



**City of Union City
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting
on Tuesday, June 21st, 2022, at 7:00 P.M.
Virtual Meeting**

1. ROLL CALL

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

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

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

Members Absent: Steve Nichols

Union City Staff: Marilou Ayupan, Jonathan Segarra, Steve Adams, Tommy Cho, Trieu Tran, Carmela Campbell

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

Presenters: Aaron Welch (Aaron Welch Planning), Shawn O'Keefe and Danielle Sanchez (Mark Thomas), Dan Leavitt (ACE Rail)

Members of the Public: Dave Campbell (Bike East Bay), Maria Ramirez (Union City Resident), Andreas Kadavanich (Bike Fremont), Bob Czerwinski (Union City Resident), Flavio Poehlmann, Tony Wong (Union City Resident), Liz Ames (BART Board)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 19th, 2022 BPAC Meeting Minutes

Member Glenn Kirby moved to approve the April minutes. Member Jo Ann Lew stated that a few individuals were incorrectly listed as members of the public and need to be categorized as Union City Public Works staff. With the updated participant list, all members unanimously approved the April 19th, 2022 BPAC meeting minutes.

3. 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.

4. COMMISSION MATTERS

- a. Station District Specific Plan Update

Aaron Welch, a consultant who works with Union City, presented an update on the Station District Specific Plan. This is a state and district specific plan that included a full environmental impact report (EIR). Next fall, the Plan, EIR, and associated zoning amendments will all go to council to be approved together. Mr. Welch began by showing a map of the 471-acre Plan area in Union City. Mr. Welch described the inter-connectedness between this plan and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan that was adopted by council last November. The project team intends to link the citywide network that they established in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master plan with the station district area. Mr. Welch then displayed a street design concept before reviewing the project timeline and next steps.

BPAC comments:

- Chairperson Mandeep Gill: I would ride along Alvarado-Niles, and I see on the map that it is a Class IV bicycle lane. The nicest ones are Class I, and they are most attractive to families as well. Have you decided what the separation is going to be?
 - Mr. Welch's response: These decisions will be made over time. Vertical delineation is likely to come further down the line. One of the constraints are street sweepers.
- Member Glenn Kirby: I saw that there was a color marking for what's called a bicycle boulevard. What is the distinguishing characteristic of a bicycle boulevard compared to other facilities? We need to prioritize the safety of bicyclists.
 - Mr. Welch's response: Class III or bicycle boulevards will be on street facilities with traffic calming measures like sharrows. Overall, the city is moving towards having more separated facilities rather than shared use.

Public comments:

- Ms. Liz Ames: BART received a \$300,000 grant to look at job creation on the East Bay, and they targeted Union City, Hayward, and Fremont. By the end of the year, we'll have a better idea of what the specialized job sectors in the different districts are. I would prefer to see the Class 1 connections. Decoto Road should be a top priority to make a complete street. The Safe Routes to BART grant was offered to Fremont, and they elevated the bike path next to the sidewalk on Walnut Avenue, which is near the central Fremont BART station. I support the alignment of Quarry Lakes Parkway (QLP) trail because of the regional park, the Alameda Creek trail system, and Fremont's Class 1 over I-880, parallel to Decoto. We want to connect bicycle routes into recreational areas

into the hills in the future. We want to preserve the horse ranch on the other side of Decoto.

- Mr. Welch's response: We show a Class I along the Quarry Lakes Parkway alignment. Decoto Road is a priority location that will likely require the most effort and money.
- Ms. Liz Ames: I want to enforce the spine and see a completed design for the east side. We are working with Union City to do the at-grade rail crossing. I want to see the design of the spine that goes over those two sets of tracks, the Oakland and Nile subdivision to activate the development area on the east side. On the west side, I want to see the spine continue into the marketplace. I was advocating to put housing there and not on farmland.
- Mr. Flavio Poehlmann: Are there two bikeways to get to the BART station, or are there Class I or Class IV paths to get there? I was looking at Union Square and 11th Street, and those are both Class II, and maybe there's something along the Union Pacific tracks. What's the safest way to get to the BART station by bike?
 - Mr. Welch's response: You identified coming from the backside along 11th Street, which is a Class I and is opening soon. Coming from the front side would be a Class II or separated lane. The Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan highlighted these off-street connections, particularly along the canals and streams. The green connection shown on the map looping north, then east above Alvarado-Niles behind the apartments, along the canal, then left along the train tracks. That is an existing alignment with gravel on it that's ready to be used after figuring out the crossings and permissions with the flood district. None of this requires Union Pacific coordination.
- Mr. Flavio Poehlmann: Is that a Class I trail leading directly to the station for people who are farther away?
 - Mr. Welch's response: Correct. On the east side, the intention is a pedestrian route all the way along the backside of what's called the restoration site where there's currently a large mound. Then parallel to the tracks and then eventually intersecting with the class one at QLP.

5. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

a. ACE-BART Rail Hub Station: Update on proposed ACE connection to existing Union City BART Station

Dan Leavitt, the manager of regional initiatives for the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRRC), presented an update on the ACE-BART Rail Hub Station. SJRRRC is the owner-operator of the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) Rail service. Mr. Leavitt gave an overview of the service and discussed the Valley Rail Program, which includes developing new stations and connecting ACE Rail with other public transit options. Mr. Leavitt then showed a map of California and explained the California Statewide Integrated Passenger Rail and Bus Services program planned for 2029. Mr. Leavitt discussed the constraints for ACE expansion in the South Bay area, then provided an overview of the Southern Alameda County Integrated Rail Analysis (SoCo Rail Study). He concluded by presenting the 2030 vision for ACE's network,

including the extension to the East Bay Hub (Union City BART) and the Valley Link (North Lathrop to Dublin/Pleasanton BART).

BPAC comments:

- Chairperson Gill: Now with remote work being so common, what is the financial liability of ACE?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: Even before the pandemic, a lot of our passengers had a hybrid work environment. Our busiest days are Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. In the longer term, there will continue to be people telecommuting, which could push more people to live in places, like the Valley, with lower cost housing. We are currently serving about 30% of the market pre-pandemic, and that's without the Silicon Valley bringing many people back to work in person. The project with Union City is focusing on the Inner-City market. The San Joaquin's has been one of the best rail services in the country in terms of maintaining ridership – we are over 70% of past ridership. With the connection to high-speed rail and the expansions to the Inner-City market, these are strong opportunities for the future.
- Chairperson Gill: Have you done any surveys regarding ridership projections in Union City?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: That's the next step of the studies underway. The state has invested billions of dollars into developing new infrastructure. We will be running trains on that and connecting with other services. For the investment to be worthwhile, it needs to be high-speed. We've worked hard with the state to make sure that some of the funding stays in the valley to complete this piece.
- Member Jo Ann Lew: Regarding what you said about the Hub, will there be an actual stop at the Union City intermodal station?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: Yes, our plan is to have some of ACE's trains do additional round trips, terminating at Union City with a direct connection to BART.
- Member Lew: The train at Union City won't be going any further, like down to Fremont?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: Correct, it will not. That's where we need the layover tracks.
- Member Lew: Do you think riding the ACE Train is safer than riding BART?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: I can't comment on BART. We've had a good record in terms of safety. Our trains are clean and comfortable. They are safer compared to driving and more environmentally friendly. We typically have less crowded trains. Many of our passengers are repeat passengers and know each other.
- Member Lew: What kind of power do your trains use?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: We run on diesel. We are going to move to renewable diesel soon. In terms of the trains we run, we are now on tier four, which is the cleanest diesel in terms of the locomotives. We are working with the state to go to zero-emission vehicles, whether they are battery powered or hydrogen. We are looking to do a pilot program to have a zero emission a locomotive within the next 10 years.
- Member Lew: Do you plan to run three (3) trains during the non-commute "off-hours"?

- Mr. Leavitt's response: The trains to Union City would be non-commuter trains. Two (2) trains would come in around late morning and then leave in the late afternoon. One (1) train would leave Union City around 7am to Southern California by making the connection to High-Speed Rail in Merced to Bakersfield and then transfer to a bus-bridge to Southern California.
- Member Glen Kirby: Given that this is a bicycle focused group, how does ACE handle bicycles?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: We have bike cars and have a lot of people who use them. Our number one stop is Great America, where people use shuttles, VTA Light Rail, or bike throughout the Silicon Valley.
- Chairperson Gill (via Zoom chat): I want to ask about longer range electrification, but that can wait for later.

Public comments:

- Mr. Poehlmann: How long does it take to reach Merced via ACE Rail, and how does that compare to taking BART down to San José to take High Speed Rail there?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: In terms of connections to San José and other parts of the Bay Area, High Speed Rail doesn't have adequate funding yet. Where the infrastructure is being built between Merced and Bakersfield, it is likely that we will have infrastructure to use this section by 2030. Based on our current operations, it would be about three (3) hours to get from Union City to Merced.
- Mr. Poehlmann: In the first study you showed, the Oakland subdivision would be a double-track. How far will it get a double-track?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: We haven't determined yet if it needs to be double tracked. The frequency of trains we are talking about wouldn't require that.
- Mr. Poehlmann: If the transfer between BART and the ACE platform is grade-separated, can the people in the station district use it to get across the tracks? I much prefer the grade-separated pedestrian crossing.
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: Yes. We are looking at two options – we'll see if they both get carried through the environmental process. We are looking at a second option that would maintain the at-grade crossing. It's harder for us to do that because it becomes tighter with our layover tracks, but we do have that option.
- Mr. Poehlmann: Is funding secured for that? What are the options for funding?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: No, this project is at the planning stage. Union City has discussed funding opportunities for the environmental process. This will be a relatively smaller project cost compared to most rail projects in the Bay Area because it is fitting in with a bigger network connecting to High-Speed Rail. This project is in the State 2022 Rail Plan as a midterm project to be built the next 5 to 10 years. We will work with our partners in the Tri-City area (Fremont, Newark, and Union City) and Alameda CTC to get state and federal funds, as well as other funding sources.
- Mr. Poehlmann: Do you know about how much funding will be needed?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: We will have cost estimates by the end of the year. Our current estimates are around \$200 million for the layover facility, track, and

platform. With the layover track, we will have to remove a portion of a large slag pile in order to get our layover track there.

- Mr. Bob Czerwinski: For more than 10 years, there has been talk about bringing ACE to the Union City BART station. Why now do you have the ridership to justify the cost, and what changed?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: We are now working on ridership. About 10 years ago, ACE just ran from Stockton to San José. ACE now is going to run as far north as Chico and as far south as Merced. That's a huge, additional area that we are covering with these trains. Focusing on InterCity trips is a different model than ACE's service over the last 20 years, which is a commuter service model. The expansion is happening in the San Joaquin Valley and in Sacramento. Parts of the expansion is funded, and we are looking to start construction next year. In the Bay Area, we are constrained right now. ACE has only has four (4) roundtrips (between Central Valley and San Jose); compared to other rail services, it is small. MTC's SoCo Rail Study identify opportunity to add additional round trips. The Union City BART Hub in the Alameda County was determined the most cost effective option to get additional trains into the Bay Area. ACE would like to get one (1) additional train to San Jose.
- Mr. Czerwinski: You will be building on the EPA superfund site for Pacific State Steel.
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: We need to remove slag, which we anticipate will be somewhat costly. We need to do the environmental documentation for this work. We looked at many options, and we believe putting a layover track here is the least impactful option.
- Ms. Ames: I wanted to emphasize the work that Mr. Leavitt has done with Union Pacific and coordinating his work with the train schedules with freight. What is happening with freight right now on rail? I just attended a Bay Area Council sub-committee meeting on freight and the Port of Oakland is looking to expand. They want to create a master plan for ports, since every port has different needs. How are you envisioning the future of freight and how that's going to impact passenger rail?
 - Mr. Leavitt's response: I don't think that's a question for this presentation at this time. We run ACE trains on UP track today and have been working with them for over two decades. We don't believe we're going to be able to get additional trains into San José without major investment, but we can run some additional roundtrips to the Tri-City area without a major investment. We are going to continue working with UP staff.

b. Quarry Lakes Parkway, Phase 1 & 2: Update on project and opportunity for community members to highlight interest in topics for future discussions

Shawn O'Keefe from Mark Thomas is the consultant project manager for the Quarry Lakes Parkway (QLP) project. Mr. O'Keefe began by giving an overview of the Phases 1-5 of this project, then explained how this project will allow for the completion of approximately 2,000 housing units, will enhance bike connectivity, enhance transit service, and support the future ACE station. Mr. O'Keefe then shared the City's vision for the Complete Streets design near BART, and he explained that the project is no longer a high-speed expressway per Caltrans' Highway Design Manual (HDM). Mr. O'Keefe then shared visual renderings of Quarry Lakes

Parkway and Quarry Lakes Drive and a map of the project areas. Mr. O’Keefe described Phases 1-4 from Old Alameda Creek to Mission Boulevard in Union City along with associated costs, current status, and concluded by sharing next steps. Mr. O’Keefe highlighted that Union City has created an email address: qlp@unioncity.org where people can send feedback and questions.

Ms. Corinne Winter from Winter Consulting noted to the group that there will be future meetings to discuss particular aspects of the project in more depth. Ms. Winter asked if people could share what specifically they want more detail about and if there are other agencies, departments, or specific people they would like to hear from.

BPAC Comments:

- Member Lew: What is supposed to come first—the housing at the station district or the completion of Phases 1 and 2?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: I believe that Phases 1 and 2 will be completed before housing development.
 - Ms. Ayupan’s response: The Station East/Integral Housing project (at 7th/Decoto Road) has been approved and is moving forward. We expect Phase 1 (from 7th Street to Mission Blvd) will be completed at about the same time. We are still coordinating with the Gateway developer for Phase 2.
 - Ms. Carmela Campbell’s response (Economic and Community Development Director, Union City): Integral project will be developed in phases and is moving forward. We’re currently going through the design review process. We will see some build out of Station East and other projects coming with Phase 1 and then other portions coming with further phases.
- Member Lew: To confirm, neither of you are going to ask the developers to hold off with their construction plans until QLP is completed, correct?
 - Ms. Ayupan’s response: Correct. It’s beneficial when the Public Works project, such as QLP, is coordinated with the development projects. This helps us coordinate utilities concurrently with the developer and understand what the future development needs are.
- Member Lew: I appreciate that approach. Regarding Quarry Lakes Drive, is that Fremont’s responsibility to finish it?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: No, that’s in Union City.
- Member Kirby: With the current downgrading of the project, it’s no longer a high-speed expressway according to the Caltrans Design Manual. What does that mean from a design and management standpoint? What are the constraints that are lifted? Does that give the city more control over speed limits and intersection design?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: Yes. This process includes narrowing the lanes, providing a more protected intersection, and adding bulb-outs to slow vehicles down. The horizontal and vertical curves are designed to be consistent with a lower-speed facility, which will be posted at 35mph.

- Member Kirby: Thank you, that's encouraging. In the future, I would like to see the design for the intersection. Will the bicyclists be treated more like pedestrians at the intersections or more like vehicles?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We can bring more information on this to the committee in the future.
- Chairperson Gill: What would it cost if it was a two-lane roadway instead?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We have not estimated this cost.

Public Comments:

- Mr. Bob Czerwinski: In 2009, Fremont and Union City created a Mitigation Monitoring Committee which selected three citizens each from Fremont and Union City. I was fortunate that I was the chair of it and still have several presentations that I've made over the years covering many concerns. Are you going to have a public mitigation monitoring committee?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We have looked at the mitigation measures that came out of the 2009 EIR. That is something that we are complying with.
- Mr. Bob Czerwinski: There were issues that weren't addressed as part of the EIR. Channeling under the Pacific State Steel site, for example.
 - Ms. Ayupan: The former process was led by Alameda CTC. Currently, Union City is the lead agency for this project and is working with a number of agencies including DTSC, Union Pacific, Fish and Game, Army Corp of Engineers, Alameda County Flood Control. We are working with all of these agencies regarding the appropriate permits.
- Mr. Czerwinski: There are still issues the public is concerned about, such as water quality. The public needs to have input.
 - Ms. Ayupan: Alameda County Water District would take the lead on the issues related to their jurisdictional rights. We will coordinate with them.
- Mr. Dave Campbell: I would appreciate a follow-up meeting on the cost estimates, particularly for Phases 3 and 4. We think these estimates are too low and not realistic. What is Union City doing to make sure these cost estimates are accurate? What's the process to get a second opinion on those? Have you considered inflation?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We're moving into the final design for Phases 1 and 2 right now. Phases 3 and 4 aren't at that stage yet. These estimates shown were taken from the former project and then the unit costs were updated to reflect mid-2020 costs. We used the old existing design that was supposed to be at 95% and then carry those forward with today's costs. These estimates were created two years ago; current inflation has not been accounted for.
 - Ms. Ayupan's response: This is a very good point you bring up. We will update the estimates when we get into the final design including value engineering. However, we need Alameda CTC approval to begin final design of Phases 3 and 4. We continue to communicate the importance to Alameda CTC staff the importance to begin design of Phases 3 and 4 because of the opportunity to coordinate and collaborate the BART-ACE Station/Trackway project and Line M Bypass system.

- Mr. Poehlmann: In the cross-sections that you showed, there's a landscaping strip between the fast-moving cars and the sidewalk and Class I trail. Will this include trees? The cross-section reminds me of Paseo Padre Parkway, which ended up being a very fast road. As the result of it, nobody uses the sidewalk because the cars are too fast, loud, and scary, so it's completely empty. What's the design speed of QLP? Why does QLP have 11 ft wide lanes, and Quarry Lakes Drive has 12.5 ft wide lanes?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: The planting in the median on the rendering is illustrative. For the 11 ft lanes on QLP, the posted speed will be 35 mph. The cars will be crossing directly adjacent to each other on Quarry Lakes Drive. It's important to provide a little more space for those driving lanes, especially as we consider the curb and the gutter pan of those as well.
- Mr. Poehlmann: Can you provide more details on whether Line M will be mitigated somewhere else, or stay in place with modifications? What's the plan? How long is it?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: With the new roadway alignment coming through, where we tee into at 7th St., the Line M Channel will need to be put into a box culvert for a portion and then moved over to accommodate for the new roadway. It impacts the southern portion of Union City's Maintenance/Corp Yard especially the Union City transit operations. The reconstruction of this channel then connects down the Line M. There is also going to be a bypass line that takes flow from the Line M channel and diverts it over to Old Alameda Creek as a part of the flood control work. The culvert will likely be about 200 feet, just enough to get through the new roadway alignment.
- Ms. Maria Ramirez: I'm a third-generation resident of Union City. Quarry Lakes Parkway is just another name for a freeway connector that has been a part of my life for the last 40 or 50 years. You say the city has confidence, but a lot of us in the city don't have confidence in our leadership at all. With Save the Hills, the city tried to develop the Hills twice; they put it on the ballot, and we showed them that we don't want it. You're going to put 2000 homes in the open space at Quarry Lakes. Why don't you put it where the freeway is supposed to start on Mission and 7th St.? Put the housing closer to BART so that people can walk or ride to BART. There's so much distrust and unhappiness with Union City, which has not been financially strong to take on something like this. For what and for who? It's a freeway connector because the long-term goal is to connect the freeways. This is an old way of looking at life. I'm very unhappy with this.
- Mr. Kadavanich: I want to second Glenn Kirby's comments. It's important to see where the intersection design goes. We're calling this a local roadway, but the design looks like an arterial with four lanes in each direction. With the traffic estimates I've seen, you could make this a two-lane connector and be okay. I'm trying to understand where the four-lane decision is going to lead in terms of the design of the intersections. Also, my understanding is that most of the bus traffic is routed on Decoto. There is the Alameda CTC project to make that a more bus-oriented transit route. But we've had discussions in the past about maybe diverting some of that onto QLP. I'd like to see if that is the case. If you're going to utilize four lanes here, how can we make that be beneficial to bus routes and have dedicated bus routes here? It looks overbuilt as a local road.
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We are coordinating with Union City Transit and AC Transit to look at potential future routing and what that will look like along the

Parkway. Those discussions have already begun. We're looking at their long-range planning. This does provide another parallel route to Decoto, which helps the transit on Decoto.

- Ms. Ames: Last June, there was a change.org petition to have the California Transportation Commission not sell this property for QLP. There were over 1,100 petitioners that signed within two weeks. Where is Highway 84 and can we answer the route to get to the Dumbarton Bridge if Caltrans has relinquished Highway 84 to Fremont?
 - Ms. Ayupan's response: That's a question for Caltrans.
- Ms. Ames: Where is Highway 84? This four-lane expressway is making room for highway traffic to get folks to pass through town from Tri-City, the central valley, over to the peninsula. The city should be responsive to this because we're creating an avenue that could be perceived as Highway 84, the fastest route to get over to Dumbarton Bridge. Separately, it is a mobility policy or goal to reduce VMT and automobile dependency. How are we reducing VMT on this project?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: There is no detailed VMT analysis that has been completed as that wasn't a requirement of the EIR that was completed and certified in 2009. You don't need to go back and reassess the traffic for an already approved project.
- Chairperson Gill: That's a relevant comment. I don't know when the Union City Climate Action Plan happened, but VMT was probably included in that.
 - Ms. Ayupan's response: When we did our revised traffic memorandum, we did a high-level analysis and submitted to MTC. This project does reduce VMT because it provides multi-modal transportation along the corridor, especially with the separated Class I trail. This project and the whole corridor for both Union City and Fremont is in Plan Bay Area. MTC and Alameda CTC recognize this project reduces VMT.
- Ms. Ames commented regarding the Station District meeting VMT requirements.
 - Ms. Carmela Campbells' response: The Station District EIR looks at the VMT generated by the new development proposed. It looks at the new residential units and the new commercial office square footage. Then it establishes what the VMT generation is. That was the analysis in the Station District EIR. For the purposes of the EIR, QLP was included in the Station District EIR as a planned roadway.
- Chairperson Gill: The cost estimates haven't been modernized, if cost continues to be an issue, we may want to look at the possibility of a two-lane roadway instead of four.
- Mr. Campbell (via Zoom chat, sharing future QLP topics): 1) toxic site issues, how will toxic contamination be handled? 2) BART funds—intermodal station funds and BART sidetrack needed to dig road under BART, 3) cost estimates--we would like more detail, particularly phases 3 and 4; 4) aquifer, how are we going to protect aquifer?
- Ms. Ames (via Zoom chat, sharing future QLP topics): Parkland deficits given Union City parkland deficit was at 77 acres in 2018. What is the parkland deficit now? City has an ordinance to maintain adequate parkland. Also, will City be making overriding considerations by not including historic Peterson farmhouse as a national historic site? Restoring old Alameda creek and riparian areas rather than channelizing Line M and building storm retention ponds. San Francisco Estuary Institute has recommended Old

Alameda Creek as habitat for the steelhead trout. How can we maximize the riparian habitat east and west of the BART station? Regarding farmland, does Caltrans, owner of Ramirez Farm, need to be designated as agriculture given the land has been farmed over 4 years? This land is possibly farmland of statewide importance and is nationally significant historic Peterson farmhouse complex. Is Caltrans, as owner, required to apply for a national historic site, so that the Peterson farmhouse complex can be mitigated or preserved. Why can't farmland and an historic farm complex be preserved and protected under CEQA and NEPA? The state/Caltrans property (Ramirez Farm and Peterson farmhouse complex) was purchased with federal funds. This EIR is stating no mitigation needed, but the city did not perform a NEPA evaluation to comply with federal requirements. We have an active farm on farmland, not grasslands, and the proposal is to remove a farmhouse without historic preservation. Hope we can meet with the community on this!

Mr. O'Keefe concluded the discussion by saying that there will likely be more project specifics to report on for QLP every quarter. Ms. Ayupan noted that the project will be agendized in September, including answering questions asked today about the geometrics of the intersections, about coordination with various agencies, and the direction of the project.

6. GOOD OF THE ORDER

- Member Kirby: Like many bicyclists these days, I ride with front and rear cameras on my bike. This gives me a level of confidence that if there's an incident, I could have a video recording to help with an investigation. I learned through an incident that I had that just having a video of an incident isn't always all you need to get somebody cited if they're aggressive towards you. I've been working with an advocacy organization called Cyclist Video Evidence, run by Craig Davis. Craig has presented about the complexities of the video on our bikes as evidence at BPACs in San Mateo County, Santa Clara County and at the Emeryville BPAC next week. Could we have Craig present at a meeting where there's not a lot on the agenda?
 - Chairperson Gill: That sounds like a great topic. Let's have him present in July or in the fall.
 - Mr. Kadavanich: Since this is about traffic enforcement rather than engineering, it would be helpful to have somebody from the police department present so they can answer questions about legality and enforcement issues.
- Ms. Ayupan: Regarding QLP, you are welcome to send comments and questions over email, and we can answer them more thoughtfully and robustly.

7. UPCOMING BPAC MEETINGS

- a. July 19th
 - i. MTC Complete Streets Checklist
 - ii. Union City Safe Routes to School Project
- b. September 20th
 - i. Quarry Lakes Parkway

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:04pm.