

APPENDIX C

2025 OUTREACH SUMMARY





To: Eric Anderson, City of Berkeley
 Dani Dynes, City of Berkeley

From: Christopher Kidd, Alta Planning + Design

Date: February 26, 2026

Re: Appendix C: Berkeley Bike Plan Update – 2025 Outreach Summary

Introduction

This memorandum summarizes activities and key findings from public engagement undertaken in the winter of 2025 for the Berkeley Bike Plan Update process. This represents the second phase of outreach for the Berkeley Bike Plan Update, with the first phase taking place in the spring/summer of 2022. Results from this first phase of outreach can be found in the 2022 Outreach Memo.

Engagement in 2025 focused on introducing and validating network recommendations with the public and communicating how public input from 2022 engagement was used to develop recommendations. Engagement events focused on a series of pop-up events to reach the general public and a series of small-scale “listening sessions” to reach specific stakeholder groups within Berkeley. This memo documents the process and outcomes of the 2025 outreach process and how that input will be integrated into the Draft Plan.

2025 Outreach Summary

Outreach for this second phase of engagement ran from January 16th to the end of February in the winter of 2025. During this period, the project team hosted 3 pop-up events, 6 listening sessions, conducted individual interviews with stakeholders who have a disability, presented to the Transportation & Infrastructure Commission, and presented to the Commission on Disability. All project materials were posted to the project website berkeleybikeplan.org, and stakeholder communication included 3 project email blasts, promotion through the City of Berkeley Public Information Officer, event posting to the City of Berkeley calendar, and a story in Berkeleyside.org. A citywide online workshop was held in August of 2025 to coincide with the release of the Draft Plan. A summary of events and input is shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1: 2025 Outreach Participation Summary

Input Method	Number of Events	Number of Participants	Number of Comments
Pop-up events	3	180	97
Listening sessions	6	237	270
Commission Meetings	3	36	25
Emails to project team	--	63 emails	124
Formal Letters	--	11 letters	57
Disability needs interviews	--	4 interviews	49
Public Workshop	1	128	146
Draft Plan Comments	--	313	535
Total	13	972	1,303



The project team collected over 1,300 comments during outreach in 2025, with the most common types of comments summarized below by comment type and by outreach method. Cells have been color-coded for the frequency at which they appeared by event type. As single comments may encompass multiple themes, these tables add up to more than 100% per event type.

Table 2: 2025 outreach comments by theme and comment method

Comment Type	Total Comments (N=743)	Support Bikeway Improvement	Support Intersection Improvement	Roadway Safety Concerns	Pavement or Maintenance	Insufficient Facility or Recommendation	Oppose Project	Bike Parking	Education or Programming
Pop-Up (N=97)	13%	36%	31%	38%	8%	42%	13%	0%	5%
Listening Session (N=270)	37%	18%	17%	40%	7%	40%	4%	1%	7%
Email (N=124)	17%	35%	44%	58%	10%	30%	15%	0%	6%
Letter (N=57)	8%	26%	30%	37%	2%	21%	25%	0%	9%
Disability Interview (N=49)	6%	5%	0%	42%	34%	12%	0%	0%	25%
Virtual Workshop (N=146)	20%	9%	3%	53%	18%	33%	3%	2%	8%
Total		21%	21%	46%	11%	34%	8%	1%	8%

Outreach by Stakeholder Group

Outreach during the winter of 2025 was designed to reach a broad range of stakeholder groups, representative of various challenges, needs, and values. While the three pop-up events were meant to capture input from the public-at-large, the Listening Sessions were held in partnership with specific stakeholders to capture input and participation from their constituents. The table below identifies each key stakeholder group, event dates, and key interests from each group.

Table 3: 2025 Outreach Stakeholder Groups & Feedback Themes

Stakeholder Group	Event(s)	Key Themes
UC Berkeley Community	ASUC Listening Session 2/5/25	- Desire for connected network
Business Community	Berkeley Business District Network Listening Session 2/6/25	- Concern for parking loss & loading
Disability Community	Center For Independent Living Listening Session 2/18/25 Commission on Disability 2/19/25 Disability Interviews (4)	- Accessible facility design - Concern for parking loss & loading - Desire for more active outreach
Senior Community	North Berkeley Senior Center Listening Session 2/19/25	- Concern for parking loss & loading - Desire for more traffic enforcement
Parents & Youth	MLK Middle School Listening Session 2/25/25	- Desire for traffic safety for youth - Desire for connected network
Affordable Housing Community	Berkeley Way Tenants Meeting Listening Session 2/26/25	- Concern for parking loss & loading - Desire for more education & traffic enforcement

Promotion and Outreach

The project team advertised to residents in the following ways:

- A project website update on BerkeleyBikePlan.org - hosting the event schedule and all outreach materials, presentations, and network recommendations
- 3 email blasts to the project subscriber list – with over 530 subscribers
- Coverage of the outreach phase in a [January 21st story by the publication Berkeleyside](#)
- Event promotion through our 3 pop-up event partners and our 6 listening session partners
- Social media advertising conducted by the Berkeley Public Information Officer
- Posts to the City of Berkeley calendar conducted by the Berkeley Public Information Officer
- Project fliers, distributed with all project & outreach partners
- Postcard mailers to 15,000 households in August to promote the Draft Plan release and an online workshop.

All project advertising materials were provided in English and Spanish.



Figure 1: Example of outreach event flyer



Figure 2: Example of social media art for 2025 outreach

Outreach Materials

The Project Team developed a powerpoint presentation and a set of seven poster boards that were used during this phase of public outreach. The powerpoint presentation included:

- An introduction to the Plan Update and the project schedule
- The state of Berkeley’s bike network and progress made since 2017
- An overview of public input received in 2022
- The process & factors used when developing network recommendations
- A description of recommendations for the network, for intersections, and for bike boulevard traffic calming
- A request for feedback and description of next steps for the plan process

The seven outreach boards displayed the following information:

- the current bike network, City progress since 2017, and a summary of input provided during 2022 outreach
- Network recommendations with space to comment
- Intersection recommendations with space to comment
- Bicycle Boulevard traffic calming recommendations with space to comment
- Top 10 priority projects with space for sticker-voting by participants
- A visual glossary showing examples of bike network infrastructure
- A visual glossary showing examples of intersection improvements



Figure 3: Network recommendations poster & Key Projects sticker voting poster

Pop-Up Events

Downtown Berkeley Farmer’s Market – January 25th, 2025

Overview

The project team staffed a table at the Downtown Berkeley Farmer’s Market, held on Center Street between MLK Jr Way and Milvia Street, from 10AM to 2PM. The event was staffed by 2 Alta staff. The project team engaged with approximately 80 members of the public, recorded 43 written comments, and tallied 93 votes for Key Projects.

67% of written comments focused on safety concerns and 6 written comments explicitly opposed certain project recommendations. General themes of comments and discussions included: requests for all-way stop intersections, traffic enforcement needs, concern for access for residents with a disability, comments both in favor and opposed to parking removal, high preference for bicycle boulevards, requests for additional traffic calming treatments, and comments both in favor and opposed to separated bikeways.

A small subset of participants attempted to engage the project team in detailed discussions surrounding the City’s Complete Streets policy and the recommendations development process.



Figure 4: Residents at the Downtown Berkeley Farmer's Market

South Berkeley Farmer’s Market – January 28th, 2025

Overview

The project team staffed a table at the South Berkeley Farmer’s Market on the corner of Adeline Street at Stanford Avenue, from 2PM to 6PM. The event was staffed by 2 Alta staff and 1 City of Berkeley staff. The project team engaged with approximately 60 members of the public, recorded 41 written comments, and tallied 147 votes for Key Projects.

6 of the 41 comments explicitly opposed specific project recommendations. General themes of comments and discussions included: maintenance of bicycle facilities, preference for traffic signals or all-way stop signs, prioritizing Safe Routes to Schools, improving visibility on separated bikeways, the potential to re-locate existing bicycle boulevards, and an overall desire for robust traffic calming at intersections.

Ashby Flea Market – February 8th, 2025

Overview

The project team staffed a table at the Ashby Flea Market, held in the parking lot of the Ashby BART station, from 10AM to 2PM. The event was staffed by 2 Alta staff and 1 City of Berkeley staff. The team was initially scheduled for tabling on February 2nd, but the Flea Market was canceled due to rain. The February 8th Flea Market was the day before the Super Bowl, potentially contributing to lower foot traffic compared to other weekends. The project team engaged with 40 members of the public, recording 15 comments and tallying 17 votes for Key Projects.

Members of the public were generally supportive of plan recommendations, with about half of participants requesting stronger network recommendations on the basis of safety concerns. One participant requested quick-build projects at intersections to prioritize rapid safety improvements.

Listening Sessions

Associated Students of UC Berkeley – February 5th, 2025

Overview

The project team staffed an in-person event in partnership with the Associated Students of UC Berkeley (ASUC). The event was held at the top floor of Eshelman Hall at 2465 Bancroft Way from 5PM to 6:30PM. The event was staffed by 2 Alta staff, 2 City of Berkeley staff, and 1 ASUC representative. ASUC conducted event promotion with the UC student body, with merchants in the Southside business district, and other adjacent community stakeholders. 17 members of the public attended the meeting, which consisted of a presentation followed by a roundtable discussion and posting comments to outreach boards. The project team recorded 64 written comments and tallied 35 votes on Key Projects.

Comments included broad support for network recommendations, requests for more robust intersection treatments, requests for additional separated bikeways, and requests for additional Bicycle Boulevards.



Figure 5: Participants at the ASUC listening session

Berkeley Business District Network – February 6th, 2025

Overview

The project team staffed a presentation during the monthly Berkeley Business District Network (BBDN) meeting, which is held on Zoom. BBDN meetings are convened by the City of Berkeley Office of Economic Development and serves as a clearinghouse for information relevant to business district representatives across the City. The event was staffed by 1 Alta staff and 1 City of Berkeley staff. The project team presented to a group of 22 individuals on the Zoom call.

There were no questions or comments from attendees.

Center for Independent Living – February 18th, 2025

Overview

The project team staffed a virtual workshop hosted by the Center for Independent Living (CIL), a non-profit organization dedicated to disability rights and advocacy. At the recommendation of CIL staff, the event was held as a virtual workshop and was advertised as having a limited number of \$25 virtual gift cards for attendees. The presentation was screened and updated to be fully WCAG-compliant for screen readers. The virtual event was held from 5:30PM to 7:00PM. The presentation was staffed by 1 Alta staff and 2 City of Berkeley staff. 66 individuals attended the event and the project team recorded 27 different comments during the discussion.

Comments focused on three general themes: meaningful engagement with residents with a disability, facility design for blind and low-vision residents, and parking/loading needs for residents with a mobility disability. Residents voiced strong concerns and/or opposition to separated bikeways, including visibility challenges, challenges crossing separated bikeways, and parking/loading adjacent to separated bikeways. Participants expressed skepticism that their concerns would be heeded or that their recommendations would be incorporated into the Draft Plan.

North Berkeley Senior Center – February 19th, 2025

Overview

The project team hosted an event with the North Berkeley Senior Center in conjunction with their recurring luncheon event. The project team worked with North Berkeley Senior Center staff to promote the event through their mailing list and their SMS message list. The project team set up an outreach table with posters in the senior center lobby at 11AM and gave a presentation in the Goosebury Room from 12:30PM to 200PM. The event was staffed by 2 Alta staff and 2 City of Berkeley staff. Between the presentation and the outreach table, the project team engaged with 25 residents, collected 30 comments, and tallied 24 votes for Key Projects.

Comments from the presentation focused on the necessity of street parking for seniors, complaints with an outreach process that focused on Equity Priority Communities, concerns about roadway safety impacts from increases in bicycling mode share, interest in creating separation between drivers and bicycle users, and concern about congestion/parking impacts from future housing growth. One participant called for a 1-year moratorium on bicycle projects until data collection, evaluation, education, and enhanced signage projects were completed.

MLK Middle School BUSD Community Meeting – February 25th, 2025

Overview

The project team hosted an event open to all parents, students and staff of Berkeley Unified School District at the auditorium in the MLK Middle School auditorium, with the event going from 6:30PM-8:30PM. The project team worked with the MLK Middle PTA, the BUSD PTA Network, BUSD Superintendent Ford, Safe Routes to School Task Force coordinator Sheila Islam, and various parents to promote the event to all school communities across Berkeley. More than 75 parents and students attended the event, which was staffed by 2 Alta staff and 2 City of Berkeley staff. 120 written and spoken comments were recorded at the event and 104 votes were tallied for Key Projects.



Figure 6: Participant discussion at the MLK Middle School listening session

Comments at this meeting focused primarily on wanting the City to implement more robust bike network solutions and to implement them more quickly. Comments expressed frustration at City of Berkeley Public Works for not fulfilling past Bike Plan recommendations during paving projects, such as Rose Street. Attendees strongly supported re-starting the Hopkins Street proposal for separated bikeways. Comments focused on designing projects nearby schools with additional emphasis on traffic calming, traffic diversion, and physical separation to provide maximum safety and comfort to youth. There were also competing opinions about the role of traffic enforcement in improving overall safety.

Berkeley Way Affordable Housing Tenant Meeting – February 26th, 2025

Overview

The project team joined a pre-existing tenants meeting for the BRIDGE affordable housing development at 2020 Berkeley Way. The site managers at Berkeley Way put up meeting posters throughout the building and sent email invitations to all tenants. Participants were offered a \$25 gift card for their attendance and participation. The event was staffed by 1 Alta staff and 2 City of Berkeley staff. 17 tenants attended the meeting, recorded 32 comments and questions from participants, and tallied 1 vote for Key Projects.

Comments at this meeting focused on the availability of parking for tenants. The Berkeley Way site has limited on-site parking and residents of the building struggle to find enough nearby street parking. Residents worried about the loss of street parking due to future bicycle projects and worried about the impacts of new housing slated for construction in downtown on the availability of street parking. Promotional posters within the building erroneously stated the City was proposing a new bike lane facility on Berkeley Way itself, and many tenants expressed their fears about the potential for street parking removal. Residents were also very supportive of rebate programs for low-income residents to purchase e-bikes, universal helmet distribution, greater education for foreign UC Berkeley students on rules of the road, and enhanced traffic enforcement.

Virtual Workshop

The project team hosted a virtual workshop open to the public to share the Draft Berkeley Bike Plan Update. The workshop was promoted on the City of Berkeley's social media accounts, newsletter, and a community message. As advertised, participants who registered in advance for the workshop were entered into a raffle for a limited number of \$25 gift cards. One hundred and twenty-eight (128) community members attended the workshop.

The workshop included a 50-minute presentation with interactive polling using Mentimeter. The chat feature was initially available for submitting comments/questions, but was closed after 10 minutes so that the project team could more effectively respond using the Q&A feature. After the presentation, participants were added to breakout rooms for 30 minutes of small group discussions. In the breakout rooms, the project team facilitated discussions and documented questions/comments using a Miro board. A total of 146 comments or questions were submitted either via chat, Q&A, or on the Miro board during the workshop. Key comment/question themes are organized below.¹

Accessibility & ADA Compliance

- **Framing ADA Compliance:** Multiple comments emphasized that when discussing accessibility, it's important to frame ADA compliance as a requirement and not optional.
- **Concerns for people with visual impairments:** Multiple comments raised the concern that concrete bikeway barriers and concrete safety features at intersections may pose risks to visually impaired users.
- **Include design references and future accessibility focused work:** Suggestions included referencing ADA and PROWAG in planning documents, hiring ADA consultants, and conducting accessibility impact studies.

¹ Themes were derived using generative AI

Safety & Traffic Calming

- **Dangerous intersections and corridors:** Locations like Claremont Ave, Gilman Ave, King/Russell were cited as dangerous for people walking and biking.
- **Flashing beacons:** Multiple comments highlighted that flashing beacons are challenging to use as a bicyclist.
- **Traffic calming needs:** Locations like Channing east of MLK, California, Milvia, and Ninth Street were cited as needing additional traffic calming measures to divert vehicles and/or lower speeds, particularly near schools.
- **Diverters vs. traffic circles:** Participants shared a preference for installing diverters over traffic circles, which were seen as ineffective or dangerous.
- **Speeding and enforcement:** Speeding near schools and residential areas was shared as a major concern, with calls for lower speed limits and better enforcement.

Project Implementation & Timeline

- **Project delivery timelines:** Participants about anticipated project delivery timelines and shared frustration with excessive studies leading to delays.
- **Repaving and bicycle improvements:** Participants shared questions about requirements to incorporate bicycle improvements when a street is repaved.

Network Connectivity & Wayfinding

- **Wayfinding improvements:** Participants requested improvements to wayfinding, to facilitate navigating unfamiliar routes.

There were 96 submissions through the interactive polling using Mentimeter during the workshop. The following table summarizes the comments.

Table 4: Summary of Mentimeter Responses

Question	Responses
Top three concerns for the Bike Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve bike safety and comfort for all ages and abilities (62) 2. Improve bike connectivity through a complete low-stress bikeway network (52) 3. Safe Routes to Schools (35)
The weighted average of comfortably biking and rolling in Berkeley (1 = least comfortable, 5 = most comfortable)	3.22
The weighted average of comfortably navigating the existing bike network in Berkeley? (1 = least comfortable, 5 = most comfortable)	2.78
People we heard from during 2022 and/or 2025 outreach	Yes! (30) No, but participated in the workshop (48)
The three tier one projects most important to the attendees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Pablo Avenue – Parallel Routes (35) 2. Telegraph Avenue Corridor – Complete Streets Study (27) 3. Rose Street Bicycle Boulevard Corridor (27)
Key projects the attendees are most excited about	1. Gilman Street (25)

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Sacramento Street at Russell Street (22)3. Sacramento Street at Channing Way (16)4. Derby Street (5)5. Heinz Avenue (3)
--	---

Project Team Emails

The project team received emails through a contact form on the project website berkeleybikplan.org. Between the relaunch of the website on January 16 and the close of the public outreach phase on March 15, the project team received 63 separate emails with over 100 individual comments or recommendations. 18 emailed comments explicitly opposed elements of the bike plan update – or the plan overall. Some emails expressed general project support, while others provided detailed, point-by-point recommendations for specific streets and intersections.

The project team provided individual responses to each email, letting the sender know their comments would be integrated into the public outreach record.

Letters

Independent of the website contact form, seven individuals/organizations sent formal letters to either the director of public works or to City of Berkeley elected officials. These seven letters contained 57 different comments. Letters included:

- One letter from Walk Bike Berkeley focused on improvements to the network recommendations and policy recommendations to streamline delivery
- One letter focused on opposition to the Bike Plan Update and requests for additional CEQA analysis
- One letter focused on the City of Berkeley ending its practice of using chip seal for roadway resurfacing projects on the bike network
- One letter from Berkeleyans for Accessible Right-of-Way (BAROW) focused on accessibility needs for residents with a disability and requested additional engagement specifically with the disability community both during the plan process and during project design for individual projects.

Interviews on Disability Needs

Following the listening session with Center for Independent Living and the presentation at the Commission on Disability, the project team met individually with different residents with a disability who wished to give specific input on bike facility design challenges. The project team attempted to meet with residents experiencing different disabilities to gain a range of perspectives on design challenges. The project team met with Eric Knaresboro (a low-vision individual) on February 26, with Helen Walsh (who suffers from MS and is low-vision) on March 3, and with Kathi Pugh & Rena Fischer (both of which are powerchair users) on March 10. Below is a summary of feedback received during those interviews.

Support for Bikeways:

- All individuals interviewed expressed support for bikeways in general, stressing that opposition to bikeways from the disability community comes not from a fundamental opposition, but instead to the implementation of design details that impact accessibility and safety for users with a disability.
- There was strong support for bicycle boulevard projects, though some concerns with how traffic circles may force driver vehicle paths into crosswalks
- Separated bikeways are sometimes preferable to sidewalks for mobility device users in order to avoid pavement uplift, cracks, or heavy seams. Mobility device users will often ride against the direction of traffic on separated bikeways in order to see bicycle traffic that would otherwise overtake them from behind.

Engagement:

- Work proactively with the Commission on Disability, BAROW, and the Center for Independent Living to engage members of the disability community on the early stages of project design.
- Ensure all presentation materials are WCAG-compliant and always provide verbal descriptions of images and maps during presentations for blind and low-vision participants

Facility Design:

- Consider the needs of slow and wide-based devices, such as e-trikes, mobility scooters, and powerchairs, during separated bikeway design. Limit cross-slopes, design for width that accommodates safe & comfortable passing, and design breaks in vertical elements wide enough for a wide-based device to leave the bikeway.
- Consider the needs of low-vision users when designing separated bikeways. Apply reflective paint and reflectors to vertical elements and use consistent hatch-stripping in buffers for users to pick up in their peripheral vision.

Intersections:

- Consider the needs of low-vision users crossing at separated bikeways. Consider a second row of truncated domes in the crosswalk to delineate between the bikeway and the vehicle portion of the roadway. Ensure curb ramps point directly at each other on either side of a crosswalk. Consider braille messages and/or audible messages for pedestrian push buttons alerting users to the presence of a separated bikeway.
- Consider transit boarding island accessibility as part of separated bikeway design. Where possible, integrate transit boarding island ramp access into a pre-existing crosswalk, using truncated domes to demarcate the extents of the transit boarding island. Where transit boarding island access is not at a crosswalk, consider a raised crossing of the separated bikeway, at sidewalk level, with corresponding yield signage and markings for separated bikeway users.

Parking and Loading:

- Attempt to provide a minimum 4' buffer/path-of-travel adjacent to parking-protected separated bikeways. When placing bollards within a buffer space, place bollards in the edge of the buffer space to maximize path-of-travel width.

- Consider opportunities to establish blue-zone parking stalls adjacent to intersections with pre-existing curb ramps, especially on longer blocks, blocks without mid-block curb ramps, or blocks where driveway slopes exceed minimum requirements for use by a wheelchair

Construction Mitigation:

- Increase enforcement of construction mitigation plans, in particular: accessible crosswalks, audible warning devices announcing crosswalk closures, and sufficiently-wide path-of-travel for temporary walkways or bikeways.

Draft Plan Comments

The Draft Bike Plan was released in August 2025 and during the approximately 7-week public comment period City staff received 316 emails on the draft plan. In addition, seven organizations and groups submitted letters to the City regarding various aspects of the draft plan including design guidelines, recommendations for the bikeway network, and accessibility. In total, these emails and letters resulted in 535 comments that City staff reviewed and analyzed to revise the plan appropriately. Some of the changes reflected in this final draft are the result of these public comments, such as an expanded accessibility recommendations section, and a more streamlined project delivery process section.

Outreach Results

In total, the project team received 590 comments with more than half (57%) coming from listening session events and the virtual workshop. Most comments related to roadway safety concerns (46%) and a desire for the City to introduce more robust bike network projects than were in the recommendations (34%).

All public comments are grouped by event and category in **Table 5**. Opposition to the Bike Plan Update or to specific projects was highest among letters received, comprising 25% of all comments in letters. Emailed comments had the highest emphasis on safety (58%) and support for intersection improvements (43%). Pop-up events had the strongest support for Bikeway facility projects (36%). Interviews with residents with disabilities had a much higher focus on pavement quality & facility maintenance (36%) and the desire for additional programming (26%) than other methods of input.

Table 5: Engagement comment matrix

Comment Type	Total Comments (N=743)	Support Bikeway Improvement	Support Intersection Improvement	Roadway Safety Concerns	Pavement or Maintenance	Insufficient Facility	Oppose Project	Bike Parking	Education or Programming
Pop-Up (N=97)	13%	36%	31%	38%	8%	42%	13%	0%	5%
Listening Session (N=270)	37%	18%	17%	40%	7%	40%	4%	1%	7%
Email (N=124)	17%	35%	44%	58%	10%	30%	15%	0%	6%
Letter (N=57)	8%	26%	30%	37%	2%	21%	25%	0%	9%
Disability Interview (N=49)	6%	5%	0%	43%	34%	12%	0%	0%	25%
Virtual Workshop (N=146)	20%	9%	3%	53%	18%	33%	3%	2%	8%
Total		21%	21%	46%	11%	34%	8%	1%	8%



When calculating input on specific streets, there were 140 total comments recorded. Of these 136 comments the Top 10 streets with the most comments are shown below, representing 52% of all comments. Major streets (such as Telegraph Avenue, Gilman Street, or San Pablo Avenue) or streets that are currently Bicycle Boulevards or proposed for Bicycle Boulevards (Rose Street, Channing Way, Russell Street) were the streets most likely to be most mentioned.

Table 6: Occurrence of specific streets in public input

Street	Occurrence
Hopkins Street	19
Rose Street	12
Milvia Street	9
Telegraph Avenue	6
Gilman Street	5
San Pablo Avenue	5
Channing Way	4
Claremont Avenue	4
Russell Street	4
Alcatraz Avenue	4
Spruce Street	4

When calculating input on specific intersections, there were 131 total comments recorded. Of these 131 comments, the top 8 are shown below, representing 34% of all comments. Three separate intersections on Sacramento Street are identified as high-priority crossings.

Table 7: Occurrence of specific intersections in public input

Cross Street A	Cross Street B	Occurrence
Russell St	Sacramento St	10
Virginia St	MLK Way	9
66 th St	Sacramento St	6
King St	Alcatraz Ave	5
Russell St	Shattuck Ave	5
Channing Way	Sacramento St	4
California St	Dwight Way	3
Virginia St	Shattuck Ave	3



Key Projects

During this phase of outreach, the project team brought a sticker-voting poster board for participants to vote among 10 different “key projects”. These projects were selected due to their proximity to High Injury Streets, their proximity to schools, the street being programmed on the city’s upcoming paving plan, or projects where the City had already secured partial funding. The outreach team solicited input from residents with the intent of using resident feedback to refine this list down to 5 Key Projects which would receive concept design treatments for the Draft Plan. Public input will be incorporated into the final selection of the 5 Key Projects, along with safety, equity, and feasibility criteria.

Table 8: Key Projects

Project Location	Recommendation
Claremont Ave	Complete Streets Corridor Study/Study New Cycle Tracks
UC Berkeley “Back Route” (Piedmont/Waring/Derby/Belrose/Claremont Blvd)	Complete Streets Corridor Study/Study New Cycle Tracks
Oxford St	Complete Streets Corridor Study/ Study Upgrading Existing Bike Lane to Cycle Tracks
Rose St	New Bicycle Boulevard
Southwest Berkeley Bike Blvd (subsequently funded)	New Bicycle Boulevards/potential bike lane connector on Alcatraz
Heinz St	Upgraded Bicycle Boulevard, including Heinz/San Pablo crossing
Derby St	New Bicycle Boulevard
Gilman St	Complete Streets Corridor Study/Study Extending Existing Cycle Track
Sacramento & Channing	Bicycle Boulevard Crossing/Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon
Sacramento & Russell	Bicycle Boulevard Crossing/Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon