

Yes. I have it on the calendar.

There are several issues I would like to discuss, mainly having to do with dedicated bike lanes (class 4) and evacuation routes and fair and equitable access to the city.

This is a very important evacuation video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2PamppHOHTs>

There is a mandate for the City to evaluate evacuation that has not yet been met. Our hill area has the same evacuation score as Paradise, CA had. The majority of the deaths there were people over 65.

Equitable access must have something to do with population. Bike riders are about 7%. Most of these also use cars. Handicapped persons under 65 are almost 7%. People over 65 in Berkeley are about 16%.

Look forward to speaking with you.

Candace

---

I would hope the CoA can take a position and write to the council. The protected bike lane drive is, IMO, more ideologically driven than data driven. But in areas like Hopkins, able-bodied bike riders are being favored over the much larger numbers of older and handicapped people, who are about 23% in Berkeley compared with, at most, 7%. So street equity is important.

Also, there is increasing data that Vision Zero is not safe: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2PamppHOHTs>

And from Bloomberg: "Vision Zero cities like Washington, DC, Seattle and Portland, Oregon, are still seeing traffic deaths rise. Last year Portland had its highest total since 1990. In cities like Nashville and Columbus, Ohio, which have just started their Vision Zero journeys, the impact remains unclear." This is an expensive program to promote only to see it fail.

Protected bike lanes interfere with emergency access. You can see it very clearly on Telegraph Avenue in Oakland. There is no way for cars to pull over for ambulances and fire trucks, and this direct route to Summit Hospital is no longer viable (I have discussed this with Berkeley Firefighters). Berkeley is an area with two major calamities in its future; a major earthquake as high as 8.0 on the Richter scale and a major fire in the hills. Hopkins is an evacuation route and CalTrans has recommended against any construction that reduces the width of these streets. Let's not forget that the North Berkeley Hills have an evacuation score of 95, the same as Paradise, CA. had. The majority of people killed in that fire were over 65 and a major problem for them getting out was the narrowing of an evacuation route for traffic calming.

<https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/design/documents/signed-dib-93-evacuation-route-a11y.pdf>

If a project is on an evacuation route, an assessment should be made on the project's potential to impact the route and what may be done to enhance the route's efficiency and effectiveness at moving significant numbers of people and vehicles. Such discussion may need to occur outside the project development process, depending on the needs of the community and the route. The needs of the community and route will vary but the information needed for assessment includes, but is not limited to:

- the population of the community
- percentage of that population expected to use the route during an evacuation

© 2020 California Department of Transportation – All Rights Reserved

- 1 • percentages and descriptions of citizens who may require buses or special transportation needs
- types and numbers

of vehicles expected to use the route during an evacuation • commute patterns • locations of schools and hospitals – either as a facility that requires evacuation or as a destination refuge area • the need for emergency services to use the route to access to the community while the route is also being used for evacuations.

3.7 Complete Streets Features Complete Streets features provide improvements to the community but have the potential to create challenges in an evacuation. Consider the use of Class II bike lanes on evacuation routes instead of Class IV as a way of providing an unobstructed pavement width. Place all fixed objects (light posts, street furniture, parkettes, etc.) setback as far from the edge of traveled way as feasible.

We need to be serious about street design. Emergency access should be primary. Protecting the most vulnerable is something the Commission on Aging can chime in on. Thank you! Candace

Mr. Castrillon and members of the Commission:

I am writing to follow up on my public comments at the last Commission on Aging meeting on November 16 regarding the Hopkins Corridor project.

I am 63 years old and a resident of Hopkins Street between Gilman and Sacramento for the past thirty-one years.

The purpose of this letter is to urge the Commission to strongly oppose the Hopkins Corridor plan in its current form. I and many of our neighbors believe that the extensive removal of parking required for this plan will have an adverse impact on many seniors who utilize the shops on Hopkins Street, and have the secondary impact of putting the survival of those businesses at risk.

We are also concerned about the impact on seniors living on the corridor pulling into and out of their driveways on this very busy street, particularly between the intersections of Hopkins with Monterey and Gilman and the risks this will pose to cyclists, other motorists, and the residents themselves.

The city has not adequately explored or considered alternatives that would achieve the same objectives of providing safe east/west bicycle travel, utilizing streets with a fraction of the auto traffic, that would not require such drastic changes to the street.

I urge the Commission to take a strong stand in opposition to this plan and to demand that the city consider alternatives.

Thank you.

Jim Offel

---

I live in Albany but Monterey Market is one of my favorite shopping places.

Many people besides Berkeley residents also shop in this area.

I rode a bike for years but at 74 don't bike anymore: shoulder problems, balance issues.

I agree with many others in my community who shop on Hopkins. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Bicycles can use other alternative streets. That is no hardship for them. They don't need Hopkins to get to the area.

Sincerely

Deborah Perkins-Kalama

---

Here is the letter I sent to my council member; she sent it on to pertinent staff and to the mayor.

*Most mayors in the nation would be thrilled to have a high functioning commercial neighborhood like ours on Hopkins.*

*It works well for pedestrians and drivers and access to it via California, Colusa, Ada, and Vine street works pretty well for cyclists. Messing with a rare gem of small business success and residential happiness seems foolish.*

*In two to three years there will be an abundance of much more affordable electric cars on the market and shortly thereafter on Berkeley's streets. Most of our city residents will never take up biking -look at our demographics, more seniors than schoolchildren - but many of those who come to Hopkins Street will soon be driving non-polluting cars.*

*While I like the idea of supporting cyclists as we have done on Virginia street for instance, the designs along major thorough-fares in Berkeley, Oakland and Albany are clunky, they increase pollution every single day because of stalled traffic idling as we try to squeeze all the cars through fewer lanes and they create danger zones for all users.*

*Look at the confusion of cyclists and drivers at the North Branch Library intersection - confusion in traffic creates danger.*

*Look at the intersection of Ellsworth and Bancroft - drivers have to look at three possible sources of cross traffic that doesn't slow or stop coming from two directions as they pull onto Bancroft. The likeliest recipient of harm there? Cyclists abiding by traffic rules.*

*Look at the intersections in which a cyclist running a stop sign from the other side of a row of parked cars is invisible to drivers turning right, who by the way need to be looking left for part of their turn to make sure there aren't cyclists or cars coming from there. It is truly unpredictable whether or not a cyclist will stop at a stop sign; the city government either needs to stop designing with the belief that they will or start giving cyclists clearer expectations of abiding by them.*

*We need much better designs and we need bicycle streets that are not main traffic corridors. We also need recognition from the designers that a lot of our town drivers do not have the speedy reflexes and quick ability to interpret an intersection that looks like a game board that the designers themselves may have. Respect our town elders as you plan. We can build good cycling streets without creating driving conditions that are problematic.*

Kathleen

---

**To Commission on Aging,**

***I am a senior and very long-term Berkeley resident who of necessity must get around by car. I have long been distressed by the City's disregard for seniors when it comes to issues relating to parking and access to amenities/necessities, and by the pandering to a loud aggressive bike lobby which seems to mostly cater to the fit and young. I am generally concerned by the proposed near-elimination of parking at our BART stations and by the installation of very expensive meters at many commercial areas, and I am totally distraught at the insane plan to disrupt and, yes, ruin the Hopkins/Monterey commercial area where so many seniors go to shop and eat and linger and relax.***

***This letter is a request for the Commission on Aging to immediately take up the Hopkins Corridor situation on behalf of the neighbors and others who regularly frequent the area and who stand to totally lose out if current plans are implemented. This Commission should have been consulted in the first place!***

***--the removal of parking and the metering of parking will remove my ability to frequent this district which I regularly visit, patronize, and enjoy several times a week. Many many others of my acquaintance will be similarly affected as of course will be the local businesses.***

***--there are alternative safer ways to provide bike routes for bicyclists in general and for school-going bike riders***

***--two-way bicycle lanes are dangerous and obstructive***

***-City parking meters are ugly, expensive, and a deterrent to a thriving commercial area. Lingering can cost you almost \$3.00/hour! Besides, the revenue thus extracted by the City has diminished every year and, I believe, does not even cover the employee and infrastructure cost of the metering.***

***--Lower Solano in Albany is lively and exciting for folks of all ages and abilities, and we should use this as a model when thinking about Berkeley commercial areas.***

***--I understand that Hopkins is an emergency evacuation route and that the current plan would would totally negate this vital function.***

***--if the City just went ahead and re-paved the subject roads and implemented a few well-considered traffic safety measures (maybe traffic light, turn signalling, more and better crosswalks) we could spend much less money, improve the area, and save this beloved commercial area for seniors and all who love it.***

***I hope you will take this up as an emergency matter and take a strong stand against the current plan and for the positions stated above.***

***Sincerely, Barbara Gilbert***

---

Internal

To: Berkeley Commission on Aging  
Att: Richard Castrillon

The following was sent to Farid Javandel and Council member Sophie Hahn with no reply.

When I take my daily walk from Hopkins/McGee where I live, with delivery trucks often blind-siding me, I feel a bit safer crossing at Hopkins/ Monterey. While I fear cars might jump stop signs, I am more imperiled by bikes, e-bikes, e-scooters who cannot be counted on to YIELD to me. They redundantly break the law, and there is NO enforcement.

As an aside, you must be aware that in Downtown Berkeley, e-scooters and e-bikes are rampantly careening down sidewalks threatening pedestrians. I had to have my new iPhone device serviced at Verizon on Shattuck/Allston way and as I walked on Shattuck to the establishment I was nearly hit by a speeding e-Scooter... same for when I emerged from the store. My friend, Carole Kalous who resides in South Berkeley, will not shop at local stores, because of the e-scooters and bikes that are speeding down sidewalks. She e-orders her groceries.

How can you claim to deal with these threats to pedestrians of all ages when there is NO enforcement of existing laws.

The same applies to my walk in the Hopkins neighborhood. A bike speeds down Hopkins approaching Monterey (the intersection), and a car is parallel coming to a Stop sign. I am gambling when to cross when the bike DOES NOT yield and the car is confused whether it should jumpstart me, the pedestrian, I err on the side of caution and let the car pay no heed to my right as a pedestrian. I could be seriously injured if I play Russian Roulette with the bikes and cars. Again, with NO enforcement, all these surveys, plans are useless. That the City does its one or two time surveillance of cars speeding through crosswalks is of no value to this neighborhood where bikes of all forms, and cars are not cited for breaking the law.

Therefore you are operating a vacuum claiming all your surveys are done to advance the SAFETY of pedestrians who are trying to get from their departure from home, back to their home without being injured. And let's not talk about injuries from cars vs. bikes. I don't need to be told as a senior that being maimed by a speeding e-bike or scooter will spare my life, but put me in a wheelchair with a broken hip, at minimum. This is utter nonsense reasoning.

I appreciate your attention to measures that will truly guarantee pedestrian safety without creating

6 stop sign lanes at Monterey/Hopkins where the confusion of who arrived first, bikes, e-scooters, e-bikes, cars, will usher in more pedestrian casualties. The design is dangerous and a menace to those in this community who want to have a quality of life that is safe and non-threatening.

Shirley Kirsten

---

I understand that I can reach the Commission on Aging through this message to you.

I am 77 years old and in reasonably good physical condition for now. I live near the intersection of Hopkins and Sacramento, and I shop often at the stores along that corridor on Hopkins. They're so close that I can walk to them. Generally, I have no need for a car, because I can still carry my shopping bags home from there.

Other senior citizens, however, must certainly find the need to drive their cars to the commercial area. I sincerely doubt that a lot of seniors are going to arrive in that area on bicycles to do their shopping.

So, I oppose the current two-way, southside bicycle proposal for Hopkins in that area, to the extent that it will remove most or all of the parking spaces along Hopkins. Shoppers from the hills and surrounding neighborhoods who must drive will need to have parking spaces available. If not, surely the businesses there will suffer loss of business.

And I don't see adequate consideration being given by the city to how emergency vehicles will negotiate a narrowed street, if the two-way cycle track is installed along Hopkins near the shops. I have seen on the city's emergency evacuation map that Hopkins is a designated evacuation route, so clearly we must be assured that putting in this design will not create increased hazards under emergency circumstances.

The city just needs to consider alternatives to the current design, so that these far-reaching changes do not bring adverse consequences to shoppers, stores, and drivers on Hopkins. Surely, the city can achieve its vaunted objectives to provide safe bicycle travel on the

street without such drastic changes to users, especially older residents.

So, I request that the Commission oppose this design. Please get involved for us seniors and demand that the city consider alternatives to the current proposal.

Chris Hamilton

---

To the Berkeley Commission on Aging

#### OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED HOPKINS CORRIDOR STREET RECONFIGURATION PLANS

Hello Commission on Aging Members,

Please note my opposition to any street reconfiguration along Hopkins, or on nearby streets, between Gilman and San Pablo Avenue. I feel that the City of Berkeley is becoming increasingly hostile to senior citizens like myself.

The Plans would remove hundreds of parking spaces on Hopkins, between Gilman and San Pablo. This would cause much pain and harm to Hopkins Street residents and residents on nearby streets. I am opposed to any removal of street parking along Hopkins Street or on adjacent Streets.

The proposed plans are hostile to senior citizens and to the disabled. The plans are profoundly ageist. Hopkins is a busy street with many senior citizen home owners and renters. It's very dangerous to back out into busy streets, especially into high speed bicycle lanes.

Seniors need street parking for their health care workers.

Families need street parking for transporting children and groceries.

Delivery trucks, such as Amazon, and mail carriers need street parking. Without street parking delivery trucks and mail carriers will park in the middle of the street, risking injury to themselves, pedestrians, people in wheel chairs, and motorists.

At a Dec. 12, 2022 meeting on the Plans, Staff dismissively said people on Hopkins could park on side streets. But driving around and around looking for parking spaces would cause more pollution and more vehicular trips. People on streets near Hopkins in turn would have to drive around and around looking for non-existing parking spaces, resulting in yet more vehicular trips and more pollution.

And people on Hopkins would have to roll their trash, yard debris and recycling bins to some distant location. This would be especially hard on senior citizens.

All this pain and inconvenience so that some self-entitled young bicyclists can have exclusive Olympic luge like nonstop bicycle lanes. How cruel is that?

## TAKE CARE OF DEFERRED MAINTENANCE FIRST

The City's billion dollar plus backlog of streets, sewers, sidewalk, etc. repairs needed due to deferred maintenance should have priority over elective and controversial street reconfiguration projects, such as those proposed for the Hopkins Corridor.

In these times of record high interest rates, and growing talk of a coming recession, the City should not be spending tens of millions of dollars on controversial and unproven street reconfiguration projects. Before proceeding with any further planning for the Hopkins Reconfiguration project, the City should state exactly how much this project would cost, and where the funds would be coming from.

## ZONING ORDINANCE REVISION, GENERAL PLAN REVISION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW SHOULD BE REQUIRED

The potential removal of hundreds of street parking spaces along one mile stretch of Hopkins between Gilman and San Pablo Ave should first require environmental review, and Zoning Ordinance and General Plan amendments.

People have been parking their cars and vehicles on Hopkins Street for over 110 years. If all these parking spaces are removed, where will they park? People will drive around and around on surrounding streets looking for parking spaces, thus causing more pollution and risking more accidents. There will be hundreds of instances a day of people backing out of their driveways on Hopkins Street into fast moving vehicular and bicycle traffic, greatly increasing the risk of serious and fatal collisions.

Families need street parking for transporting their children and groceries. Disabled people need street parking for their accessible vans. The never ending parade of delivery trucks need street parking so as to avoid blocking traffic and causing more accidents.

Mail trucks would also be forced to block traffic, leading to more accidents.

Hopkins has never been a street favored by bicyclists. The Reconfiguration plan would unnecessarily bring bicyclists to an already busy street, leading to more accidents.

The existing zoning on around Hopkins Street does not anticipate removal of hundreds of street parking spaces. Nor does the City's General Plan anticipate the removal of hundreds of street parking spaces in residential neighborhoods.

Thus, an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and an Amendment to the General Plan should be required.

The City should not hide behind any recent state legislation to avoid through environmental review.

These plans would not make it safer for bicyclist or for pedestrians. Hundreds of Hopkins Street residents will be forced to back up regularly into fast moving traffic.

The increased cumulative vehicular traffic of Hopkins residents, visitors, delivery vans and mail trucks looking for parking spaces or parking in the middle of the street will therefore make it more dangerous for bicyclists, pedestrians, wheel chair users, and motorists. The Hopkins Corridor and other street reconfiguration projects should thus not be considered exempt from environmental review.



TELL BICYCLISTS TO OBEY THE RULES OF THE ROAD The best thing the City can do to promote bicycle and pedestrian safety is to educate bicyclists and scooter riders in Berkeley to obey the rules of the road. The growing tendency of bicyclists running stop signs and stop lights, and jumping in front of cars stopped at stop signs and stop lights is profoundly reckless. Do bicyclists think the laws of physics don't apply to them?

With growing tendency of many – though certainly not all, bicyclists, one must assume that bicyclists in these new high speed continuous bike tracks will not stop for pedestrians or for people in wheel chairs. Motorists should not have to anticipate whether a bicyclist approaching a dangerous intersection is going to wait their turn at a stop sign or run the stop sign, or wait until the light turns green or run through the red light.

A continuous bicycle lane along Hopkins Street with fast moving bicyclists and scooter riders will make it impossible for pedestrians and wheel chair users cross the street.

#### GROWING PUBLIC SAFETY THREAT FOR PROLIFERATION OF ELECTRIC SCOOTERS & ELECTRIC BICYCLES

There should be a moratorium on any further complete street, smart street, or street reconfiguration planning or installation until there is a thorough study and review of the danger to public safety from the recent proliferation of electric scooters and electric bicycles. Everyone I know has either been hit by an electric scooter, nearly hit by one, and/or has tripped over one.

Untrained and uneducated electric scooter riders also pose a danger to their own safety.

Is any level of training required before someone is allowed to rent an electric scooter?

Is there a minimum age requirement? Do electric scooter users need driver licenses? Are they supposed to be on the street or the sidewalk? Do police look the other way when they see reckless scooter riders? Does Traffic Enforcement look the other way when they see scooters blocking sidewalks and curb cuts? The electric scooter and electric bicycle public safety crises needs to be dealt with first, before any further planning for street reconfiguration or street reconfiguration work happens in Berkeley.

#### BETTER USES FOR THE MONEY

With a recession looming, the City should not be spending tens of millions of dollars on such folly.

The City of Berkeley has a deferred maintenance liability of over one billion.

The City claimed it did not have the money to feed children in Cedar Rose Park last summer.

The City claims it does not have enough money to construct a bathroom at Cesar Chavez Park.

The City claims it does not have enough money to adequately staff its Customer Service Department.

The City claims it does not have the money to install bathrooms at Cesar Chavez Park or at other City parks.

Yet it claims to have over one hundred million dollars or more that this controversial Hopkins Corridor Plan and other anti-senior street reconfiguration plans.

The Hopkins Corridor plan would inflict pain on many hundreds of Berkeley residents who would no longer be able to park in front of their homes.

Do you really want to inflict pain on seniors, families, the disabled so that a few bicycle enthusiasts can have expensive, elitist, and exclusive bike lanes?

The construction impacts alone would be horrible. People along Hopkins and nearby streets would have to endure six months or more of diesel generators, heavy equipment noise and pollution, and no access at all to their street and their homes, so that elitists can have Olympic luge like exclusive bike lanes.

The Hopkins Corridor Plan would violate Berkeley's Precautionary Principle.

Please oppose the Hopkins Corridor Reconfiguration Plans being proposed by City Staff. Please visit [savehopkins.org](http://savehopkins.org) for a safer, inexpensive plan that will hurt no one.

Thank you,  
Clifford Fred  
Berkeley California

---

To the Commission on Aging,

#### MY OPPOSITION TO THE CITY'S HOPKINS CORRIDOR PLAN

I strongly oppose the City's Hopkins Corridor Bicycle Track Plan.

The Plan prioritizes athletic bicycle and electric scooter riders – who insist on riding at high speeds, over everyone else.

Hopkins is already difficult for pedestrians and for people with disabilities to cross. The high speed, continuous bicycle tracks proposed in the plan would make it impossible for pedestrians, especially senior citizens and people with disabilities to cross Hopkins.

As a disabled elder, I need to be able to – and should have a right to – cross Hopkins, so as to go to and enjoy Cedar Rose Park, the only nearby open space available to me.

If the Plan is enacted, I will be barred from enjoying the amenities of my neighborhood. These bicycle tracks would be a physical barrier, blocking the elderly and the disabled from crossing the street.

More and more bicyclists in Berkeley do not stop at stop signs, and do not stop at red lights. The bicyclists and scooter riders on these continuous tracks will be going very fast, and will not stop for pedestrians. The bicycle tracks would also block me from getting to BART and to bus stops.

The City's Hopkins Corridor Plan is elitist, ageist, and discriminates against the disabled.

#### DON'T REMOVE STREET PARKING ON HOPKINS STREET

The City's Hopkins Corridor Plan would also remove all street parking on Hopkins Street. This would pose a great hardship on Hopkins Street residents – many whom are senior citizens, and is totally unnecessary.

People on Hopkins would have to hunt for parking on side streets, resulting in more traffic and pollution, not less.

Please visit [savehopkins.org](http://savehopkins.org) for an alternative plan that would be much less expensive, and that would harm no one.

Thank you,  
Elizabeth Starr  
Berkeley Calif.

---

Dear Liam Garland, Public Works and Richard Castrillon, Commission on Aging,

I am highly concerned about the proposal for bike lanes on Hopkins Street, both east and west of Gilman Street.

The proposed lanes will significantly, and probably dangerously, disrupt access to businesses and pedestrians of all types, particularly older and disabled citizens.

Parking for resident, visitor and service vehicles will be more problematic and congested than it already is.

Bicycles are great but not at the safety and accessibility of those of us who are unable to use them. There are reasonable, alternative bike routes available, workable and convenient.

The issues and concerns that are being raised about the proposed bike lanes need to be carefully and thoroughly considered from the perspectives of all citizens before proceeding.

Meantime, please move ahead with the long overdue repaving of Hopkins Street.

Thank you,  
Carol Hirth

---

Dear Mr. Castrillon and Council Member Wengraf,

I do not live far from the Hopkins commercial corridor but when I go there I often pick up an armload of dry cleaning from Hopkins Laundrette, 10 lbs of fruit and veg from Monterey Market, a pizza from Goia and maybe a whole chicken from Magnani's. My age and arthritis do not allow me to walk home (uphill) with my purchases. I must drive and park.

I am surprised and dismayed by the Hopkins Plan-- which seemingly involved staff members who favored the plan being less than forthcoming about the amount of parking that would be lost and misleading both the public and the Council. But worse is **the lack of regard for the disempowerment of the elderly and mobility impaired who will not be able to visit this neighborhood and community hub to shop if so much parking is removed.** I often find it difficult to park conveniently now. When the bike lanes go in, followed by the NB Bart development (many dwellings, few parking spots for residents or commuters) the parking situation will be truly dire as commuter cars are likely to clog the whole surrounding neighborhood.

Those of us in the neighborhood, who shop, vote, work and play here are generally opposed to having our quality of life curtailed for a plan that has gotten mixed to negative reviews for safety. **In fact in a recent zoom meeting there was a poll taken regarding various options for Hopkins Street. The majority vote (52%) said, "Make No Changes"! Farid, the city's transportation official seemed dismissive of this result and said something to the effect that it would have NO effect on the outcome.** This response did not inspire confidence that dissenting neighbor's views would be taken seriously. And of course we, as a collection of the locals most immediately affected by the plan, cannot hope to make the advocacy splash that the very well organized and tenacious bike lobby can. Particularly since they can call on their supporters from across the region and state to weigh in-- people who have never visited the corridor. They have zeal and (mostly) youth on their side. **But the plan is not balanced: one group (the bicycle lobby) receives all the benefit; others (elderly and mobility impaired locals, as well as the Hopkins businesses) receive all the negative consequences.**

Please pave the street (something which everyone including bicyclists makes a first priority), then make some modest common sense safety changes which all agree on. And then evaluate the result before costly and permanent measures are taken which limit access for many and which will almost certainly harm the local businesses. **A number of people have suggested alternate routes for the bike lanes, but bicyclists have vetoed these for making them go a block or two out of their way, or being uphill.** Meanwhile they patronizingly tell us creaky oldsters that we can easily walk a few extra blocks uphill in the rain with our purchases.

**I hope that the Commission on Aging will do its best to stand up for your constituency (which is heavily represented in this part of Berkeley) and mitigate the damage to us which will result from the Hopkins Plan as currently proposed.**

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Marianne (Kary) Schulman

---

Dear all,

Am extremely concerned about the proposed cycle plan for the Hopkins Corridor. We, and many nearby residents did not learn of this plan until late spring of 2022. Am baffled that the City of Berkeley failed to reach out for our input previously. Residents do pay attention to city news, some said they only learned about the Corridor plan via platforms like ND.

Discussions apparently started in 2020, our household did not even receive the Fall email survey.

I don't know anyone who doesn't support more bike lanes unless the specific site presents multiple problems. I lived (and cycled) in Davis, CA for over 10 years, but the infrastructure was planned in the late 60's. This proposal would force two way cycle tracks onto dense city areas with insufficient space (like shopping district), and I have not seen any studies of alternatives, like short by passes. The city has provided only 2 months (Dec.-Jan) for comments after the Dec. meeting when many people are only NOW realizing its possible repercussions.

Some avid cyclists in the larger Berkeley community, who worked on the Berkeley Bike plan, do not feel this proposal makes sense in the Hopkins location. Many residents want to rationally

consider alternatives in a way that will benefit *all*: pedestrians, cyclists, seniors, drivers. There is no miracle panacea, but there can be further planning where no one loses everything, though not everyone will get *everything* they want.

Some residents a block from Hopkins support possible alternatives.

A small number of extreme cyclists active on ND declare that anyone who drives necessarily is a lazy, selfish polluter, even if they themselves drive cars and bike recreationally. Many residents, like my family, use electric or hybrid cars when commuting. Our household walks to Hopkins for shopping.

One vocal advocate of the proposal, Todd Andrews, posted my location on Nextdoor and suggested he could walk to see what my driveway is like (?) Perhaps implying that since I have a driveway, I have no right to comment, tho some ND users felt he was trying to intimidate me.

---

100% of the parking from Gilman to Northside would disappear. At least 35 spots in front of Monterey Market, the cleaners, and the rest of the residences on upper Hopkins between Monterey and Gilman. Many people have NO idea that the proposal will also eliminate at least **129-132** parking spaces on lower Hopkins, where many elderly reside.

Merchants will lose customers from across town and elsewhere who cannot find parking and go elsewhere.

Lack of parking on Hopkins corridor will disrupt delivery trucks to shops, deliveries to residents, spaces for contractors /plumbers/ caregivers/ visitors etc.

St. Mary's College High school- what will parents now dropping & picking up students at the Monterey/Hopkins intersection do?

Berkeley has streets in very bad condition compromising safety, perhaps particularly for cyclists. Defeat of Measure L = scarce funds to repave streets. Has the city considered paving the worst streets, including Hopkins, to increase cycling safety for many?

Would implementing the expensive Hopkins proposal preclude improving other surface streets?

The City's online document cites studies going back to 2010, from Minnesota, New York City etc.- but where is evidence showing that overlaying these plans will work in a very different location at Hopkins?

[https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Hopkins%20Workshop%204.1%20Presentation\\_20220301.pdf](https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Hopkins%20Workshop%204.1%20Presentation_20220301.pdf)

## ADVANTAGES OF 'COMPLETE STREETS'

A 'complete street' **anticipates and accommodates the needs of all road users**

Travel choices

- Over 70% increase in cycling (National Institute for Transportation Communities, 2014)

- Promotes health benefits from active transportation( Pucher et al., 2010)
- **Safety**
- 90% reduction in cyclist injuries on major streets with on- street parking (Teschke, 2012)
- Over 80% reduction in sidewalk cycling increases safety for pedestrians (New York City Department of Transportation [NYCDOT], 2012)
- Decreased automobile speeding (Minnesota Department of Transportation, 2021)

**Access to local businesses** Improved accessibility and a more welcoming street environment can generate increases in retail sales (NYCDOT, 2014)

Again, most residents in our 'hood only learned of the proposal late in 2022. Not because we don't pay attention, but because we were not notified. From the number of "[savehopkins.org](https://www.savehopkins.org)" signs popping up in the last few weeks, clearly more residents (and merchants) are voicing concern.

Wish I had written to you sooner, but it was extremely difficult to piece together factual information, and there are several conflicting articles online on Berkeleyside etc. Hope some of you have dipped into Nextdoor, though it's unfortunately not searchable and there are at over 800 corridor comments on three diff. threads.

Please listen to residents' concerns. We want to believe your concern is measured and considers all of us. Please hear and address our questions about the Hopkins Corridor plan.

Finally, this article may be of interest to you:<https://www.renehersecycles.com/separated-cycle-paths-who-asks-the-cyclists/>

"..In the discussion about separate or "protected" cycle tracks, it has been surprising that planners and decision makers don't seem to want input from those who actually ride bikes...many experienced cyclists don't want to ride on segregated cycle paths (except in the very rare instances where they actually make sense). For the most part, they prefer to share quiet streets with slow-moving cars, rather than ride on "protected" paths that put them in harm's way at each intersection. And if they have to ride on busy streets, they prefer on-street bike lanes that keep them visible and predictable to other traffic.

On the other hand, if you ask non-cyclists what they would be afraid of – if they were on a bike – many will tell you that it's cars. To those unfamiliar with riding in traffic, it can make apparent sense to "separate" cars and bikes in order to provide "protection." But many non-cyclists don't understand the real risks of riding bikes... which occur at intersections.

...What about those who actually have ridden their bikes for many years? Even in Berlin (above), where cycle paths were mandatory until recently and remain deeply ingrained in the culture, more and more cyclists prefer to ride on the street, rather than use unsafe cycle paths (the path is on the right in the photo above).

Even more experienced cyclists in North American are opposed to segregated cycle paths. When "physically separated cycle tracks" were mentioned on the popular [Bike Portland Blog](#) recently,

the [vast majority of comments](#) was by cyclists voicing their dislike of these facilities – even though the blog post only mentioned the cycle paths in passing.

So why doesn't anybody want to listen to those who actually ride bikes for transportation?... most cyclists are genuinely interested in getting more people on bikes. However, their experience tells them that the "solutions" proposed right now won't work well in North America. Yet their experience and concerns are dismissed without further discussion.

The push for "protected bike lanes" comes mostly from well-meaning architects and planners. Architects and planners tend to see the world through a lense of facilities. That is their job – designing and building things. When they see a problem – getting more people on bikes – their reflex is to design something to make this happen."

Sincerely,  
Grace Munakata

---

I saw that you had recommended a review of plans for bike plans on Hopkins Street before proceeding with the current, highly disruptive plans which do not work for those of us who do not ride bikes, who are disabled, who are elderly, who need safe access to crosswalks and intersections, who are pedestrians—so many of us who live and shop along Hopkins.

Now I have heard that you have endorsed a plan for Hopkins east of Gilman that would include concrete barriers for bike lanes on each side of the street with one land of parking in the middle of the street and with cars between the bike lane and parking?

What happened to looking at alternative streets, basically parallel to Hopkins which would require only painted bikes lanes and would be much less expensive???

I am greatly sadly disappointed to see that interests other bicyclists have so little input, influence and consideration in Berkeley.

Thanks.

Carol Hirth

---

Dear Commissioners:

I am a senior citizen and cringe at the City's recently proposed plan for Hopkins Street, particularly the vibrant shopping district between Gilman Street and McGee Avenue. I urge the Commission to send the letter that I read in your Agenda Packet, and completely support its summary statement:

...[T]here should be very little change to the Hopkins corridor from McGee St to San Pablo Ave. We strongly feel that the simple repaving of the corridor should move forward....

David Brandon  
Resident, District 1

cc:

Councilmember Rashi Kesarwani  
Savehopkins.org

---

Here is the statement I sent to Transp./Infra. Commission this morning.

To Transportation and Infrastructure Commissioners:

Please consider the following points as you debate proposals for “Hopkins West”.

The currently proposed changes to Hopkins Street (East and West, as I will call them) are based on the concept of Complete Streets as explained in the 2017 Berkeley Bicycle Plan (BBP). The Plan’s top priority is “Safety First”. It’s odd then that for both ends of Hopkins increasing bicycle ridership has been prioritized over safety.

The plan approved by the City Council in May (for Hopkins East), actually reduces safety. From The Alameda heading west, bicyclists will have a much narrower pavement to ride on--about FIVE FEET less in both directions. If the proposal is implemented I (and all other cyclists who ride in that lane) will have less wiggle room than we do now, and will be less safe. It is hard to understand how anyone could argue otherwise.

Further, the proposed 2-way “cycle track” for less confident riders is designed at the (state) minimum allowable width (4’ each way). Putting that cycle-track on the south side of Hopkins would, as far as I know, be a novel approach to bicycle management --essentially creating a narrower 2-way (bike) street on an existing 2-way street. (The city has not been able to give me examples of its use anywhere else in California.) In effect, then, the city will be running an experiment with youngsters, with minimum safeguards. (The space given over to the cycle-track, plus additional feet of buffer between the track and parked cars, results in the loss of drivable pavement.) One prominent bike enthusiast recently told me the plan was “not ideal” but “OK”--as a trade-off to get more cyclists on our streets.

There is a serious visibility issue here: Encouraging small children, whose helmets will be hidden from view from the other side of parked cars, to ride in a cycle track of minimal width is simply not a good idea. The cycle track is intended



to attract young children, even while more experienced riders will stay in the middle of the street.

So, cyclists riding in the main travel lane will have less wiggle room and children on the cycle track will be hidden from view from turning drivers. This proposal, if implemented, creates a false sense of security. In reality it is very likely to result in more accidents. This is, simply, a dangerous plan and should be rejected.

Everything I have written for Hopkins East applies to Hopkins West (from the Gilman Y). The only difference is that the narrowing of the main travel lanes is somewhat less, but they will still be narrowed—in both directions of travel. And the particular danger for children in the cycle track at the Hopkins-Carlotta intersection (in the eastern part) will repeat at Hopkins-Acton (in the west).

Finally, as everyone should know, the Hopkins-Monterey intersection can be messy at heavy commute times. But it actually works. Adding that narrow, new two way street (“cycle track”) on the south side of Hopkins will, if nothing else, add more moving “parts” to the picture. Imagine dealing with the situation it creates: after stopping who goes first!?

On a personal note: I am an 84 year old bicycle rider; I have lived just off Hopkins Street for 25 years. I am “in” the retail heart of the Hopkins Corridor neighborhood virtually every day, sometimes multiple days a day—on foot, on my bicycle or in our car. With all due respect, I believe I know the area as well as anyone in the city and can speak with some authority.

I urge you to go back to the drawing board and rethink both proposals for Hopkins—East and West; and urge your City Councilor to hit the pause button. Pave the street ASAP and then come up with a better, safer plan. To proceed with any of the proposals now would be reckless.

Bill Hickman

---

Mayor Jesse Arreguin

Councilperson Rashi Kesarwani & the rest of the Council

Manager Farid Javandel

The City of Berkeley Transportation Commission

The Berkeley Planning Commission

The Commission on Aging

The Commission on Disability

[SaveHopkins.org](http://SaveHopkins.org)

I am writing to express my gravest concerns regarding the City of Berkeley's Transportation Dept. proposal to create a new dedicated bicycle corridor on Hopkins Street from San Pablo Ave to Monterey Ave and likely beyond.

The full implementation of this plan would result in the following:

1. The plan proposes the removal of 136 parking spaces on Hopkins between San Pablo and Monterey Avenues, with disastrous impacts on the residents along Hopkins Street with spillover for probably two blocks on either side of this corridor.
2. The plan places this corridor on a highly trafficked street used by cars at all hours. Frankly, it places bike riders at unnecessary increased risk.
3. For people living directly on Hopkins, on one side, residents will be forced to back across this bike corridor from their driveways, leading to potential car/bicycle incidents.
4. As fourteen feet of travelway will be removed from the street, residents on the south side of Hopkins will be forced to move their garbage and recycling bins across the proposed four foot concrete barrier for collection. This places the bins directly in the eastbound travelway.

The above are three quite negative and unnecessary impacts on the residents of this area.

I would like to point out the obvious benefits of moving this bike corridor 2-3 blocks to the South to Virginia St.

1. Virginia Street is already a designated bicycle boulevard with sharrows, and signage running from Sixth street to Spruce street.
2. The City has already installed a bicycle only signal at the intersection of Sacramento and Virginia, and blocked auto traffic heading east from the North Berkeley BART station via Virginia.
3. The City has blocked car traffic travelling on Virginia at Acton and McGee years ago with concrete barriers, that bikes can pass through. Thus non-residential cars are actively discouraged from using Virginia, thus lowering traffic volumes and speeds.

4. The city is currently installing a traffic light at the intersection of Virginia and San Pablo.
5. In addition to creating a more dangerous situation by using Hopkins, there will be a major expense in building a four foot wide “ramped curb” separating auto traffic from bicycle traffic.
6. The bicycle boulevard on Virginia can be updated for minimal cost, by re-painting sharrows only and perhaps adding some signage. No parking needs to be removed, and no additional curbing would be required. In addition, auto traffic volume on Virginia is much lower than on Hopkins, and thus slower due to the previously mentioned impediments to auto traffic listed above.
7. A connection to the shopping area at Monterey can be made via California Street. It is already a designated bike corridor.

I urge you to discard this ill-advised plan for Hopkins. It will be more expensive, much more impactful, and more dangerous than the Virginia option. The entire neighborhood is up in arms over this absurd plan, which greatly and unfairly impacts the residents of this area.

Sincerely,

Ray Freeman

---

Chairperson Porter and Commissioners:

I wanted to take a moment to thank you all for your thoughtful and engaged discussion of the Hopkins Corridor plan at yesterday's meeting.

As noted throughout the meeting the plan for Hopkins Street, while perhaps originating with the best of intentions, is seriously flawed. I would call just two examples to your attention:

1. Hopkins Street is a designated evacuation route. In the California Department of Transportation's updated December 2020 guidelines for evacuation routes, it is stated: "Complete Streets features provide improvements to the community but have the potential to create challenges in an evacuation. **Consider the use of Class II bike lanes on evacuation routes instead of Class IV as a way of providing an unobstructed pavement width.**"

2. Also from the California Department of Transportation guidelines on the implementation of bicycle infrastructure, and augmented by numerous articles and studies, comes strong caution about the implementation of Class IV Two-Way Cycle Tracks on roads with multiple bicycle/auto conflict points which are defined as driveways and (non-light controlled) intersections. Hopkins Street crosses SEVENTY of these in the section from McGee to Kains alone, not including the ones above McGee to Sutter.

Add to the above the reality that a one-half mile stretch of Hopkins from California/Monterey to Northside would see 100% of its street parking removed, on an entirely residential section, in an already

parking-impacted area of the city, and the plan potentially presents significant challenges for disabled, elderly and other people in our community who, like it or not, depend on their cars.

We believe strongly in making streets accessible for ALL users with sensible and proven strategies. Shoehorning a Class IV Two-Way Cycle Track on a heavily trafficked, almost entirely residential, narrow roadway is neither sensible nor proven. There are many other ways to approach access and we believe the city has done a woefully inadequate job of exploring this for the Hopkins Corridor neighborhood.

Thank you again!

Jim Offel

---

Subject: Hopkins Street Corridor Project – Proposed Bike Track

Dear Mayor, City Council Members, and Commissioners:

We have lived in the Hopkins Street Corridor neighborhood for 30+ years. Laura is a native, born in Berkeley. We are life-long bike riders. In fact, Laura rode her fully loaded bicycle across the entire US from East to West. Now we are recreational bicyclists using trails such as the Ohlone Greenway. We relied on public transit and bicycles for most of our lives only obtaining a car after we retired in our 60s. Even now we walk and take public transit a lot and hardly use our car.

**Comment Summary**

*We strongly oppose the proposed bike track along the entire length of the Hopkins Street Corridor.*

1. We have significant safety concerns if this proposed bike track is approved. In fact, we anticipate a substantial increase in safety risk for bicyclists, pedestrians, drivers, seniors, people with disabilities, children, and pets.
2. There will be major adverse impacts to the currently thriving local businesses and local landlords.
3. There is a total lack of verifiable data and statistics of the current and anticipated use of the proposed bike track. This current and anticipated use is cited as one of the main justifications for the proposed bike track. *We are extremely concerned with the apparent bias in favor of the desires of a specific interest group at the exclusion, and to the extreme detriment of, the local residents and their children, local businesses, landlords, people with disabilities, seniors, and drivers.*

4. There is a total lack of concrete and verifiable data to support the assumption and justification that the bike track will reduce car use, replace car trips with bike trips, or have any notable reduction in greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.

### **Detailed Comments**

#### **Safety Concerns**

The 2017 City of Berkeley Bicycle Plan identifies Safety as the main priority. The proposed bike track is NOT SAFE!

1. The proposed bike track will cross approximately 70 driveways and 9 intersections. There will be a substantial increased risk of hazardous collisions as residents, guests, delivery trucks, and other service vehicles try to enter and back out of low visibility driveways. This hazardous situation will put bicyclists, pedestrians, and drivers at a very high risk of injuries, accidents, and deaths.

2. The concrete track edge and proposed intersection floating islands will introduce a huge number of additional driver and pedestrian obstacles within an already highly congested area. These obstacles represent a major hazard for those with disabilities, seniors, pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers. There is growing evidence that these obstacles can and will be major hazards as is evident from the many skid marks on the already constructed floating islands in the Alameda intersection and bulb outs along Milvia Street near the YMCA. These obstructions are virtually invisible at night especially in the heavy rain. We have already had collisions and near collisions with these obstacles when we could not see them at night or in the heavy rain.

3. The proposed bike track protected by parked cars, as proposed in the East Segment of the Hopkins Street Corridor Plan, is especially dangerous for bicyclists, pedestrians, and drivers. Users of the bike track are completely invisible to drivers and pedestrians when hidden behind these parked cars. *We strongly oppose any bike track with a configuration that uses parked cars as the protective barrier for the track.*

a. Recently Robert was almost run over by a car near the Ashby BART Station because the oncoming car's and Robert's views were blocked by the parked cars on the side of the bike track.

b. A bicyclist hit and rolled over Laura's sister's car hood when the bicyclist materialized into the intersection from behind the parked cars of the bike track. Laura's sister made a full stop at the stop sign and did not see the bicyclist behind the parked cars. She was just starting her turn when the bicyclist hit her car.

4. The removal of 192+ parking spaces for local long-term residents will have major, and potentially life threatening, consequences for seniors and those with disabilities who rely on fast emergency response, access for caregivers and health workers, and easy access to their

own vehicles which may not fit in any off street parking. Please note the claims by the Americans with Disabilities (ADA) community of the Hopkins Street Corridor that the proposed bike track is in violation of the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and would impose a significant burden on their ability to access services and conduct their daily lives.

5. Pedestrians will be placed at increased risk of being hit by all types of vehicles. The Hopkins Street Corridor is already very congested and hazardous for pedestrians trying to cross the intersections. With the proposed bike track, pedestrians will not only have to watch out for 2-way car traffic, but also for 2-way bicycle traffic, including the much faster electric vehicles of all sorts that use these tracks.

6. There is growing evidence that these protected bike tracks, bulb outs and other added road obstructions result in increased response times by emergency vehicles. Fast first responders and emergency response is a matter of life or death!

7. Hopkins Street is a designated Emergency Evacuation Route. We urge the full review and approval of this proposed bike track plan by the Fire Department, Safety Department, and emergency and safety personnel and experts.

8. The bike track and resulting loss of so much existing parking will increase the risk of mugging for vulnerable populations such as single women, seniors, and those with disabilities, that will no longer be able to park near their destinations (e.g. Monterey Market, local businesses) or their residences. Please note that there are a number of high density rental residential properties that do NOT have access to off street parking. These residents depend on street parking near their homes.

9. A two-way bike track hemmed in by a hard curb on one side and hard concrete barrier on the other side on an already congested high volume traffic street is NOT a stress-free bike track. As life-long bicyclists, we would be *afraid* of hitting the hard obstacles and being thrown into traffic! The potential for such accidents is increased by the presence of many low visibility driveways, congested intersections, two-way bike traffic, and the increasing number of fast electric vehicles using these bike tracks. Robert was thrown off his bike in a low visibility driveway crossing by a small truck a few months ago and had leg problems for two months.

### **Impacts on Local Businesses and Landlords**

1. Parking and traffic and pedestrian flow is already a major challenge around the local Monterey Market shopping district. Removal of a substantial amount of parking and an increase in congestion and chaos with the addition of the bike track will have an adverse effect on these vital thriving businesses.

2. We urge the City to fully coordinate with these businesses and other local landlords to ensure the proposed Hopkins Street Corridor Plan and bike track do not have an adverse impact on them.

3. We recommend the City work with the local businesses, surrounding neighborhoods, and local landlords to locate additional parking. One suggestion has been to work with the church at the intersection of Sacramento and Hopkins Streets that has a very large unused empty parking lot.

### **Lack of Data to Support Climate Change Improvement and Increased Bicycling Justifications**

Project proponents state that the proposed bike track will result in a reduction of car use, increased bike use; and therefore, reduce carbon and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change.

1. *There is a total lack of concrete and verifiable data to support these assumptions and justifications.* In fact, the study cited by project proponents evaluated only bicycle commuting for work and states that there was an increase in commuting-related bicycling by *regular* bicyclists NOT an increase in bicycle use by others or an increase in bicycle use for access to amenities, schools, or for recreation.
2. There is a total lack of substantiated data and statistics of the current and anticipated use of the proposed bike track.
3. Given the potential for a significant increase in safety risk posed by the proposed bike track and for major adverse effects on local businesses, residents, and landlords; the City is duty-bound to provide verifiable and substantiated data and statistics to support the underlying increased bicycle use and climate change improvement justifications for the proposed bike track.

We strongly oppose the proposed bike track along the entire length of the Hopkins Street Corridor for the above reasons. We urge you to eliminate the proposed bike track from the Hopkins Street Corridor Plan. Furthermore, we urge adoption of alternative bike routes on less congested noncommercial streets such as the proposed Ada Street alternative.

Sincerely,

Laura Fujii  
Robert Wilkinson  
Albina Avenue, Berkeley, CA.

---

Please share with Commission on Aging commissioners:

Thank you very much for preparing a draft letter condemning the proposed plan to alter the Hopkins Street Corridor.

This plan's lack of consideration for the needs of our senior community (the fastest growing population demographic in Berkeley) as well as local shoppers and local merchants is

appreciated. The plan as proposed by the City of Berkeley is ill-considered and harmful to the community.

Thank you for your support.

Diane Estes  
Berkeley resident for 20 years and counting.  
Current resident, North Berkeley

---

Mr. Castrillon,

Please share this email with the Commission on Aging commissioners.

Dear Commissioners,

As a senior citizen living in North Berkeley along the Hopkins corridor, I cannot tell you how appreciative I am that you took the time to write such a detailed, informative letter to the city council, taking a stand against the corridor plan in its current form.

Many of us have felt that the plan is an assault on those of us who have stood behind Berkeley for so many years, an attempt to discard us in a generational battle that depicts us as no longer relevant and thus disposable. It was wonderful to know we have defenders in city government.

With enormous appreciation,  
Donna DeDiemar

---

Please share with Commission on Aging commissioners.

I am a 76 year old, long time resident of the Hopkins/Monterey community. Although I am currently able to walk to Monterey Market (in good weather), the time may shortly come when I will need to drive (or be driven) to the Hopkins shops. Many of my neighbors are in the same position.

Thank you so much for supporting us and helping make our voices heard.

Alice Gates

---

Please share with Commission on Aging commissioners.

Thank you so much for your strong support detailing how the Hopkins Corridor Plan leaves seniors out. I was able to zoom the Commission meeting personally and wanted to thank those of you on the Commission for your important contribution. If it is true that elders are the largest growing demographic in Berkeley, how has that fact been ignored by City Council members in their decision making? I have found my representative Sophie Hahn most disappointing in her lack of leadership and inability to gauge her constituents' needs.



Internal

Thanks again.  
Leni Siegel

---