



**City of Union City
Bicycle And Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting
on Tuesday, January 17, 2023 at 7:00 P.M.
Virtual Meeting**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Gill at 7:03 pm.

Members Present: Chairperson Mandeep Gill, Vice Chair Tim Swenson, Glenn Kirby, Jo Ann Lew, and Steve Nichols

Members Absent: None

Union City Staff: Marilou Ayupan, Tommy Cho, Jonathan Segarra

BPAC Consultants: Corinne Winter and Christina Guarino (Winter Consulting)

Presenters: Shawn O'Keefe, Ety Mercurio, and Danielle Sanchez (Mark Thomas), Dylan Passmore (Toole Design)

Members of the Public: Andreas Kadavanich (Bike Fremont), Liz Ames (Union City Resident), Richard Tanaka (Union City Resident), Flavio Poehlmann (Fremont Resident), Maria Ramirez (Union City Resident), Monika Aeschbacher (Fremont Resident), Bob Czerwinski (Fremont Resident), Suzanne Wilson (East Bay Parks), James O'Brien (Alameda County Transportation Commission), Robert Prinz (Bike East Bay)

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chairperson Mandeep Gill made a motion to nominate Commissioner Tim Swenson to be the new Chairperson. Commissioner Glenn Kirby seconded, and BPAC members voted unanimously to appoint Commissioner Swenson as Chairperson.

Chairperson Gill then nominated Commissioner Glenn Kirby as the Vice Chair. Commissioner Jo Ann Lew seconded, and all members unanimously agreed. Chairperson Gill chaired this meeting and Commissioner Tim Swenson will chair the next meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. October 18, 2022 BPAC Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Gill moved to approve the October minutes and all past meeting minutes, and the BPAC members voted unanimously in agreement.

Commissioner Kirby stated that he is impressed at the level of detail in the meeting minutes.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a. Members of the public have an opportunity to bring up topics not on the agenda.
- b. Members of the public participating by Zoom wishing to speak should use the "raise hand" feature or dial *9. When called upon, unmute yourself or dial *6.

Andreas Kadavanich from Bike Fremont summarized comments that he had emailed the Quarry Lakes Parkway project team prior to the meeting, which included a detailed analysis of the project's design, particularly around the turning radius for bicycle lanes at intersections.

Union City resident Maria Ramirez asked if the Quarry Lakes Parkway Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document would be discussed during this meeting. Corinne Winter and Marilou Ayupan responded that the revised FAQ will likely be distributed to the mailing list prior to the February BPAC meeting, and it will possibly be an item on the February BPAC agenda.

Ms. Winter also shared that there will likely be additional public outreach coming up specifically for Quarry Lakes Parkway, and those plans will be shared with the mailing list as they get solidified.

5. AB 1234 Ethics Training

- When making a public comment, please state your name and address the first time you speak for the record.
- If possible, please have your video on while speaking.
- Chat will be disabled.

Members of the public can email qlp@unioncity.org if they have any questions or comments related to the Quarry Lakes Parkway project.

6. COMMISSION MATTERS

- a. Committee members have an opportunity to bring up topics not on the agenda.

Member Glenn Kirby shared that he was nominated to be on Alameda County Transportation Commission's (Alameda CTC) BPAC and was approved to be a member of it. He shared that he will attend his first meeting in February, and people are welcome to suggest topics for him to bring to the Alameda CTC BPAC to discuss.

Union City's stay at home order concludes at the end of February. There will not be a meeting in March. The first in person BPAC meeting will be in April or May. The BPAC meeting schedule is currently being finalized, and it will be shared with the mailing list as soon as it is ready.

7. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS & DISCUSSION

a. November 23rd City Council Actions - Quarry Lakes Parkway (QLP) Phases 1 - 4 update

Shawn O'Keefe, the Consultant Project Manager for Union City for the Quarry Lakes Parkway (QLP) project, gave a presentation on QLP Phases 1 - 4. Mr. O'Keefe first shared that the November 22, 2022 City Council authorized the contract amendment of QLP Phases 1 and 2, there is also a new contract for Phases 3 and 4. Mr. O'Keefe then shared key design updates and the status of Phases 1 and 2, presented on the refined design and coordination for Phases 3 and 4, then reviewed the signing and striping plans for Phases 1 - 4.

BPAC Comments:

- Member Tim Swenson: Since vehicle lanes will be going from 12ft to 11ft wide to slow traffic down, was there analysis done on the impact of lane sharing (i.e. lane splitting for motorcyclists)? Decoto Rd. is a great example – if you are on a motorcycle, you can pass through the backed-up traffic. Lane sharing is legal, and narrower lanes can make it dangerous to do so.
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: I'm not familiar with a specific analysis on this. We reduced the size of the lanes as a traffic calming measure. We will look into this and circle back.
- Member Kirby: Looking at the grade-separation on slide 14, the separation elevation requirements for vehicles, buses, and trucks are much greater than they are for bicyclists and pedestrians. The separated bicycle path and pedestrian path are considerably level and separated from the roadway. This will be a very nice experience for bicyclists and pedestrians.
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We will maintain ADA compliance and make it a more pleasant ride. The roadway will be steeper to be able to get out of the grade separation as quickly as possible to create a more level pathway.

b. Quarry Lakes Parkway (QLP) Phases 1-4 Signing and Striping Review (35% design)

Mr. O'Keefe presented diagrams that showed the updated Signing and Striping plan for the 35% design for QLP and walked through these designs explaining each aspect of them.

BPAC Comments:

- Chairperson Gill: Are there places where pedestrians can press a button to cross a sidewalk?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: There is a mid-block crossing between Quarry Lakes Drive and Alvarado-Niles Rd. We have potential future development on the north and the south side. We didn't want to have such a long distance before pedestrians could cross as that would result in jaywalking. We're trying to provide those appropriately spaced mid-block crossings. We have a jog in the middle of the intersection so pedestrians will turn right to see oncoming traffic and ensure safe processing.

- Member Kirby: I've seen jogging crossings on high-speed expressways, and jogging is very effective in getting people's attention. At the Quarry Lakes Drive and QLP intersection, the bicycle lane puts bicyclists in conflict with pedestrians. If the light is green, bicyclists cannot turn right if there are pedestrians present. Who has the right of way between bicyclists and pedestrians? When the light is green, I want the right of way as a bicyclist. I'd like to see a design where I can move out of that bicycle lane back into the travel lane to the left and make the right turn to avoid the mixing zone.
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: Every intersection has a mixing zone, including this one. On Quarry Lakes Drive, the cross-section has a sidewalk adjacent to an at-grade bicycle path. Then you would ramp down in the same way that the pedestrians would ramp down and make that turn. As you head eastbound on QLP, there is a mixing zone. If you are going to go straight through, you would do that movement as well so that pedestrians come down to roadway grade, and then they would wait here before they crossed.
 - Marilou Ayupan's response: This is similar to the protected intersections at Paseo Padre Parkway and Walnut Ave in Fremont. Member Kirby has noted that when he is biking on this street in Fremont, there is no extra space (5ft) on the street, so bicycles are forced in the same mixing zone area with pedestrians. How can we delineate or design this mixing zone so that both users are warned in advance for active bicyclists and pedestrians?
 - Dylan Passmore's response: This is fundamentally how a protected intersection works. Bicyclists would need to yield to pedestrians. This is a 6ft crossing, so it would be minor. In designing it that way, we need to make it clear to the approaching cyclists that they need to yield to the crossing pedestrians, because that is an unsignalized crossing before the pedestrian gets into the refuge to proceed through the signalized portion of the crossing. The signal push button placement will help reinforce that.
- Chairperson Gill: I know there is high density housing around the station, but what is the housing potential here [around QLP]?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: Either side of QLP is zoned for medium density development.
- Chairperson Gill: What I see is one lane going south once you cross the intersection, because there's five lanes, two going to each side, and one going through. Is that right?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: Yes, that's correct. It goes down to one lane at the rail and as it continues down and over the bridge. It's a very short distance between those two intersections, which is why we're putting in the dual lefts and the dual rights, which is not ideal. We tried to eliminate as many dual rights and dual lefts as we could along the alignment and eliminate all right turns if we could. But based upon the volumes and the analysis from the traffic perspective, we had to keep those in to be able to deal with the vehicular operations at the intersections. We eliminated them almost everywhere. But this is a tough one because of that short stretch between Osprey and QLP.
- Member Kirby: How far is it to the grade separation coming from the east? When you're coming from the east, how much of a climb is it going to be up from that previous grade separation to get to the grade here?
 - Mr. O'Keefe response: It's about a 20ft elevation change over a few hundred feet.
- Member Kirby: This section of Alvarado-Niles Rd. is constrained to one travel lane; it seems like there should be two travel lanes continuing to the north.

- Mr. O’Keefe response: As you head south, the bridge over the railroad tracks to the south of here is one lane in each direction. We are making that transition happen at the intersection versus going across and merging.
- Member Jo Ann Lew: How does QLP align with the old Caltrans property that was originally set aside for the East-West Connector? Are you still using most of that same land?
 - Mr. O’Keefe response: We are using the same general alignment. We have looked at refining and reimagining what that cross section would be in between. The land that was determined to be the pathway for the project remains the same.
- Member Lew: At the intersection where Fremont and Union City meet, will people be able to meet there, or will there be a wall? I like what I see in this presentation.
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: There will not be a wall. Fremont is a stakeholder partner. They are taking on part of this project as well, and doing the Decoto Complete Streets design, which was a former segment of the East-West Connector. There are a couple of places where this interface between Fremont and Union City will be; one on Quarry Lakes Drive where it connects in the Quarry Lakes Regional Park at that south side, where it turns into Isherwood. There is one down on Alvarado-Niles as well.

Public Comments:

- Robert Prinz: I’m the new advocacy director with Bike East Bay. The project details are looking good. I am a fan of the protected intersections. We’ve been having a lot of luck with those elsewhere on the East Bay, so I’m happy to see more of those incorporated into this project. Regarding the mid-block crossing, Fremont tried something similar with rapid flash beacons (RFB) multi-lane crossing on Walnut Avenue by the BART Station. That was out of necessity for budget reasons, but it’s not ideal for a project of this scope. I’d rather see a Hawk Beacon (High-Intensity Activated crosswalk beacon) at that location, or something to give bicycle riders and pedestrians the right of way for that crossing, as opposed to expecting drivers to yield to bicycle riders with the RFB but not give them right away. Regarding the dog-legged (off-set) crossing, those don’t work very well for any bicycle riders, especially people with larger cargo bikes who have a hard time navigating the angles. Look at the alignment to make sure that the angles are a little softer. It would also be difficult to accommodate multiple bicycle riders going through this type of intersection at once. I appreciate the reduction in the speed limit, although less than 35-mph would be better. Are there any design features incorporated to achieve the 35-mph design speed in reality?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: We will look into reducing speed with lane width reduction. We will take a closer look into mid-block crossing.
 - Ms. Ayupan’s response: The road profile itself [the road going up and down] will slow down traffic as well.
- Monika Aeschbacher: What is the concurrence of the housing development with the phases of the project? What are you doing for risk management? What if the phases cannot be finished as planned? Will there be any mitigation during construction, especially if there is additional traffic coming from the new housing construction?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: The development opportunity will be within Phase 2. We are still evaluating the overall cost of the project, but we don’t have a full funding plan at this point. We will try to mitigate traffic during construction. We tried to be as thoughtful as we could about each phase and their independent utilities,

especially when providing connections and value in Phases 1 and 2, as well as other benefits in Phases 3 and 4. Regarding traffic during construction, we would mitigate it through stage construction as well as traffic handling which will be thoroughly vetted with the city and stakeholder partners. Phases 3 and 4 are in open areas, so traffic will be less impacted compared to the other two phases.

- Chairperson Gill: Is the proposed housing in the hills [east of Mission] development happening independently?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: Yes, that’s not in our project scope, and I am unfamiliar with that area.
 - Ms. Ayupan’s response: We are only working with the developer City Ventures who made the offer on the Caltrans property.
- Liz Ames: I am concerned with the design of this project and its ability to accommodate 35,000 cars per day as a major arterial. This has long-term consequences. Can the design team elaborate on the maximum number of vehicles QLP can accommodate? It wasn’t clear to me regarding the Ramirez Farm if the Peterson Farmhouse will be sacrificed by Quarry Lakes Drive. You are shifting all of the stormwater on the east side of the BART station to the west side to these retention basins. What are the storm water retention basins designed for? This road is going through main residential neighborhoods, and we are trying to reduce traffic going through neighborhoods. Is it possible to make this a greenway and reduce the roadway to two lanes instead of four?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: We are currently not exploring reducing the roadway to two lanes or looking at a greenway. The surrounding community will benefit from the project’s stormwater retention basins. Alameda Creek used to hold a lot of water, but little water currently goes into it. We are utilizing existing natural resources to help mitigate stormwater. We are moving it from the east to the west side, where it should be within the creek. I will look at the traffic analysis to see the volume of cars that the roadway can accommodate. There is a certain capacity per lane, which I will look into.
- Bob Czerwinski: I am concerned that this road is digging adjacent to the Pacific State Steel EPA Super Fund which ties into the Niles Canyon. This can directly affect Quarry Lakes where we get our drinking water from. To get Union Pacific to approve the shoefly might take longer than you have planned.
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: It will take some time to get to an agreement on the shoefly standards and other aspects, but we do know their process and design standards. Union Pacific can be a difficult agency to work with, but they are a major stakeholder, and we have had success with them in the past. Alameda County Water District is responsible for the aquifer, and we are engaged with them to avoid any impacts to it. We need approval from the Alameda County Water District on any designs around the aquifer.
 - Chairperson Gill: Are you also working with the California Water Board?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: Typically, the California Water Board does not get involved with these kinds of issues. The California Water Board only focuses on issues related to creek matters which is the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay region. The Regional Water Quality Control Board regulates all of the projects that drain into the bay, and this is the main agency that we have been working with when we reimagined the storm water drainage design for the project. We wanted to use the Alameda Creek as an existing resource and be able to put more water into it so we can see the benefits from an ecological perspective to increase water in the natural creek. This agency is one that we will need to satisfy from a permitting perspective.

- Ms. Ayupan's response: We are coordinating with the Department of Toxic Waste and Substance on Phases 3 and 4 as well.
- Andreas Kadavanich: When you have a 6ft bicycle lane next to an 11ft vehicle lane and the only delineation is paint, you effectively have a 17ft vehicle lane. If you are designing curbs to manage turning radius and you are designing them for an 11ft vehicle lane, you will get them wrong. I am looking forward to the next round of designs to see how you will be addressing that issue. It would be helpful if you distributed the materials for something as technical as this before the meeting.
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: Thank you for the thoroughness of your comments. As it relates to the bicycle lane adjacent to the turn lane, we will be looking into that more closely because you are right, that does increase the radius from the cars versus having the fully protected intersection with the bicycles behind the curb.
 - Chairperson Gill: It is a good idea to get the documents out ahead of time. I am not sure if it is possible to raise where the bicyclists will go but this is a valid comment as well.
 - Mr. O'Keefe: We know that this cross section is unique. It is a complicated intersection with a two-way bicycle facility and a sidewalk. Dylan Passmore at Toole Design is an expert on this, as he is solely focused on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Flavio Poehlmann: Three or four years ago, Marilou presented at the Alameda County Transportation Commission, and she said that there would not be double turn lanes, but now almost every turn has double turn lanes. The County has asked you to redo the traffic study which does not have the level of detail that the 2009 traffic study had. The public was not told what the vehicle volumes for the different streets and sections are. Please publish the vehicle volume with detail on the street level. You are prioritizing all the benefits to the vehicles and then try to fix it with green paint.
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: The traffic analysis represents what was prepared in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the traffic study. We eliminated as many of the double turns as we could, except for the one on Mission Blvd. because it is a "T" there. There has been a reduction in the turns as it relates to multiple lefts or rights, but the analysis does dictate the volumes that we need to accommodate.
 - Chairperson Gill: Releasing additional information would be helpful.
- Maria Ramirez: I am concerned you don't have cost estimates for such a high-cost project. Will the farmhouse be sacrificed?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: The Peterson Farmhouse will stay intact within a half mile around it. Quarry Lakes Drive does not go within a half-acre boundary of it.
 - Chairperson Gill: That is good to know that it is being protected. In regards to funding estimates, I believe these will be supplied in May.
 - Ms. Ayupan's response: This is a complex project and funding is limited. There has been funding identified for this corridor through Alameda County Transportation Commission and other agencies. The Caltrans property appraised at about \$86 million will fund or contribute approximately \$59 million to Quarry Lakes Parkway. Union City's experience with complex transportation projects like QLP is to construct the project in phases on what is available in terms of funding. The Union City BART station was roughly \$140-150 million, and we did not build the \$150 million right away, we built the project in phases. We have to be strategic on how we can build these construction projects, and this will be based on approvals by agencies. We cannot simply build something unless we get approval, that is part of the public process. We would have to get a permit from

the Alameda County Water District on whatever we do along the Newark Aquifer, we would have to get permits from Union Pacific Railroad for the grade separations, and we would have to get BART approval for a structure underneath the BART. We are working with all the resource agencies and regulatory agencies, army corps, federal agencies, and California agencies. We cannot start construction until these permits are in hand.

- Member Lew: I appreciate the work that has been done so far for the project. Bicyclists do not have the right of way over pedestrians. I have had many problems with bicyclists. Pedestrians need to be taken care of, we do not want to be hit by bicyclists or vehicles. Help protect us.
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: Thank you for your comment.

8. GOOD OF THE ORDER

Chairperson Gill shared that we are in a new year and a lot of good things happened with the elections in November.

Member Swenson shared that there is a folding bicycle retailer in town called Zizzo. Member Swenson also shared that he saw in the *Tri-City Voice* that there is a bicycle repair session happening on February 28th around Civic Center.

Member Lew thanked Chairperson Gill for his contributions to the BPAC as Chairperson and for improving the meeting minutes. Member Lew also appreciated Chairperson Gill’s engagement with the public, BPAC, and staff.

9. UPCOMING BPAC MEETINGS

- a. February 21, 2023

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm.