution is, but the current crossing is very dangerous. A pedestrian or cyclist is going to be seriously hurt there unless there is some improvement to the crossing.

Comment #9

Thank you for sending the report over. Thank you also for resisting the pressure to recommend the installation of a bunch of unwarranted stop signs for traffic/speed control. Glad to see that we are actually following science and engineering in Piedmont.

Thanks for your help with this project. Although I am against virtually everything proposed in the safer street proposal, I appreciate your desire to help. Applying bubble wrap to

everything and responding to squeaky wheels in the community is not a great way to govern, but I understand the pressure to do something.

Thanks for sharing the engineering report online ... we need to get facts and science out to the public and not just a bunch of random (albeit well-meaning) opinions to help drive policy.

I also appreciate the addition of bike lanes on many roads (like Moraga), where it makes sense.

Comment #10

Thank you so much for forwarding this to me. I have just read it all!

I was not able to join you on Zoom tonight but here are my thoughts:

I really appreciate the effort that has gone into these two years as well as the informative 30 pages!

My concerns for the Rose Avenue community's safety are my personal priority.

I hope that all of the residents of our street will reach out to Daniel Gonzalez and Chris Monahan [City staff] to discuss our safety concerns directly with us.

We are looking forward to scheduling a meeting here on Rose with residents, Daniel and Chris, within a few weeks after school is in session.

I am thankful to all of the many people who have put so much time and care into this endeavor and I look forward to seeing the ways each of us can together improve the safety of our community.

Comment #11

I have read the PSS plan and think it is extremely well done. I do support the four objectives set forth on pages 34-46, particularly the Highland Avenue road diet and bend reconfiguration. I think that the way in which those two possible projects are set out in the plan is well considered, and my hope is that both projects ultimately will be implemented. Not only will a Highland Avenue road diet promote safe cycling with, I predict, an acceptable burden on motorized traffic, but also it will be a sign that Piedmont is serious about bicycle safety and taking cycling seriously as a form of basic transportation.

Comment #12

Despite many responses saying that the uphill directions of Moraga Ave., Oakland Ave, and Wildwood Ave. are

extremely popular cycling routes, and also extremely dangerous currently, there is no plans for any upgrades other than signage? Calling something a bike route doesn't make it any safer.

Comment #13

I am a resident on Rose Ave (). Having just received 's email, I didn't know there was a meeting yesterday. Please let me know when future meetings are scheduled.

I was confused by "Related Plans and Studies" on page 8 of the report (06d7f0_ef41225638db42548f7164b3557c6f28.pdf) about the Kingston triangle. It looks like those changes are proposed, but that project has already been completed.

In my opinion, the "traffic diet" on Grand Ave. is a terrible idea.

Every work day, during commute hours, the street gets very congested.

Sometimes the intersection at Grand and Wildwood doesn't empty out during one green-light period. Drivers become very impatient ... for good reason. While bicycle safety is important, the vast majority of users of the street are not bicyclists, and won't be in the future. Bike riding is fun and healthy, but when one has to go a distance in a short time, or when one is going to buy things and bring them home, bicycles are not the form of transportation that will be used. And the older one gets, the less one uses a bike for anything other than recreation. So, don't constrict our streets for the imagined benefit of more bike riding; it's not going to happen.

Comment #14

As currently configured the crosswalks at these intersections are unsafe. Consider the following:

When driving at night on Linda towards Piedmont Avenue, one makes a stop at the stop sign at Kingston where there is a crosswalk. This location is slightly uphill and with lights on one cannot see that there is another crosswalk a very short distance in front, crossing Linda at Rose. A driver does not expect to encounter another crosswalk less than 100 feet forward at the time he is accelerating from the stop sign at Kingston - a danger in itself. However, this danger is amplified if a car is coming in the other direction on Linda and is about to stop or is stopped at the Rose stop sign. Because that stop is over the crest of the small hill, the lights from that car shine in the face of the driver stopped in the other direction at Kingston. In this circumstance, it is difficult to see a child in the crosswalk until one is almost on top of him. This happened to me driving at night months ago. This same problem exists for a driver stopped at Linda

at Rose dealing with pedestrians crossing at night at Kingston.

Please look into this.

Comment #15

I'm writing to request that you consider adding a stop sign at the LaSalle / Lafayette / Woodland Way intersection. This three-way intersection has no traffic control whatsoever (not even a crosswalk), even though it's the pathway many children use to get to school, and cars tend to drive fast, seldom stopping to check for cross-traffic. A stop sign at the top of Woodland Way, at the very least, would make that crossing safe for children walking up LaSalle/Lafayette.

Comment #16

Hello Rose Ave Residents,

SPREAD THE WORD:

Everyone on this list and others who are affected by the Rose Ave safety concerns are invited to join us and meet with our Piedmont Public Works Director, Daniel Gonzales, and our Piedmont Police Captain Chris Monahan.

This would be an **in-person, on-time, outdoor meeting at the ' backyard (Rose Ave)**, with these two City officials sharing important information with all of us.

The proposed dates are either:

Wednesday, August 18 OR August 25 at 5:30 pm

Please **RSVP by Sunday, August 8th as to your choice between the two dates**. *The date with greater number of responses by 8/8 will decide which date is chosen for our meeting.*

We hope that you can join us!!

Comment #17

If you are still taking suggestions for improvements to make streets safer, I would ask you to consider the following.

I live on Boulevard Way and it is a prolific "cut through" street between Lakeshore and Grand, especially for Uber and Lyft drivers. Could we please get a speed hump on Boulevard in the middle of the street to slow down the traffic?

Comment #18

I commend you for attempting to address specific traffic safety issues in our city, and for developing a plan to address these issues and improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

I understand the city is working with limited resources to address these issues.

I must say I am disappointed in the solutions presented to address bicycle safety. Road diets are good, and better than nothing. However, a skinny strip of white paint on the ground that is somehow supposed to keep cars away from bicycles, in reality do almost nothing. Those types of bike lanes are used constantly as double parking for delivery drivers and private cars. Drive up Piedmont avenue in the afternoon and you'll see what I mean. Multiple cars parked in the bike lane on every block. There NEEDS to be some type of physical barrier between moving traffic and bicycles. This is easily accomplished with parking protected by planes. See telegraph avenue in Oakland as an example. This can be accomplished with paint and bollards. It can also be accomplished simply with paint. A parking protected bike lane is vastly safer for cyclists.

Bike lanes adjacent to flowing traffic lanes are not safe.

While signage is appreciated for bicycle routes, they're not very effective, and most likely ignored by commuters cutting through neighborhoods in order to avoid stop signs. Some sort of physical marking or barrier at cross-street intersections of bicycle routes is much better. See Oakland's and Berkeley's bicycle route network.

If you are serious about bicycle safety, please consider implementing parking protected and other protected bike lanes.

Comment #19

I live on upper Blair. My neighbors use their garages for storage units and park their cars on the streets and often far up on the sidewalks. My neighbor pushing a baby pram had to go out on the street to continue her walk. When I take my dogs for a walk, I am required to go out in the street because the cars are blocking the sidewalks. The police make no effort to ticket these illegally parked cars. Further down on Blair there are blind curves and parked cars on either side. When two cars meet, one car has to yield. It can be scary. I have two recommendations. Have the police ticket cars that are parked so far up on the sidewalk that pedestrians are forced to walk in the streets. On narrow curved streets allow street parking only on one side.

Comment #20

I cannot overstate my disappointment with the plan. Almost every project in it is for central or lower Piedmont, virtually no projects east of Crocker and absolutely nothing beyond Hampton Field. Those of us living in the eastern part of the city have been complaining for years about fast and reckless driving and high speed stop sign running on many of the streets, but totally ignored by the city. This plan is more of the same.

Comment #21

I recommend that you install a walk button with flashing lights at the crosswalk on Oakland by Latham street. This is a busy street and that crosswalk is right by a bus stop and also very close to Dracena park. There are children (and adults) crossing Oakland all the time to get to and from school and to the park, and traffic along Oakland is heavy and fast. I think safety would be enhanced with a more visible crossing signal. I am aware that there is such a signal further up Oakland, but that is not close enough to Dracena or the bus stop.

Comment #22

Thank you for the comprehensive review of the plans. A big concern of mine is the unsafe biking conditions for kids to bike to coach's field. I was not able to see what the plan is for a safer bike route to get from coach's field back to Highland. The road is narrow, curvy, and in the evenings sun is in the eyes of the drivers (and they drive fast) which makes it especially dangerous when the bike is in the road. Are there plans for providing a bike lane or sidewalk that allows bikes in order to keep the kids off this dangerous portion of road (Moraga from coach's field to highland)?

Comment #23

Can you please consider putting a stop sign at the crosswalk slightly above Jerome Ave on the east side? It is very difficult to cross because cars are speeding up and down Oakland Ave and often times do not slow down or stop for pedestrians. Dracena Park is nearby and it is quite dangerous crossing with a stroller. It is also hazardous crossing to catch a bus heading west. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment #24

I read your latest plans for safer streets in Piedmont and would like to offer the suggestion I requested a couple months ago to Daniel Gonzeles [City staff]. I requested Blair Avenue be painted in the area across from Piedmont Reservoir to help direct cars to continue on Blair Avenue and

not go barreling down our street, Blair Place. On a daily basis, we have cars mistake Blair Place for Blair Avenue because they do not see the upward curve in the road toward Montclair. Our neighborhood, feels that if Blair Avenue were painted, drivers would not come tearing down our street. MANY CHILDREN PLAY ON BLAIR PLACE, one of the few flat streets in the area. We would hate to see a child hit.

Comment #25

The draft bike & ped plan looks great! I am super glad that Grand & Rose, Grand & Greenbank and Grand & Oakland are slated for some attention.

Comment #26

I live with my family at [redacted] Highland Ave (where Requa meets Highland) and have lived at this address since 2015 and have lived in Piedmont since 2010.

A few observations as requested to the planning document.

1. The stretch of road on Highland Ave, specifically between Sierra and Wildwood is a dangerous stretch of road. Cars drive incredibly fast on this stretch b/c most have not seen a stop sign or stop light since Oakland Ave. While the planning document addresses hot spots (Highland / Sheridan) and (Highland / Wildwood), I don't think it goes far enough. Specifically, cars driving south on Highland through the Sheridan crosswalk towards Wildwood often drive way too fast and can't see pedestrians. They can't see pedestrians usually because there are parked cars blocking the line of sight of the driver (who is usually driving way to fast). In my opinion we should add a stop sign in that direction to slow down cars (making it a three way stop), or add a speed bump on the cross walk itself. Also, the city shouldn't allow cars to park that close to the crosswalk that is blocking line of sight between drivers and pedestrians.
2. Secondly, most cars do not stop at the corner of Highland and Wildwood. I am on the corner everyday and have witnessed this since the stop sign was installed a few years ago. We need to do more. Many kids are crossing during the school year that go to Wildwood, PMS and PHS and we need to provide them a safer way to cross.
 - a. Most of the violators are coming down Highland (and are largely speeding - see item 1 above).
 - b. The second biggest group are coming down Wildwood toward Highland.
 - c. The last group (coming up Wildwood are generally observing the stop sign.

Thank you for leading this incredibly important work.

Comment #27

Hi - one last thing as I read through the document more - it seems like the proposed 'top six' highest priority locations are already locations that have received much of the money, improvements and budget in previous years. Please consider doing a better job of spreading our tax money around to other areas in Piedmont that have been largely ignored on this issue in the past.

Comment #28

[From a phone call from a resident to City staff]

- All of the high priority projects are those intersections and streets which already have crosswalks, stop signs and signals.
- The St James neighborhood has not been looked at for improvements.
- If City looks at areas and intersections around arterials and collectors (as per the scoring rubrics) then that is the incorrect way to prioritize projects as those roads already are generally always marked for improvements in general. The aim of the plan should be to make other areas in the city walkable/bikeable.

Comment #29

As a comment to the proposal, I would request the City evaluate increasing the size of the sidewalks on Highland (in addition to reducing the number of lanes to two) to create more of a boulevard with wide walkways, parklets, rest, and play areas for pedestrians.

Furthermore, I would like the City to evaluate adding additional CCTVs along Highland, Park, Blair, and Oakland Ave to deter and abate the dramatic increase in crime.

Lastly, I think the City should consider blocking lesser used street entrances to the City with bollards (similar to what has been done in Berkeley) as additional crime deterrents, traffic control, and point of access control.

Comment #30

We live at [redacted] Blair Place and want to echo [redacted]'s comments. We have 2 young boys, who play and ride bikes/scooters on the cul de sac. Our other neighbor, [redacted] Blair Place, also has 3 little kids who play on our little street. We see cars coming at concerningly high speeds into our street from Blair Ave and the kids can not anticipate that level of speed. These cars regularly turn around right in front of our home window. We believe painting the lines of Blair Ave. clearly to show its upward curve will help prevent driver confusion and the increase safety for the kids playing on our block.

Comment #31

I saw a map of proposed enhancements to street crossings and was shocked to see our corner is not on it (I was told two years ago by a person in the planning department that a stop sign was already being considered). We are at the corner of Hampton and King, across the street from Crocker (Bear) Park.

We do not even have a stop sign here. Each day it's a harrowing experience to cross the street there for everyone walking and for cars to pull out onto Hampton because of poor sight lines.

It's a main entrance to Bear Park, visited by a constant stream of families with small children and dogs. There are close calls with cars almost daily.

This corner desperately needs a stop sign!

What do I need to do to get this on the list of changes and get a Stop Sign installed asap? Since I was told it was on some consideration list two years ago we've just been waiting and waiting...time for some action on this!

Comment #32

Bike lanes/routes: First, it would be helpful to have a map of current completed bike lanes and the proposed bike lanes (with some prioritization of implementation) so residents can understand what changes may occur in their neighborhoods. This is particularly relevant based on the comment from the Plan:

"When implemented, every segment of the network should be equipped as appropriate with additional safety features. These include smoother pavement; non-slip surfaces; traffic mirrors; motion-activated flashing signs indicating the presence of a cyclist around a curve; flashing radar speed signs; center lines; and solid white lines demarcating the travel lane from the shoulder or parking lane (by visually narrowing the street, shoulder lines cause drivers to drive somewhat more slowly)".

These safety features may not be on every segment of the network but I think the Plan should acknowledge what segments of the network will need these features. Moraga is identified, where else?

There are not many comments in Appendix H supporting the need for a bike route on Ricardo (one?). I live on that street and have seen an increase in riders with children in seats so these riders may be mostly non-residents and were not surveyed. That said, I think a better approach for bike access to lower Dracena would be from the walkway on York to Ricardo. Ricardo has more and faster traffic than York (it is a "cut-through" street for commuters going to upper Piedmont), is fairly steep and I believe more narrow than York. A bike/stroller friendly ramp at the walkway would facilitate bike and particularly stroller access to the park

without the steep climbs of Cambridge and Arroyo. I think entry to the ramp could be constricted so riders have to get off and walk their bike through the ramp. As for strollers, this route to Dracena is much less strenuous than climbing Cambridge or Arroyo and connects more logically to the lower Piedmont neighborhoods that walk to the park.

There should be integrated up and down lanes designated for certain bike routes (aka loop). The two best examples are Oakland and Moraga. Riding down these streets is easy and fairly safe but riding up is problematic because of grade and traffic. The "up" route for these should be designated as such. This currently happens with Oakland as Cambridge/Blair and Magnolia offer safer climbs than Oakland. For Moraga the up route could be Ramona/Bonita/Park. Color-code these loops as single routes on the map and make the recommendation that riders use certain sections depending on their direction.

Speed humps: the survey results show speed humps to be the most popular pedestrian safety element in the plan. Such installations have to be evaluated but don't overdo it – traffic studies costs thousands and slow the process down. Use the street speed survey data collected by PPD to prioritize speed humps.

Highland reconfiguration: this will be a long-term project with lots of public input. In the meantime install a bollard quick-build at the Exedra triangle to improve the crosswalks.

"Last mile" improvements: Piedmont bus routes could be improved with the installation of bike/scooter racks at select bus stops. In particular, at the bus stop on Highland Way next to the church and at Latham/Oakland bus stop.

Appendices: add the text of the question for which the responses are given at the top of each appendix. Makes it easier to interpret the responses.

Comment #33

It appears that a number of comments documented by the plan relate to the necessity of providing bike lanes on Moraga (page 30 & 32). While improvements are identified for the portion from Bonita to Ramona, the eastern portion of Moraga between Mesa and the City Line are still shown in Figure 5 of the plan as a bike route only provided with "share the road signs" in the downhill direction and Figure 12 shows no improvements to the uphill bicycle experience. This leaves slow moving cyclists no protection in the uphill direction as cars speed by. It appears that the comments citing the importance of this portion of the bike network were completely ignored. A study of Moraga Road to determine what can be done for uphill bicyclists should be conducted before any work is done to the pedestrian crossing

at Red Rock Road and should be a high priority within the overall plan.

Comment #34

Hello and thank you for all of the work to create this new plan. My only piece of feedback relates to the intersections of El Cerrito Ave and Oakland Ave. and Jerome and Oakland Ave. My understanding is that neither of these intersections were included in the final plans because work is beginning soon/in the short term for both of those areas. If so, could you please note said work in progress in the plans? I am very grateful that these very dangerous intersections (speeding cars that refuse to stop or slow down for pedestrians) are being addressed quickly!

Comment #35

With regards to the Safer Streets Plan, I suggest greater police effort to both stop and cite blatant stop sign violations by bicyclists.

On any day, casual observation shows bicyclists coming down WILDWOOD Ave, at high rates of speed, blowing through stop signs at Wildwood/Highland, Wildwood/Prospect, and Wildwood/Winsor/Wallace intersections. There are likely other Piedmont streets with similar high rates of dangerous non-compliance with traffic law.

I suggest the City post signage, where appropriate but especially at certain intersections, informing bicyclists that "BICYCLISTS MUST STOP AT ALL STOP SIGNS" or "BICYCLISTS COMPLY WITH ALL TRAFFIC LAWS" or signage to that effect.

A bit of signage, and the issuance of a few citations, may save a life.

Comment #36

Bicycle and walking are my primary means of transportation, so I appreciate the efforts to make walking and bicycling more appealing to more people.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the draft Piedmont Safer Streets plan document. I participated in the first round of comments and used that forum to alert the City to two issues, at intersections that I walk across frequently and find them to be dangerous due to lots of traffic and/or speeding traffic. Unfortunately, neither is included in the priority list for enhanced street crossings for pedestrians.

1. **Moraga and Ramona** – this is the route in and out of Piedmont for pedestrians travelling to/from Piedmont above Ramona. For example walking to the Safeway on

51st or to shops/restaurants on Piedmont Avenue. Current conditions are hazardous! I notice that the crosswalk at Monticello and Moraga is identified for enhancements but that crosswalk goes to a bus stop. There is no walking path on the cemetery side of the street so the crosswalk is only useful to people using the bus stop.

2. **Rose Ave** – While the Rose and Grand intersection is on a priority list, that intersection already has a ped crossing light. (Imagine what it was like before the light was installed! I remember what that was like.) The crossings (from Piedmont to the public library on Echo and shops/restaurants on Piedmont Ave and the US Post Office) at **Greenbank and Echo** have no crosswalks and the visibility is poor in both locations. Cars travel fast along that stretch from Linda to Grand. You might check to see if the new red curb at Echo/Rose (resulting in a wider lane for traffic traveling from Linda Ave) encourages even higher speeds along this route.

In general, I am pretty satisfied with conditions for bicycling in Piedmont. The newer bike lanes on Linda and Grand have improved my commutes (and are major arteries serving a great many cyclists). Side streets with little traffic work well for getting around Piedmont as long as drivers respect the speed limit and observe stop signs.

Speeding traffic is a difficult problem that seems to be tough to address. I would love to see Piedmont adopt the Safe Driving Pledge (page 50) – so practical!

Comment #37

I saw your article in this week's Piedmont Post regarding the Safer Streets plan. I'd been meaning to reach out to you about the best way to surface some suggestions about traffic on Moraga Ave. I skimmed the draft plan for references to Moraga Ave. and didn't see what I was looking for so I'm emailing you here. (For others who may read this email, I live at [redacted] Moraga Ave.)

Here are my comments:

- We moved to [redacted] Moraga in November 2020. In that time, I've observed the following specific instances on Moraga Ave.:
 - In April 2021, as I was placing my 2 year old in his car seat, my street side car door was side-swiped with enough force to shear the other vehicle's side mirror off.
 - Just last week, a contractor parked on Moraga had his side mirror hit (and the offending car fled).
 - Two weeks ago there was a water main break at Mesa and Moraga. EBMUD was on-site in the evening to repair the break. An EBMUD dump truck was parked on Moraga just east of Mesa Ave. (in the direction of 13). A driver in a Honda civic sped around the bend and missed colliding with the parked dump truck by

approximately one foot. The driver swerved at the last minute.

- (Also, this isn't an event I witnessed as it happened before we bought our house but the prior owner of our home noted that a drunk driver traveling westbound missed the blind curve on Moraga Ave, crossed traffic, drove over the Moraga-side of the property of [redacted] Mesa, and hit the stairs leading to [redacted] Moraga Ave.)
- In addition, I've generally observed:
 - Cars that turn right on to Moraga from Highland Ave. regularly make a sharp turn which sends them in the direction of the parked cars. These drivers then jerk their cars back towards the middle of the road.
 - Not uncommon to busy downhill streets, cars are traveling at speeds that far exceed the speed limit.
 - For anyone trying to cross Moraga Ave at Mesa from the northside of Moraga, the combination of parked cars and a blind curve means that most cars do not see pedestrians and therefore do not stop.
- I propose the following improvements to Moraga Ave. between Highland and Monte:
 - Install bollards on Moraga at Highland that gradually force drivers towards the middle of the road.
 - Put a speed hump on Moraga at Mesa (eastbound direction) in front of the crosswalk. This should allow those crossing the street to do so safely and force cars to slow down.
 - Put a speed hump on Moraga between Mesa and Monte (westbound direction) a little before the blind curve. To ensure the safety of bike riders, you can cut leave some flat parts of the hump to ease bikers' concerns. This has the benefit of forcing drivers to slow down, which allows pedestrians to be safely seen when crossing the street (especially from the north side of Moraga at Mesa).
 - Add an additional crosswalk at Mesa and Moraga (opposite the current one). This will make it easier for cars to see pedestrians crossing from the north side of Moraga.
 - On the north side of Moraga just before the S curve, paint the curb red so that drivers have more distance to see pedestrians.
 - Put a light up crosswalk on Moraga (similar to what is in front of Havens Elementary School on Highland).

I'm not sure if it's too late to incorporate these requests but I wanted to add my on-the-ground perspective and observations as a person who is committed to making our neighborhood and the street I live on, a little safer!

Comment #38

We are sending these comments from our residence at [redacted] Wildwood Ave.

We would like to see the proposed Wildwood/Nova project completed. We are also interested in continuing to explore more ways to calm traffic in Wildwood from Grand Ave to Nova, in particular in the first part of the block near Grand Ave and also where there is a yield sign where Wildwood Ave turns uphill to the right.

We have been very happy with the bike lanes in the City of Piedmont and with the stop signs Chester Nakahara [former City staff] put in!

Comment #39

EVACUATION BY FIRST RESPONDERS TO AN EMERGENCY ROOM

You could have a publicity campaign urging Piedmont residents and their children to carry Emergency Medical IDs. You could develop a standard format that could be downloaded. The format would include allergies, conditions, immunizations and the name of the hospital where the cardholder's electronic health record is filed.

The purpose is to enable the staff of an emergency room to immediately know allergies, conditions, and immunizations and also find the cardholder's complete electronic health record before providing care to children or unconscious adults they receive.

CONNECTED CARS BACKGROUND

Beginning in 2022 car manufacturers will begin to include modems and SIM cards in the cars so that the cars can

a. Communicate back and forth with other connected cars. This communication will be usable from the moment the new owner takes possession of the car. Put differently, it will arrive in Piedmont as soon as Piedmont residents buy model year 2022 cars.

b. Communicate back and forth with smart phones carried by pedestrians. This communication will be usable from the moment the new owner takes possession of the car. Put differently, it will arrive in Piedmont as soon as Piedmont residents buy model year 2022 cars.

c. Communicate back and forth with sensor/connection points called Roadside Units (RSUs). These are small devices usually installed on traffic signs and traffic signals. See below for a link to an image. In addition to signal and signage information, they provide guidance, such as which car at an intersection has right of way or pull over instructions to let an emergency vehicle pass. These Roadside Unit communications will not be available until City of Piedmont installs the Roadside Units in Piedmont.

The purposes of enabling cars to communicate are to both reduce fatalities/injuries and improve efficiency of

streets/freeways. These purposes coincide with your mission.

CONNECTED CARS MESSAGES

The communications will provide drivers with:

- a. Alerts of upcoming signs and traffic signals.
- b. Alerts of nearby vehicles and pedestrians including their location, speed, and direction.
- c. Alerts of upcoming hazards observed by the sensors on one vehicle and sent to following vehicles. For example hydroplaning conditions or debris in the road.
- d. Videos and images.
- e. Useful guidance from the Roadside Units.

SEVERAL LINKS ABOUT CONNECTED CARS

Connected and Automated Vehicles (C/AV) in Caltrans
<https://acec-la.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/CT-CAV-High-Level-August-17-2020.pdf>

<https://www.auto-talks.com/>

<https://www.autosinnovate.org/>

Image of a Roadside Unit installed on a Traffic Signal
<https://www.danlawinc.com/danlaw-routelink-dsrc-roadside-unit-achieves-omniair-certification/>

Ford

<https://medium.com/@ford/how-ford-is-preparing-todays-connected-vehicles-for-the-connected-world-of-tomorrow-76ca5d7a1a70>

Honda (includes a video)

<https://hondanews.com/en-US/releases/release-32797eaea7316f1bed4bfcd279049a91-through-mcity-consortium-honda-and-verizon-test-how-5g-enhances-safety-for-connected-and-autonomous-vehicles>

GoMentum Station (facility you can use to test city-owned connected vehicles)

<http://gomentumstation.net/v2x-lab/>

CONNECTED CARS COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS

There is currently a conflict between rival communication protocols. One protocol is wifi and is called Dedicated Short Range Communication. This protocol can and has been disrupted by the Federal Communications Commission. The other protocol is 5G C-V2X. The 5G refers to cellular telephone infrastructure. The C-V2X stands for Connected – Vehicle to Everything. Everything refers to nearby cars, Roadside Units and smart phones carried by pedestrians.

These two protocols are not interoperable. This means cars equipped with one of the protocols can not communicate with cars equipped with the other protocol. Also, the Roadside Units are specific to one protocol or the other.

Because the car manufacturers tend to choose 5G C-V2X, it looks like it will ultimately be the universal protocol in the U.S.

CONNECTED CARS AND VARIOUS DEVICES

There are child tracking devices and dog tracking devices that provide the GPS coordinates of their location.

Insurance companies provide devices that capture driver behavior so the insurance company can provide rates tailored to the driver.

There are devices and applications to find your car in a parking lot.

There is the LoJack Vehicle Recovery System.

None of these devices can be sensed by the connected cars or Roadside Units. However, it should be noted that the connectedness of a stolen connected car can be used to find a stolen connected car or know that a particular car being examined by police is stolen.

ACTION ITEMS FOR THE CITY OF PIEDMONT

You may wish to determine City of Piedmont's responsibility for funding, installing and maintaining the Roadside Units in Piedmont and choose topics for public dialog.

- a. Develop Piedmont-specific information you would store on the Roadside Units.
- b. Identify consultants who could research where the Roadside Units should be installed and develop an installation schedule.
- c. Coordinate with the Piedmont Police Department to learn of how it would adapt its practices and procedures to connected cars.
<https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/how-v2x-will-be-a-game-changer/>
- d. Since driving a connected car is so different from driving an unconnected car you could develop a course for teens and include it in the Piedmont High School curriculum. You could also develop an adult education course for Piedmont residents only or collaborate with other agencies and car dealerships to develop a county-wide adult education course with the Mid-Alameda County Consortium.

<http://macc4ae.org/>

Comment #40

I am a cyclist and will focus my comments on this area of the proposal.

1) Wildwood Ave is incredibly dangerous and deserves more change. With school back in full swing, it's never been more congested. Parents dropping off kids, contractors and residents commuting to/from work combined with parked cars on a narrow, winding, and steep road make this a recipe for disaster. I drop off and pick up my child at Wildwood Elementary using a bike every day and it's terrifying. Parked cars push moving cars into oncoming traffic. Quickly avoiding an oncoming car traveling in my lane has now become something I need to do one every time I commute to/from WWE. We need to do better here as a serious accident here is a near certainty.

2) Downhill enhanced bike routes do not make sense. Why not enhance the uphill side where bikes need protection from passing cars? I can keep up with cars on my bike (if not have enough speed to pass cars) while descending. While I appreciate any and all protective measures for cyclists, if I had to pick only one direction for safety enhancements, it would DEFINITELY be UPHILL, not downhill. There's an excellent, well executed example of this on Linda Ave where the uphill side gets a full bike lane while the downhill side gets sharrows.



3) Bike Route signage. I like "Bikes May Use Full Lane" signage. The early data on this new wording look promising. Thank you for this! Regarding sharrows - I think this does almost nothing to make it safer for cyclists (reference here - <https://macwright.com/2020/12/04/sharrows.html>)

Comment #41

I am interested to know if the study examined past traffic studies of Moraga Ave. (1986 Coaches Field EIR and the 2010-11 proposed Blair Park sports field EIR)? I believe these reports concluded that a pedestrian crossing from Coaches Field to Blair Park is not safe or feasible because of traffic speed on Moraga and poor sight lines. How would the Safer Streets Plan overcome these inherent problems?

Comment #42

Thank you for the opportunity for public input into the draft ped-bike plan. Overall, it seems professional, attractive and relatively comprehensive. For a draft, it is well along to eventual adoption. I am a mostly retired city planner who has participated in the preparation of such plans in other jurisdictions. I am also a 40 year resident of Piedmont. After review I have found several areas or specific points I'd like to comment on.

As a Planning Commissioner involved with the 2013-2014 prior plan, I would have hoped to see better descriptions of the priority intersections identified in the existing plan, and the status of each of them today. That would seem to be essential in an update. In particular, I'd like to have seen some explanation as why so few priority projects were implemented. Also, there should be some explanation as to why other projects like the Grand- Lower Grand landscaped island seem to move to the head of the line when they would appear to have minimal pedestrian safety value.

The consultants writing the report may have not been made aware of the pending, but back-burner, Green Infrastructure Plan. I would think that it would be particularly advantageous to incorporate green infrastructure (capturing polluted street storm runoff and directing it to bioswales) into many of traffic calming measures suggested. I would hope that such improvements should be emphasized in the Final Plan.

Public transit and pedestrian safety should go hand in hand, but there is virtually no mention of the value of public transit in reducing vehicle miles travelled and accidents, or emissions. The plan should show where the existing bus stops are, with an analysis of the sidewalk condition and pedestrian safety in the vicinity of the bus stops. People who ride the bus usually walk to and from the bus stop. This important topic should be reviewed and added to the report.

The consultants again may not have been made aware that there is an existing parallel process in the city, to evaluate and prioritize public works projects such as those being considered by this very report. The Piedmont Capital Improvements Projects Committee conducts public outreach and holds many meetings to review such projects, and concludes with an annual report and recommendations to

the City Council. Unfortunately, Covid has curtailed recent CIP Meetings and outreach. However, there have been six such assessments and reports since the last PBMP was adopted. The CIP's work and recommendations are valuable but for some reason not mentioned in the report. The role of the CIP Committee should be incorporated into the current report. I believe that the future implementation of any ped-bike recommendations should acknowledge the use of the current CIP process in implementation.

There is a dismissal of speed bumps without explanation. This may be to avoid controversy. However, many, if not most, cities have employed them. I believe that speed bumps are the most cost-effective tool against speeding. Piedmont is surrounded with them on nearby Oakland streets, as well as San Leandro and elsewhere. Boulevard Way, partially in Piedmont and partially in Oakland, has speed bumps and they work well. The more expensive but less effective speed humps are promoted instead without an explanation. Chatter strips and "bots dots" are also similar low-cost measures to alert drivers of the need to slow down. Such traffic calming devices are beneficial when placed in advance of the crosswalks near each of the elementary schools such as on Linda, Grand, Oakland, Wildwood and Highland avenues.

The Vehicle Code does not prohibit cars from parking near or even around the curve of an intersection, unless the curb is painted red. This tight parking at intersections, particularly by taller vehicles, reduces the visibility of pedestrians trying to cross the street. Improved sight lines at many intersections could be improved by the inexpensive strategy of removing vision-blocking parked vehicles by putting red curbs around the curve and at least 10 feet up each street. The Requa-Wildwood intersection regularly has parked cars on the northwest corner when popular events are going on at the schools. The Wildwood-Winsor northeast corner, which is on the Plan's highest priority list, has poor sight distance in general, but that is made worse by parked cars very close to the actual corner.

I am fairly neutral on the Highland road diet proposal. I'm not sure if it should be on the highest priority list, but it could certainly work, probably with less controversy than the busier Grand Avenue area where the road diet has been implemented.

I know the consultants writing the draft plan have neither ability or authority to comment on future city budget decisions on ped-bike spending or anything else. However, the tone of the discussion of funding seems demeaning to the importance of ped-bike safety. Page 53 says there is "very limited funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects." And suggests that \$70,000 per year is all that could be expected. It's easily found that Piedmont has an approximately \$30 million annual budget. One could conclude that ped-bike safety is so unimportant that less than one quarter of one percent of the budget could be spent on this topic. The report

twice mentions that the city is doing this plan because the Alameda County Transportation Commission requires doing so. However, the May budget message mentions that the City is scheduled to receive approximately \$2.1 million in American Rescue Act funds. Hopefully, I'd suggest that either a more optimistic message should be in plan. Or delete the subject entirely.

It has been pointed out by others that there should probably be an appendix, containing copies of the actual public comments made during last winter's public comment period. Instead, there is merely a summary of the comments by category. The flavor and tone of the public's comments are both interesting and valuable in understanding the intensity of feeling about various ideas. Providing such verbatim comments are normal in EIRs. Not providing the actual comments unnecessarily raises questions of transparency and even whether the authors may be trying to lead the conclusions in a particular direction.

Again, I want to be clear that this document is proceeding nicely and is a very important step in public safety and in reducing GHGs from so much driving. Too many people drive relatively short distances because of the discomfort and even fear found in walking or biking. I hope these comments are seriously considered in further analysis and in the final product.

Comment #43

Hello and thank you for all the work that went into this plan. We appreciate the chance to provide feedback.

We live at ■ El Cerrito Ave. After reviewing the safer streets materials – which were thorough – we would like to raise what we see as an important omission: the lack of additional measures for El Cerrito Avenue, especially between Oakland Ave and Magnolia.

Your study, appropriately, aims to reduce the risk of unsafe pedestrian, bike, and auto interactions, using traffic calming measures. You're also looking to promote more walking/cycling to encourage more eco-friendly and healthy activity,

El Cerrito Ave is a major walking and biking thoroughfare for children of pre-K through 18 years old. 100+ kids use the street daily more than once a day to walk to school, as do parents who don't wish to drive into the congestion of Piedmont school corridor. The street is *also* a key route for many people *driving* to our schools, and sadly, many of them drive too fast, roll stop signs, and turn corners too quickly given the dozens of children, parents and dog walkers on the street.

Please consider one or more of the following measures to make for El Cerrito Ave safer with fewer cars, and fewer frustrated distracted and speeding drivers!

- Corner bump outs at El Cerrito/Oakland and El Cerrito/Magnolia
- Green bike lanes to reduce the perceived street width and slow traffic
- A decorative center divider to achieve the same.

Thank you for the work you're doing to make Piedmont a safer community for all of our families!

Comment #44

My comment today is a continuation of a concern that I have had for many years, which has been communicated to city officials many times, and that has never been properly addressed. The plan currently under review continues to ignore the problem of the stop signs at the intersection of Hampton Road and Estates Drive, mostly particularly the sign for the downhill traffic on Estates. There is a similar problem for the uphill traffic, but gravity mitigates it, while only amplifying the problem for cars going downhill.

The problem is that nearly all the downhill traffic completely ignores the stop sign, posing a traffic hazard for other cars in all directions. Many cars speed past the stop sign without so much as tapping the brakes, running the sign at speeds of over 30 mph and sometimes as high as 40 mph. Uphill from the stop sign there is a speed metering device and cars often slow down there, but then speed up as soon as they pass it, then running the sign at full speed. Although I am not aware of any serious accidents at the intersection due to this driver behavior, there have been countless near accidents as cars going in this direction narrowly miss traffic coming from other directions.

I should add that every few years the police department runs an enforcement operation for a few days, which has a brief, limited impact on the problem. But the reality is that this location is at the far end of Piedmont, just a couple hundred yards from the Oakland city boundary, and experience shows that continuous police enforcement is simply not going to happen here, despite the traffic using Estates Drive as a main thoroughfare to and from the Montclair commercial area.

The issue is a simple one, but its solution depends on some sort of physical installation that will force drivers to at least slow down, if not coming to a complete stop. (The operative word here is STOP sign.) There are many possible options, including speed humps or speed bumps, a narrowing of the lane at the stop sign by use of a median island and/or bulb at the curb, a traffic circle, rumble strips, or even flashing lights

and signs to catch the attention of drivers. There are probably additional options that I haven't even thought of.

The point is that this problem has existed for literally decades, has been complained about for decades, and the city has completely ignored the problem. Given this history, should there ever be a serious accident at this intersection, the city could be considered entirely liable for the consequences.

The current plan under review offers the best opportunity to address this problem once and for all. Please add a project at this intersection to the plan.

Comment #45

Thanks for your challenging work on the current plan for Safer Streets for Piedmont!

While I am overall satisfied with the plan, there is a huge omission in this plan in the street where we live (the El Cerrito block between Oakland Ave and Magnolia). This was tagged heavily in your map feedback, but I see little resolution for it at all and it is very upsetting!

Here are the two big issues for me.

1- Drivers are speeding in our street. Our street is very wide, and people see an opportunity to feel like drag race pilots. Our street is a major access way for people to go to PMS or PHS as well as going to Witter field. People are speeding in two different ways. Either they are coming already very fast from the Oak Ave/El Cerrito intersection or drag racing when they see our beautiful wide street.

2- Drivers are speeding at the intersection of El Cerrito when driving up or down Oakland Ave. This intersection is so dangerous, even with the current flashing light sign. I believe no one sees it when it flashes as cars actually NEVER stops!

Here are my tow recommendations:

1- Speeding on El Cerrito: We need to somehow narrow the street (street divider?), but the best plan would be to integrate our block as part of the biking path (with green lanes) since so many students already bike to/from PMS/PHS. are speeding in our street.

2- Speeding on Oakland Ave and intersection: Update with strong flashing sign or put flashing lights on the cross walk. This would increase visibility for the pedestrians. And enlarge the corners with a curb bump out on the corne (the one you are doing at other corners) to reduce speed at the corner and as well as securing the pedestrians.

Comment #46

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Overall it is a well written and thorough plan. A few specific comments:

Grand / Rose -- I was surprised at the relatively low priority of this key crossing, given that it is a major crossing of the bike route network and also a major student pedestrian crossing. In the priority scoring it scored lowest on Proximity to School -- I would argue this is a key school route and should score higher -- for any PMS kids on the west side of Grand, Rose, Greenbank, Kingston and probably even Lake -- they are going to cross at signalized Rose vs walking way downhill toward the uncontrolled Cambridge crossing or much busier Oakland Ave. It's a key bike crossing for the same reason and feeds many cyclists from Baja Piedmont and surrounding Oakland -- topographically it is a much more logical crossing point compared to descending at Oakland Ave to Grand and then a steep climb back up. I think counts would reveal that far more cyclists use this crossing than Oakland / Grand. In the Arterials / Collectors priority it scores as an arterial / neighborhood street -- and while Rose is a neighborhood street, functionally it operates like a collector and major feeder from Baja -- hence the signalization. I think the data support elevating the priority of this location within the current prioritization framework. Leaving this as a lower priority does not align with the bikeway recommendations -- I don't see how this location can remain as a key link in the lower stress bikeway network (Rose, Ronada, Arroyo) without some improvement -- the Rose - Arroyo link is especially challenging.

Oakland Ave / Sunnyside / Linda Park path -- Surprised to not see this location at all on the Enhanced Street Crossings, Fig 4., especially given the number of comments / upvotes made at this location in public comments. Despite improved crosswalk striping and signage, this location remains a major challenge and barrier to Beach school and the park, and given vehicle speeds on Oakland Ave (uphill and downhill) should have consideration of an RRFB and remain on the list.

Grand / Wildwood / Fairview -- Even with the road diet this location remains very challenging for pedestrians, with the multiple driveways along the sidewalk, vehicle congestion entering / exiting Ace, and the extremely long uncontrolled crossing. Was collision data included as a factor in considering priorities? This seems like a location that would have received some priority based on collision history and the general ped activity in the area.

Ped safety corridor along the entirety of Oakland Ave from Grand to Highland -- one project that could be a combination of both infrastructure and a traffic safety program would be to implement a consistent set of ped safety improvements along Oakland Avenue with curb extensions (paint & post) at every one of the crossing locations along the corridor -- the consistency of having these treatments would help to

reinforce traffic safety messaging (drive 25, school walking route, etc).

Dracena Park path -- an 'informal' bike route I've recently become aware of is the use of the Dracena Park path from the end of Artuna up to Park/Dracena as a way to avoid the steep climb up El Cerrito / Blair. I've seen HS / MS kids take this route, and just the other day saw a family on cargo bikes heading up the path. I understand this is the off leash dog area, but uphill bikes are going very slowly here and it may be worth considering adding to the bike network as an alternate uphill route. Similar bike use happens at the Linda Park path.

Bike racks -- Bike Racks in front of Ace hardware are sorely needed. One way of alleviating traffic congestion on Grand is to encourage more people to bike to Ace, and having to lock your bike to a signpost does not feel welcoming or encouraging. This is an easy and inexpensive fix that could be implemented immediately. All the commercial areas along this section of Grand up to Linda should be noted in the plan as needing bike racks on the sidewalk.

Thanks again, and nice overall work.

Comment #47

I'm a Piedmont resident, homeowner and voter. Recently, I thoroughly read the July 2021 draft of Piedmont Safer Streets. I have substantive feedback which I would like to enter into the official record.

First, I participated in the initial survey upon which this preliminary draft is based. I have high-level concerns about the methodology used to formulate our project prioritization criteria. Thus, I conclude that if we follow the project prioritization produced by the draft methodology, the results we achieve will be suboptimal and not utilize our Public Works Department funds most efficiently.

I lay out my reasoning as follows:

OBJECTIVES:

As stated in the draft report, the goals of Piedmont's Safer Streets Program update is to "make [Piedmont's] streets safer for everyone and make waking and biking in Piedmont easier, more pleasant, and more popular than ever."

Translating the stated objective into measurable metrics, the objective of Piedmont Safer Streets would be to:

a) induce *incremental* cycling, pedestrian, and public transportation travel in Piedmont— that is, we want more travelers (a higher percentage of our traveling population than does currently) to choose cycling, a pedestrian transportation method (whether it be walking, scootering,

skating, skateboarding, or wheelchairs), or public transportation for travel and

b) we want those Piedmonters who are already sometimes using these 3 safer forms of transportation (public, pedestrian or cycling), to utilize these modes for a greater percentage (%) of their miles traveled outside the home.

c) Finally, we'd like to reduce the annual number of injury-causing collisions in Piedmont— thus, "mak[ing] our streets safer for everyone"). Currently, Piedmont's averages 8.6 injury-causing collisions annually. Injury-causing collisions involving a motor vehicle over the past decade represent 94% (nearly all) of those Piedmont injury collisions— 20% involving alcohol consumption. Thus, inducing the use of safer forms of transportation for a greater proportion of the travel in Piedmont is very, very likely to result in reduced injury collisions in our City.

BIGGEST SAFETY DEFICIENCY VS COMPARABLE CA CITIES

The CA OTS (Office of Traffic Safety) most recent (2017) ranking of Piedmont vs other similarly-sized CA cities finds that Piedmont is much safer than other similar CA cities. Piedmont ranks 91 (out of 101) for Nighttime Collisions, and Fatality & Injuries statistics but is least safe, with a ranking of 61 (only somewhat better than the average at 51) for Bicyclists. Thus, Piedmont's biggest improvement need is in increasing safety for cyclists.

Coupling the OTS rankings with 2019's Alameda Countywide Active Transportation Plan's High-Injury Networks (HINs) map concludes that the highest-concern streets for Piedmont pedestrians and cyclists are Grand, Highland, La Salle, Linda and Wildwood (in alphabetized order, not in order of priority).

OBSERVATIONS AND 10-YEAR PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

As a 10-year resident of St. James Wood, a relatively frequent local cyclist and pedestrian, and a parent of 2 school-aged children who have commuted to school for the past 10 years (note that our children commuted trans-Piedmont from St. James Wood to Beach Elementary for 5 of our 10 years as residents, so we observed the traffic commute conditions in many areas of town), I observe that many, many families in the Western and Northern areas of Piedmont are already comfortable sending their children to school on their own— cycling or via pedestrian means.

PUBLIC INVESTMENT IN TRAFFIC SAFETY TO DATE ARE HIGHLY CONCENTRATED

In part, this is due to the vast proportion of public investment that has been made in making these areas of

town safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Here are a few highlights of those many, many investments:

A) There are traffic lights at 1) Wildwood and Grand, 2) Oakland and Grand, 3) Rose and Grand, 4) Oakland and Hillside, 5) Oakland and Highland, 6) Moraga and Highland.

B) There are paid crossing-guards at 1) Oakland and Grand, 2) Oakland and El Cerrito (or is it San Carlos?), 3) Oakland and Bonita, 4) Oakland and Highland, 5) Highland and Craig, 6) Wildwood at Wildwood Elementary, 7) Linda and Lake, and 8) Magnolia and Hillside and perhaps other locations (Magnolia— at El Cerrito?).

C) Many additional infrastructure investments have been made to make these areas *even safer* for pedestrians and cyclists including 1) the Grand Ave Road diet, 2) the Linda-Kingston traffic triangle, 3) Linda Ave bike lane, 4) bulb-outs at Highland and Craig, 5) on Linda Ave at Beach Elementary, on 6) Linda Ave at Linda play field and tot-lot.

D) There are many painted crosswalks in these areas

E) some with mid-crossing signs planted at the traffic lane dividing lines which read "State Law requires that Traffic Yield to Pedestrians"

F) some with flashing crosswalk lights and lighted speed indicators (on Oakland)

G) Additionally, Piedmont's Police Station is located at Highland and Vista Aves, providing yet another incentive for attentive, law-abiding (not speeding, yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks, etc.) driving behavior around Havens Elementary School, Piedmont Middle School, Piedmont and Millennium High Schools and Piedmont's municipal and business districts.

H) Lastly, due to their higher traffic patterns (both vehicular and pedestrian), Piedmont's "downtown" area as well as the Grand Avenue corridor have more "eyes on the street" (in the words of famed Manhattan urban renewal activist and journalist, Jane Jacobs) which provides an extra measure of safety from the number of witnesses who observe public behaviors.

Thus, it seems that even though many, many improvements have been made over the past decade, to make Piedmont's streets safer, and those investments have been highly concentrated in 2 areas of town, that collisions continue to happen. Yet, Piedmont residents living in those areas are still more likely to bike or walk to school in spite of the collisions which do infrequently occur.

Meanwhile, on the other side of town, where almost NO investment in traffic or pedestrian safety has been made (except 3 incremental stop signs thankfully added in the last 5 years), many families hesitate to allow their children to use

pedestrian means or cycle to get to school. There is a glaring lack of safety infrastructure (and lack of equitable neighborhood investment) in these areas-- no police presence, and far fewer 'eyes on the street' to provide safety for pedestrians and cyclists in the areas of Piedmont East of Crocker Park. There are no bike lanes, no mid-crosswalk signage, no blinking lights, no crossing guards, and no stoplights. On top of that, there are some very, very wide and curving streets with poor sight lines and large, open, sweeping intersections which tempt drivers to roll-through the stop signs which are provided.

Therefore, I strongly request that the following modifications be made:

1) The Piedmont streets defined as 'Arterial' need to be expanded. According to the report's definition, there are only 4 'arteries' in Piedmont— Moraga, Highland, Grand and Oakland. The term 'artery' is used in the body bec/ there must be an artery leading to the heart from every area of the body to supply oxygenated blood to all cells. In the traffic analogy, to reach the 'heart' of the City (Piedmont's downtown municipal area), every household must be connected to an 'artery'. According to your definition, the entire Eastern and southern sections of Piedmont would travel either to Grand Ave then Oakland to arrive in the Center of town, or they would travel on Estates to reach Moraga then travel on Highland to arrive in Piedmont's 'heart'. That is just not the case and that is not how traffic flows in Piedmont. St. James Drive (even though it is narrow and speeds are generally slower), Hampton Road, and Wildwood Avenue must be redefined as Piedmont 'arteries'. How are the folks who live on Trestle Glen to arrive in center Piedmont, if not on St. James Dr and Hampton Road? What about the folks who live on Estates, Inverleith, Lexford, Wyngaard, Selborne, Upper LaSalle, Glen Alpine?

2) The prioritization criteria utilized in the draft Safer Street report need to be modified. Utilizing this prioritization methodology (especially combined with the current anemic definition of Piedmont 'arteries') yields investment priorities which load yet more traffic and pedestrian safety infrastructure into the areas which are already packed with them (see my list A through H above). The 'Proximity to School' criteria is particularly vexing. There is so much human resource and infrastructure spending close to schools already. What will help the students reach school who live further from school? Should their safety not be considered as important as the safety of their fellows who live closer to school (and for whom the trip to school is already so much shorter and easier?) This will have the effect of making the areas where students are already comfortable walking to school marginally safer, while leaving the many outer areas of Piedmont where folks do not feel safe biking or walking to

school further disadvantaged and lacking in support for their safety.

If our primary objective is to induce *incremental* cycling and pedestrian transportation in Piedmont, we need to change these prioritization criteria to prioritize areas which are *not* next to schools, do *not* have crossing guards, flashing lights, mid-crossing signage, existing bulb-outs, police stations, etc.

With all this said, I do recognize that there are some horribly designed intersections in Piedmont and I agree that the Highland Ave Road Diet must be the highest priority given the number of collisions which arise from locating a disproportionate 'supersized' 4-lane road in the middle of a tiny town.

I appreciate the opportunity to give feedback to the draft Piedmont Safer Streets plan and I hope you will seriously consider it.