



**City of Union City
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting
on Tuesday, April 19th, 2022, at 7:00 P.M.
Virtual Meeting**

1. ROLL CALL

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

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Nichols at 7:05 pm.

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

Members Absent: None

Union City Staff: Marilou Ayupan, Trieu Tran, Tommy Cho, Erika Cramer, Coleman Frick

BPAC Consultants: Corinne Winter, Christian Ollano, and Christina Guarino (Winter Consulting)

Presenters: John Pulliam (Kimley-Horn), Shawn O'Keefe (Mark Thomas)

Members of the Public: Dave Campbell, Andreas Kadavanich

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Commissioner Jo Ann Lew made a motion to nominate Commissioner Mandeep Gill to be the new Chairperson, Commissioner Glenn Kirby seconded. BPAC members voted unanimously to appoint Commissioner Gill as Chairperson.

Commissioner Lew then nominated Commissioner Tim Swenson as the Vice Chair. Commissioner Glenn Kirby seconded and all members unanimously agreed. Vice Chair Swenson chaired the meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. November 16th, 2021 BPAC Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Glenn Kirby moved to approve the November minutes, with a second from Commissioner Lew. The November 16th, 2021 BPAC meeting minutes were unanimously approved by all members.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a. 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.

There were no comments from members of the public.

5. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

- a. Union City Boulevard Bike Lanes Update

John Pulliam, a Design Project Manager from Kimley-Horn, presented an update on the Union City Blvd. Bike Lanes Project. He began by discussing the location and purpose of the project. This project is intended to complete the gap between Smith St. and Alameda Creek Bridge with buffered bike lanes. The benefits of this project are numerous, including improving overall bike lane access to local trails, other bike lanes, schools, and parks. This project will also improve lighting along Union City Blvd. and improve drainage infrastructure.

Mr. Pulliam then reviewed the project milestones. On April 15th, the plan was submitted to the city for review. In May, they will begin work on final plans. This summer, they will complete the final design. This fall, they will advertise this project for bid, award, and construction. They aim to complete construction in fall of 2023.

Mr. Pulliam then shared key feedback received at the November BPAC meeting, lighting improvements, bicycle improvements, pedestrian improvements, signal improvements, and drainage improvements.

BPAC comments:

- Commissioner Glenn Kirby: This plan has improved significantly since 2017. Is anyone working on designing storm drain inlets that are specifically going to be placed in bike facilities? We are always having to keep an eye on those drainage inlets.
 - Mr. Pulliam's Response: We are going to be using the City's standard drainage inlets with bicycle-appropriate grates. It's challenging to design inlets with 5ft bike lanes since they take up so much space. It's much easier with 7ft bike lanes and 4ft buffers; it will give cyclists much more comfort.
- Commissioner Kirby: On the drawing, it looks like the bicycle graphic is an arrow pointed in the wrong direction.
 - Mr. Pulliam's Response: It is difficult to see on the drawing at this scale. The markings used are going to be the standard icon used to show bike lanes.
- Commissioner Mandeep Gill: After this project is done, are you going to be checking the difference in traffic on this corridor?
 - Mr. Pulliam's Response: We will definitely do speed surveys to see how the speeds are impacted along the corridor.

- Ms. Ayupan's Response: In general, we hope to encourage a more active, multimodal community. We will also evaluate the non-signalized intersections and if we need to improve the safety at those. Because of the proximity of those proposed locations, there were options to either go north or south to cross the street more comfortably. We need to wait to evaluate the roadways further once the project is complete.
- Commissioner Jo Ann Lew: Will there be grates over the inlets? I ride in Fremont and ride over the grates with thin bike tires and haven't had a problem.
 - Mr. Pulliam's Response: The inlets will have a side opening and a grate over them. The grate is bicycle-safe and won't catch a tire.
- Commissioner Lew: The speed limit is 45mph on Union City Blvd. Is there any consideration of lowering that to maybe 35mph? There is a portion of Union City Blvd., near Smith St., that is 35mph. The speed limit on Ardenwood Blvd., south of Alameda Creek, is 35 mph. Over the creek, it is 35mph as well, but most traffic goes 45-50mph. We could benefit from the speed limit being lowered throughout.
 - Ms. Ayupan's Response: Our goal is to do a speed survey and see opportunities to reduce speeds. The goal is that the 11ft lanes will naturally slow traffic down, but we also hope to reduce the speed limit.
- Commissioner Lew: The bicycle drawing shows that the bicycle traffic is to the right of vehicle traffic. How does the bicycle sensor work when the bicyclist is so close to the curb? What about the cyclists who use the vehicle lanes? I'm not a big fan of putting the cyclists on the right side of the vehicles, but if it's going to be safe for individuals who don't ride often, that's okay. Has this been proven to be a safe solution for bicyclists? Does this prevent vehicles from making a right turn if there is a cyclist present to the right of them?
 - Mr. Pulliam's response: The bicycle sensors use video detection. There will be sensors on top of the traffic poles. The signal engineers draw the areas where they want the cameras to look for cyclists, giving a lot of flexibility to determine these areas. The cameras can look for cyclists in vehicle lanes as well. The cameras will look for cyclists where the bicycle symbols are located on the map. We are implementing these protected intersections for most projects that we are doing. With the bicyclists out in front and to the right of cars, they are in the drivers' field of vision. Vehicles can turn around bicyclists. Instead of merging into the bike lane, they stay to the left of the bike lane and turn around in front of it.
- Commissioner Gill: Is the barrier between the bicycle lane and car lane pylons? I'm for the hardest barrier possible.
 - Mr. Pulliam's response: We are still working on this with the city. We are looking at using the green plastic delineators that are being used in San José. We are also considering a tack-on curb.

Public comments:

- Mr. Campbell (Bike East Bay Coalition): The type of barrier you choose should probably be a city-wide decision. Are you intending to choose a barrier specific to this project or city-wide? If there is a traffic light at this signal, are we able to look at traffic signal timing sequences to determine how long bicyclists will have to wait to turn?

- Ms. Ayupan's response: In terms of vertical delineations, we are considering various options. We are only doing vertical elements at the intersections because MUTCD is constantly changing. We want to be flexible to see what's most appropriate here.
- Mr. Pulliam's response: We are looking at signal timing and will analyze these timings. We can make these timing analyses public for your feedback.

b. Quarry Lakes Parkway

Shawn O'Keefe from Mark Thomas presented an update on the Quarry Lakes Parkway project. This project will allow for the completion of approximately 2,000 housing units. It will also enhance multimodal opportunities, such as improving bike connectivity, enhancing transit service, and supporting a future ACE Station. Mr. O'Keefe then shared the City's vision for the Complete Streets Design near BART, which included numerous goals and multimodal standards. He stated that this project is no longer a high-speed expressway per the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM). Mr. O'Keefe showed the drawings for both Quarry Lakes Parkway and Quarry Lakes Drive, pointing out the multimodal enhancements for each. He reviewed Phases One and Two, including the 7th St. Connection in Phase One and the Gateway Connection in Phase Two. He presented the project phases and costs, current status, and the project schedule.

BPAC Comments:

- Commissioner Gill: The rail underpasses are close to \$100 million, and I think there are two here, so is the \$288 million a realistic total cost?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: There are a lot of utility relocations involved with these projects. Since we are in a green field, there aren't as many utility relocations, so we have a cleaner slate to work with. When we prepared those estimates a couple of years ago, we took the existing design, costs, and quantities, looked at those again, and updated them to current costs. The pace of the increase due to various factors has exasperated that. It's accurate for the information we had at the time, but things have gone up due to utility relocations.
 - Ms. Ayupan's response: Along the peninsula is a more active corridor with Caltrain and freight. Oakland's subdivision is mainly one or two customers a week, so it's not as active. Niles is more active. The right of way is not as wide. It's about 100ft right of way in Oakland and Niles. Caltrain is about a 200ft Union Pacific (UP) right of way width. We don't have to maintain existing traffic as part of the design because there are plenty of at-grade crossings along the Peninsula that handle traffic.
- Commissioner Kirby: Fremont is going through its own separate process in two phases: Decoto Road and 880-intersection. When is Phase 5 of this project going to be under construction?

- Mr. O’Keefe’s response: Phases 3 and 4 are next to provide grade separation and connectivity within Union City. Phase 5 is a discussion for a later date. Phase 5 will likely be about 10 years after Phases 1 and 2.
- Ms. Ayupan’s response: Phases 1 through 4 are more tied to direct land use. Phase 1 is tied to the development of the integral property at 7th and Decoto that’s been entitled. Phase 2 is part of City Venture’s development. We are coordinating with them now as we look at the design of that. Phase 5 will depend on the future plans in Union City and Fremont for development along Phase 5.
- Commissioner Lew: Are you also working with Fremont and updating residents and City Council? Are they on the same timeline that we are, in terms of getting their BPAC updated and getting funding?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: Yes, and we update them when asked to. They don’t have a BPAC, rather they have a Mobility Commission which considers all non-vehicular travel modes. I haven’t been to them in a bit, but have still provided updates. The design is almost complete, but we are waiting for construction dollars to be able to fund the project.
 - Ms. Ayupan’s response: The City of Fremont is currently funded for their design phase and part of their right of way phase is looking for construction dollars. Unless we go back to Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC), their construction dollars are tied to the sale of the Caltrans property. They may have to wait before construction can start on that, unless we can collaborate to advance construction by switching funds from the City and Alameda CTC.
- Commissioner Lew: How about going over Alameda Creek? What is Fremont looking at to bring the traffic over Alameda Creek to Paseo Padre Parkway? Will it be a bridge or street? I know the Fremont residents around Isherwood Way were opposed to anything that had to do with Quarry Lakes Parkway or the re-routing of Highway 84.
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: This will be a new crossing. They have one at Isherwood Way over the Alameda Creek. All phases respect the areas. We conform to the existing 2009 Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
 - Ms. Ayupan’s response: It will be a four-way roadway. The whole project has been environmentally approved. We are looking at ways to reduce the mitigation impacts and implement current mitigation policies and standards and collaborate with regulatory and resource agencies to make it a better project that we implement on our streets and roads.
- Commissioner Swenson: With the realignment of the Quarry Lakes Parkway, you’re going between the Peterson House and Alameda Creek. What’s the impact on those?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: There’s not going to be an impact on either one of those. The Peterson House is a historical resource that we need to protect. We have a boundary around that house. The developers will respect that boundary as well.

Public Comments:

- Mr. Campbell: For Phases 3 and 4, can you update us on when you expect to start design of Phases 3 and 4? Is it true that Alameda CTC requires that before you get

money from them to design Phases 3 and 4, you need the full funding for the whole project lined up. How is the funding looking?

- Ms. Ayupan's response: We'd like to start now but the TEP 21 and 22 must be approved by the board to use that as part of the funding plan. The \$86 million for the Caltrans property needs to happen. We could be paused for a long time, which is unfortunate since there is an opportunity to create housing in this corridor and it might be delayed because of this total funding requirement. There's \$120 million identified for the Decoto Corridor. The three cities each received \$40 million. TEP 21 is the Dumbarton Corridor money that each city gets. TEP 22 is \$75 million that's designated for the intermodal station project, which is mainly complete. We've spent over \$120 million, a portion of which has been transportation dollars. We've dedicated our own funding sources to get to where it is. We have asked staff if we could use \$72 of the \$75 million for the grade separation for Phase 3 and 4, since we believe it's a nexus to access the BART station. When we do the grade separation along the Oakland subdivision line, we need to coordinate with ACE to put in a future commuter rail station to connect to the BART station. We need to create a shoo-fly and remove it after construction is completed, we will then use that shoo-fly track for an ACE spur. We will collaborate more with ACE and Union Pacific.

6. COMMISSION MATTERS

- a. None.

7. GOOD OF THE ORDER

Commissioner Gill: This is a space to talk about the world. I'm very concerned about Ukraine these days.

8. UPCOMING BPAC MEETINGS

- a. May 17, 2022
- b. June 21, 2022
- c. September 20, 2022
- d. October 18, 2022
- e. November 15, 2022

Ms. Ayupan: I would like ACE to give a presentation on their preliminary concept for the commuter rail station at Union City BART and how the vision of having two trains connecting them will support the connection from the Central Valley to the Bay Area. There will be two trains in the morning and two trains in the evening. This will support a connection to BART and a future connection to high-speed rail. They will be presenting to our council on the 10th, and then I'd like them to present to us afterwards in either May or June.

Commissioner Kirby: The Bay Trail project was pulled from the agenda because it wasn't ready yet. Do we know when it will be?

- Ms. Ayupan's response: I try to have only two presentations per night, so I pulled it tonight since the other two projects have priority. The high-level presentation is ready to present.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:24pm.