EXHIBIT A TO LETTER TO SYLVIA FUNG, CALTRANS

Review of City of Alameda Federal Safe Routes to School Grant for Northwood Drive/Gibbons Drive/ Southwood

by : Eugenie P. Thomson P.E., T.E.
date: April 3, 2012.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
7	**Grant Application Page Number**	**Grant Application Question Number**	**City Statements in the Grant Application**	**Misleading Statements**	**False Statements**	**Comment**
8	1	Q2	*"improvements to…. Involve the use of Landscaped medians… "*			The definition in the grant allows for the City to **re introduce the earlier roundabout proposal**. Several residents at the corners of the intersection in 2007 had initiated this project for a roundabout with landscaping within the roundabout and around the overal intersection. However the roundabout is only an architectural amenity. **No speed nor accident problem exists at this intersection.** The project modifications proposed for this intersection are not warranted based on the criteria of the Federal Safe Routes to school program. Unfortunately, City mislead Caltrans and City provided false and incorrect data as illustrated in the following and attached information.
9	1	Q3	*" The intersection is **on the school route** to Edison Elementary School and Lincoln Middle School…"*	✖		The project intersection is **NOT** on the SAFE Routes to School Map for both Edison and Lincoln Middle School. **The children cross at Lincoln and Gibbons** which is adjacent to the project intersection.
10	1	Q4	Amount Requested***" $235,000 "***	✖		The city mislead Caltrans in that **$82,740 of the $235000** the total requested, was identified **to be used to landscaping in the cost range of a mini park**. See Cost Estimate attached in the application dated 5/24/11. The cost items for landscaping: $9,000 for 6 trees, $25,740 for landscaping, $18,000 for irrigation, $30,000 for one water meter: all totaling $82,740. The **second large component was $ 66,590 of the $235,000** requested was to be used for contingency, mobilization, engineering and surveying etc which allows for significant staff time to be charged to the grant. Fortunately Caltrans caught the excessive cost estimate for landscaping and reduced this by $50, 400 but allowed all of the area identified for landscaping (approx 3000 sq ft) to be replaced with stamped concrete at a total cost of $49,560 as per the City revised estimate of 9/15/11. That is Caltrans reduced the $235,000 to $184,600.
11	2	Q8	City ranks this application as **number 1** priority for all of Alameda.	✖		Caltrans is mislead believing this safety project is Number 1 priority while another project at McCartney and Island Dr also submitted rates only as Priority Number 2 even though at McCartney and Island Drive the City states there have been 8 pedestrian or bicycle related collisions.
12	5	Q26	Number of students living within 2 miles: City states ***919***	✖		City misleads Caltrans believing that many students would benefit from this project.
13	5	Q28	Number of students living along the school route proposed improvements. City Answer is ***100 students*** .	✖		**City mislead Caltrans in believing that 100 students cross this intersection. The City had performed surveys in the area but** NO surveys were performed at this intersection. I surveyed the intersection after school on Wednesday March 21, 2012. During this survey NO children crossed Gibbons at the intersection and one family crossed Southwood and crossed Gibbons at Lincoln from Edison School. The school children crossed at the other (northerly) interestion of SouthwoodGibbonsNorthwood and crossed at LincolnGibbons intersection.
14	23	Q151	Is this a Traffic Calming and Speed Reduction project : City's anwer is ***yes*** .	✖		Gibbons is a collector street with City surveyed 85th percentile speeds of 30 mph midblock between the southerly and northerly interesections of NorhtwoodGibbonsSouthwood. This speed is not an excessive speed and cars were observed to slow down approaching Lincoln through the project intersection. The crossing Guard was asked if he knew of any problem speeders or squealing of brakes, and he said he has not observed any for the last 10 yrs and retired this week.
15	25	Q158	The grant application includes $1500 in funds for non infrastructure components and referred to in the application as the Bicycle/Scooter Elves program. This program is to encourage and educate children to walk and bicycle more.	✖		The City Council resolution signed July 6th, 2011 is based on only the small amount of $1500 of the grant application and the resolution misleads Caltrans to believe children cross at the project intersection.. The resolution states ***" Whereas the City of Alameda is committed to encouraging students to bicycle and walk to school, and to provide facilities and programs that will encourage this behavior. "*** $233,500 of the $235000 requested is going to an intersection where children do not cross and will not because it is shorter via Lincoln and Cambridge. City resolution is included in the grant application.

Review of City of Alameda Federal Safe Routes to School Grant for Northwood Drive/Gibbons Drive/ Southwood

by : Eugenie P. Thomson P.E., T.E.
date: April 3, 2012.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
7	**Grant Application Page Number**	**Grant Application Question Number**	**City Statements in the Grant Application**	**Misleading Statements**	**False Statements**	**Comment**
16	page 25 and City table attached to the application	Q159	Existing Site Conditions. City states there are a total of ***159 pedestrian and bicycle related motor vehicle collisions from 2007 to present wihtin 2 miles of the project and one fatality at Everett and Santa Clara Avenue. .***	✖		The City misleads Caltrans. The City of Alameda Police records show there have been **ZERO** accidents for this intersection for the period of 2002 to 2011. See attached exhibit.
17	page 25 and City table attached to the application	Q159	Existing Site Conditions. ***City states the intersection does not meet the minimum stopping sight distance requirements as per the Highway Design Manual.***		✖ ✖	**The City could not provide engineering surveys for the determination that the intersection did NOT have minimum stopping sight distance**. Removal of a few bushes and some red curb would resolve sight distance concerns. And if there is a problem, placing a stop sign for southbound Gibbons at the northerly corner would resolve any potential conflicts for the side streets. The City staff did provide a non engineering sketch from a survey they had conducted after I had repeated asked for the sight distance survey both orally and in writing and after it was not produced via a Public record request on March 8th, 2012. I observed a City staff member conduct a sight distance check around 11 AM on March 22, 2012. However, the sketch does **not** indicate from what location the measurements were taken, it does **not** indicate the physical obstructions like parked cars that were present at the time of the survey, **nor** does the sketch indicate the bushes the residents had planted between curb and sidewalk which partially obscure sight distance. The sketch had no title, no date. This sketch is incorrect and grossly below standard care of engineering practice. See attached exhibit of the City sketch for sight distances. In addition, i checked all corners and believe adequate sight distance would be available (ie approx. 200 ft) after removal of a few bushes and removal of several parking spaces. And ultimately if traffic is to increase significantly on Gibbons, a southbound Stop sign could be installed.
18	page 26	Q160, worth **15 pts out of 100 total pts for the grant application rating**	City states two public meetings were held. And the City states *" **63% of the meeting participants were in favor of improving project definition** " at the May 24, 2010 public meeting. Secondly, that 50% of the residents were not in favor of a roundabout.*	✖		The vast majority of the residents at the recent Feb 28th, 2012 had understood the project was NOT moving forward and were surprised that City Hall misunderstood them at the last two public meetings in 2010. Many residents showed up to voice their NO to the proposals.
19	page 27	Q162	History of pedestrian/bicycle collisions w/.in 2 miles of target school. Answer is yes or no. The City answers ***YES.*** ...	✖		The answer is misleading because the history is only applicable for the $1500 for education/encouragement program not the remaining $233,500 for the improvements at the project intersection. City should have stated clearly that this applies only to the non infrastructure component of the grant application.
20	page 28	Q163	Limited or no crosswalks, City's answer was ***NO.***	✖		The children do have a crosswalk and crossing guard at Lincoln.
21	page 28	Q164	High vehicular Speeds? City answers ***YES*** **.**	✖		The City surveys indicate 85th percentile speeds at 30 mph approximately 400 feet north of project intersection. This is not an excessive speed and typically for residential streets of this length in Alameda. What is omitted is vehicles slow down approaching Lincoln for the ALL Way stop and hence speeds are lower through the intersection.
22	page 28	Q165	Poor Sight Distance? City answers ***YES*** .	✖		No sight distance surveys were conducted by a licensed engineer and sight distance are typical of most intersections in Alameda. Red curb and removal of bushes could improve sight distance for two northerly corners. Grant funds not needed for this minor modification.
23	page 28	Q167	**No Traffic Control Devices at School Crossing?** City Answers **YES**.		✖	The school crossing across Gibbons is at Lincoln and there is ALL way stop sign control at this intersection. The project intersection is immediately adjacent to the LincolnGibbons Intersection and operate as one large intersection. There is also an ALL WAY STOP at the other (northerly) intersection of NorthwoodGibbonsSouthwood

	A	B	C	D	E	F
3	**Review of City of Alameda Federal Safe Routes to School Grant for Northwood Drive/Gibbons Drive/ Southwood**					
4	by : Eugenie P. Thomson P.E., T.E.					
5	date: April 3, 2012.					
6						
7	**Grant Application Page Number**	**Grant Application Question Number**	**City Statements in the Grant Application**	**Misleading Statements**	**False Statements**	**Comment**
24	page 29	Q172	No Crossing guards? City Answers **YES.**		✖	Again incorrect because there is a crossing guard at Lincoln.
25	page 29	Q174	Other information. City answers " ***Motorist behavior such as reckless driving is an on going issue according to the Gibbons Drive area residents. "***	✖		There have been a few donuts in the middle of the intersection. Residents state this was done by one of the kids in the neighborhood and he stopped. This claim was made by several of the residents who wanted the roundabout and used this in their writeup to gain support for the roundabout. See the 2007 petition. No factual proof exists this is an on going problem.
26	page 29	Q175 3a) worth **25 pts out of 100 pts**	Safety risks/hazards. City answers "within 1/4 mi of the project intersection there were 8 pedestrian or bicycle related motor vehicle collisions from 2007 to present. The from 1/4 to 1 mile, there were 88 same type of collisions and another 63 same type of collision 1 to 2 miles from Edison School for 2007 to present. And one fatality at Everett and Santa Clara Avenue. " **For a total of 159 pedestrian or bicycle related vehicle collisions** within 2 miles of Edison School from 2007 to present	✖		The accident data is only applicable to the non infrastructure component or $1500 requested. The remaining data for the project intersection and approaches was NOT provided. The City Police records indicate there were **ZERO accidents at the project intersection for the period between 2002 to 2011** and where $233,500 of funds are requested. For the MeCartney/Island Drive grant application prepared at the same time by the same people, City staff did provide the collision data for the intersection where the improvements were to be provided in addition to non infrastructure funds. By the way, 2 miles from Edison includes most of Alameda island and some of Bay Farm island and includes Fruitvale BART station. See separate exhibit illustrating the 2 mile area from Edison School.
27	page 30	Continuation of Q175 3 a)	City answers **there are NO traffic control devices** and states the residents are concerned about the lack of control devices	✖		The City misleads Caltrans that the residents believe there is a need for traffic control devices however those who have stated the need for traffic control devices are the same that have been promoting a roundabout. A survey has not been performed nor has there been an engineering study performed to determine a need of more traffic control devices.
28	page 30	Continuation of Q175 3 a)	High vehicular Speeds? City answers again ***"there are issues of uncontrolled speeds"***		✖	No evidence available for uncontrollable speeds.
29	page 30	Continuation of Q175 3 a)	Poor Sight Distance? City answers again ***"it is difficult to see approaching vehicles ".***	✖		No documentation confirming the difficulty to see approaching vehicles. And no accidents at this intersection from 2002 to 2011.
30	page 30	Continuation of Q175 3 a)	Motorist behavior. City states ***"Gibbons Drive residents state that motorist behavior such as sideshows, reckless driving and doughnuts is an on going problem due to large intersection"***	✖		Misleading Caltrans believing problem exists. We asked the crossing guard and he in his 10 yrs at Lincoln and Gibbons does not remember any screetching of brakes or high speeds. Also many residents have stated this is untrue. No documented evidence exists this is an on going problem.
31	page 30	Continuation of Q175 3 a)	limited/no bicycle lanes. City answers ***" Gibbons Drive area residents have commented on the need to i mprove bicycle circulation through the project intersection. "***	✖		The proposed modifications do not provide for bicycle lanes and with the narrow lanes proposed remove the existing safety zone between the autos and bicycles. Residents at the feb 28th, 2012 commented they prefer the extra space at the intersection and believe it is safer.

Review of City of Alameda Federal Safe Routes to School Grant for Northwood Drive/Gibbons Drive/ Southwood

by : Eugenie P. Thomson P.E., T.E.
date: April 3, 2012.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
7	**Grant Application Page Number**	**Grant Application Question Number**	**City Statements in the Grant Application**	**Misleading Statements**	**False Statements**	**Comment**
32	page 30	Continuation of Q175 3 a)	No Crossing guards? City Answers again ***the intersection does not have a crossing guard.***	✖		There is a crossing guard at Lincoln where it is shorter and faster for the children to cross. The children walk along Northwood south to Lincoln and walk along Southwood to Lincoln. No children were surveyed to cross Gibbons at project intersection and only one family was seen crossing Southwood after school on Wed March 21, 2012. City has not conducted any surveys of pedestrian or bicycle activities at the project intersection. There are no funds available to add another crossing guard at the project intersection, it is preferred for the children to cross Gibbons at Lincoln or at Cambridge.
33	page 30	Continuation of Q175 3 a)	the City states: ***"The intersection is wide making it one of the widest intersections in Alameda. "***	✖		There are other wide intersections like this in Alameda, they are typical of the period of the neighborhoods. And most importantly as noted before, the intersection has no history of incidents and the school route is adjacent to this intersection with crosswalks, ALL WAY STOP control and crossing guard.
34	page 30	**Q176 3b) worth 5 pts**	The City states again: Staff observed **no** crosswalks at this intersection.	✖		Caltrans is mislead that pedestrians do not have crosswalks and the school children cross Gibbons where there is no crosswalk. They cross Gibbons at Lincoln where there is a crossing guard and they cross Gibbons at the other (northerly) intersection of NorthwoodGibbonsSouthwood. Their natural routes to School.
35	page 30	Q177 worth **30 pts out of 100**	Proposed Project Selection: City answers*" The ALL WAY STOP controls and channelized traffic will reduce vehicular speeds and will encourage more predictable behavior.* ***The reduced speeds will decrease both the frequency and severity of collisions.*** *The channelized traffic, which is possible by the medians /islands recommended as part of the intersection improvement, will reduce the space available for reckless driving and will reduce the skewed alignment. The proposed project brings the intersection to more of a right angle, and provides stop controls for the acute angle that still exists on Northwood Drive. "*		✖	**There are NO collisions to be reduced. This is overall conclusion is a false statement.**
36	page 30	Q177 continued	City adds " *The GibbonsDr/NorthwoodDr/SouthwoodDr intersection will no longer* ***act as a barrier to accessing*** *the crossing guard for Edison Elementary School. "*	✖		This is a misleading statement, how can the intersection be a barrier to accessing the crossing guard when today **the walking distance is the less the proposed**??The children walk their natural routes along the periphery of the intersection via Lincoln to School.
37	page 30	Q177 continued	City adds other more expensive options were considered like the Roundabout at $430,000.	✖		The City neglects to illustrate a very inexpensive option is available and as per the CA and the Federal Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, must first be considered before ALL way stop control. Also City fails in not following their own the ALL WAY stop control guidelines adopted 10/13/10 by Matt Naclerio. These guidelines state the following: *" Stop signs cannot be placed within 600 ft where other stop signs are placed and stop signs should not be used for speed control and they are ordinarily used where the volumes on all approaches are roughly equal."* See attached City Public Work Stop Guideline. LincolnGibbons intersection, a four way stop is within 600 ft and the volumes are not equal and the stop signs are being used for speed reduction.

Review of City of Alameda Federal Safe Routes to School Grant for Northwood Drive/Gibbons Drive/ Southwood

by : Eugenie P. Thomson P.E., T.E.
date: April 3, 2012.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
7	**Grant Application Page Number**	**Grant Application Question Number**	**City Statements in the Grant Application**	**Misleading Statements**	**False Statements**	**Comment**
38	page 35	Q188	"Warrant" Sheets: Upload completed "warrant " sheets per the CA MUTCD for projects with traffic control devices. City leaves space blank and does **NOT** provide.	✖		As per the Public record request of March 8th, 2012 ad several emails and discussions with City staff illustrates **NO warrant analysis exists for this project** . And as mentioned above the ALL WAY STOP violates the city's own guideline. (see the attached City STOP sign guideline). First, the MUTCD requires red curb and removal of bushes to first be considered. And the northbound STOP sign is too close to Lincoln Avenue. And lastly NO engineering study or survey exists that adequately adresses the sight distance problem stated repeatedly in this grant application.
39	page 37	letters of support	The handpicked individuals for support and provided a form letter. Each letter states the following ***"the intersection is on the school route to Edison Elementary and Lincoln Middle Schools. Based on traffic analysis and community feedback , Public works staff developed an infrastructure project to improve access through this intersection... "***	✖		The intersection is **NOT** on the school routes and there is **NO** barrier to access and there is NO traffic analysis available at City Hall. And the community at the Feb 28th, 2012 meeting stated they believe this is a the waste of taxpayers $ and stated over and over again to return the funds to where there is a need for school children safety.

The remaining 25 pts for a total of a 100 pts upon which the grant is rated, are gained via illustrating having a safe routes to school map, partenering with other agencies and having promotional materials to promote walking and bicycling etc.