



**City of Union City
Bicycle And Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting
on Tuesday, September 20, 2022 at 7:00 P.M.
Virtual Meeting**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Gill at 7:02 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

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

Presenters: Shawn O'Keefe (Mark Thomas), Boris Dramov and Bonnie Fisher (Roma Design Group)

Members of the Public: Dave Campbell and Robert Prinz (Bike East Bay), Andreas Kadavanich (Bike Fremont), Liz Ames (BART Director), Richard Tanaka (Union City Resident), Flavio Poehlmann (Fremont Resident), Maria Ramirez (Union City Resident)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. June 21, 2022 BPAC Meeting Minutes
- b. July 19, 2022 BPAC Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Gill pointed out that he needs to be referred to as Chairperson in the comments of both the June and July minutes. Other than Member Steve Nichols abstaining from the vote because he was absent from both meetings, the remaining BPAC members unanimously approved both minutes.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a. Members of the public have an opportunity to bring up topics not on the agenda.

BPAC members and members of the public recognized Dave Campbell from Bike East Bay as he steps down from his role as Advocacy Director. Robert Prinz will be taking his place. Dave let people know that they can reach him via phone or email. Bike East Bay is having a party in

Oakland on October 8th that he invited everyone present to. More information can be found here: www.bikeeastbay.org/biketopia

Chair Gill, Member Kirby, Member Lew, Ms. Marilou Ayupan, and BART Director Liz Ames, recognized Dave and all of the work that he has done.

Robert, in chat: Everyone is welcome to share their favorite Dave stories and videos here: <https://www.kudoboard.com/boards/2XHYaazH>

- 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.

4. COMMISSION MATTERS

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

There were no commission matters brought up for discussion.

5. PROJECT PRESENTATIONS & DISCUSSION

- a. Quarry Lakes Parkway Update
 - i. Phase 2: Roadway Drainage Design Strategy - Old Alameda Creek Restoration Opportunities incl. Trails & Parks

Boris Dramov and Bonnie Fisher from Roma Design Group, along with Shawn O'Keefe from Mark Thomas, presented an update on the Quarry Lakes Parkway project. When Union City took over this project, the regional Water Control Quality Control Board and other agencies didn't get concurrence on how to do the drainage and water quality treatment. The presentation covered the drainage strategy, Old Alameda Creek restoration opportunities, park and trail connectivity, current project status, and the projected schedule. This process will integrate circulation in a way that can enhance environmental quality. Developing housing is also a component of this project that is being considered.

BPAC Comments:

- Chair Gill: With climate change, we might get bigger floods. Alameda Creek is generally in a big ditch. If we get major floods, what is the plan for that?
 - Mr. Dramov's response: The creek is very deep and dry and has historically handled water much greater. I don't think flooding in the Old Alameda Creek is a concern.
 - Ms. Fisher's response: That was confirmed by the environmental hydrologists that we worked with. It's completely dry and has tremendous holding capacity.
- Chair Gill: We have the creek and then we have retention basins and more shallow areas adjacent that could overflow, is that correct?
 - As part of the drainage system for the new water quality basin, overflow will be released into the creek.
- Commissioner Glen Kirby: I appreciate that this project looks at what's best for the local community. Do the storm drains adjacent to Clover, Perry, Mann, and that entire

neighborhood drain into this area now? Are there implications in terms of the water quality?

- Mr. O’Keefe’s response: The development drains into the creek. There are culverts in multiple areas.
- Commissioner Kirby: Would crossing the creek onto Clover require a bridge or is that just a boardwalk?
 - Mr. Dramov’s response: That would be a bridge.
- Commissioner Kirby: Are there any problems with existing storm drains from that existing neighborhood that are draining into that area now, or are they handled in some other manner?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: There are existing outfalls within the creek section.
 - Mr. Dramov’s response: One of the observations we had when we were walking the creek corridor is there’s an outfall in Fremont from the development right into the creek. The quality of the riparian vegetation was best where the outfall drained into.
- Commissioner Tim Swenson: Once water goes into Old Alameda Creek, how deep do you expect it to be?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: At peak storm, we’re anticipating somewhere around two feet deep, which is very shallow compared to the depth of the creek itself. There are three culverts on the Alameda Creek side that release into the Alameda Flood Control Channel.
- Commissioner Swenson: Will it always have water in it? Or will it be dry with occasional water?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: It will be dry with occasional water. There’s no natural source of water, except for the water that’s coming from the roadway and the development projects.
- Commissioner Swenson: Would it be possible to have signage that talks about the history of Alameda Creek and how much it has changed? There’s another section of Old Alameda Creek that goes from William Cann Park to Sugar Mill Park.
 - Mr. Dramov’s response: Absolutely. That’s a great idea.
- Commissioner Jo Ann Lew: Is the rehabilitation of Old Alameda Creek in phase one or phase two?
 - Mr. O’Keefe’s response: The timing hasn’t been determined at this point. There are opportunities based upon the new flows from the project and the adjacent development to do enhancements to the corridor.
- Commissioner Lew: Are the pictures of the boardwalk meant to be part of the rehab of Old Alameda Creek?
 - Mr. Dramov’s response: No, that’s at the water quality treatment areas between the top of the bank and Quarry Lakes Drive.
 - Ms. Fisher’s response: From Quarry Lakes regional recreational area to Quarry Lakes Parkway is the area we are talking about here. It’s a large area that has an opportunity to have multiple different environments within it.
 - Mr. Dramov’s response: We’re looking at Quarry Lakes Drive as being a great link between the regional recreational area and Arroyo Park. Adjacent to this would be the ability for people to understand how water flows can be treated and then be released into the creek itself.

- Commissioner Lew: We're still going to have Quarry Lakes Drive and Quarry Lakes Parkway as a roadway for cars, right?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: Yes. The basin is adjacent to Quarry Lakes Drive. Quarry Lakes Drive will have its own roadway with sidewalk and bicycle facilities.
- Commissioner Lew: Have you seen the boardwalk adjacent to the Don Edwards Nature Reserve? There's a trail connection to the boardwalk. You should take a look at it. When you rehab the Old Alameda Creek, are you going to remove the non-native plants?
 - Ms. Fisher's response: Yes. Our goal is to replace the invasive vegetation with native vegetation that is very supportive of the riparian values of the area.

Public Comments:

- Mr. Dave Campbell: The group that Bike East Bay has been involved in has concerns about this project. I agree with Commissioner Kirby that this looks a lot better than the freeway that Caltrans was building. When you say that 50% of the land here is for people, you're implying that you're comparing it to the freeway. This project is being challenged because what could we do with this space other than the project you're proposing? Could this all be open space? What could Union City do with the money other than this project? How much is the habitat improvement going to cost? Union City is not allowed to move into the design stage until the project has a full funding plan. Where are you on updating the cost estimates in order to move forward with this project?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: The restoration piece is still at the conceptual level of program engineering. We have not done any detailed cost estimates at this point.
 - Ms. Ayupan's response: Mark Thomas's role is looking at how to save costs. Revising the storm water treatment as they did is a cost savings measure. We're looking at how to minimize reconstruction. When the city is comfortable with the overall design, we will update the overall cost estimate.
- Mr. Flavio Poehlmann: I agree with everything Dave Campbell said. This road is oversized when compared to the status quo. We can capture some rainwater, provide some flood control, but how does that compare to what we have today? All the lengths of the right of way that captures rainwater today that can absorb flood water is essentially going to be replaced by this very small section that we saw here. How much rainwater are we capturing and how much flood protection are we providing compared to today's status quo? What are the maintenance needs for this? Even with 50% put aside for walking and biking landscaping, cars are going to drive really fast on a four-lane straight road. I live in the area next to Paseo Padre Parkway, and people do not use the sidewalk there to walk or bike. When you're next to a roadway with fast cars, that's not the place where you want to leisurely walk. What will actually be built within Segments One and Two?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: Related to the storm water and how it relates to the status quo today, we haven't evaluated that at this point. I imagine this will be some joint partnership between Fremont, Union City, and Alameda County Flood Control. There will be an agreement about long-term maintenance needs. We have full design funding for One and Two, but what will be built out of the creek is undetermined at this point. We don't have any firm answers on cost or timing.

- Mr. Andreas Kadavanich: Relative to trees, I'm concerned about root upwelling and damage to the roadway, which always happens close to the curb where the bike lane or trail is. I'm also concerned about tree debris. Seed pods are a big problem. There are a couple locations in Fremont with sweet gum trees; from mid-October to late November, the bike lanes get covered in the seed pods that street sweepers can't pick up, which makes the bike lanes unusable. What are you doing to ensure the bike lanes and trails stay accessible to people on wheels, like cyclists, scooters, wheelchair users, etc.?
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We are in the process of developing a conceptual landscape plan for the Parkway project that is not completed yet. Those are good concerns that I will take note of.
 - Mr. Dramov's response: If you provide an adequate amount of area for root growth, then the roots won't interfere with the adjacent bikeways. The selection of trees is going to be very important. We want trees that can provide shade to the pedestrian, bikeway, and roadway areas. We don't want to have a heat island effect, which tends to happen when you have a lot of asphalt paving.
- Commissioner Kirby: I want to make a comment relative to someone asking if this could just be open space. This property has been owned by the state for years and was a former highway project. It was just declared as a surplus property. The legislature said that the sale of surplus property must be such that it reimburses the state at market value. I don't know of any scenario where this land would've been relinquished to anybody for a small amount of money to make this open space. The only way this land came into the city's control was because of a housing agreement that helped pay for the roadway project.
 - Mr. Poehlmann's response: There is a Caltrans parcel that was not shown on this map. The creek and land above the creek was not owned.
- Ms. Liz Ames: Regarding the riparian areas, we should think about the riparian corridor. It's not enough to just do a retention basin for storm water overflow from a development we had – we have this right now. To adapt to climate change, we're trying to create new ecosystems. It's not just putting trees around a retention basin that stays dry most of the time. We're talking about taking the hillside drainage from the development on the east side to the west side to create a creek. That's what a riparian corridor is, and we need to start doing that.
- Ms. Ames: I'm really troubled by the city's conflicting policies. I know we want to try to develop housing and do these great projects, but we're increasing our vehicle miles traveled, and we're also developing on land that should be conserved. This is farmland with a historic site. I'm trying to get a balance, and I don't see any compromises. I see a typical development with not a lot of conservation. This is a stormwater retention basin. I would like to see the city do more in conserving some of this land. Maybe we could do a linear park instead. The four-lane expressway is a shortcut from Highway 84, so it's going to induce demand. I hope we can figure out a way to rethink the design of this road that could have less vehicles.
 - Mr. O'Keefe's response: We are required to treat any new storm water that's being created in a way that meets local regulations. No matter what we are building here, we will need to treat the water. This is not happening in the creek; it's happening in the Upland, which is a new water quality basin area between Quarry Lakes Drive and Old Alameda Creek. The former design just had large,

deep basins with chain link fences, which didn't make sense within the community. The current project is a way to have something more context sensitive and still meet the standard requirements of storm water mitigation that are required by the regional board. Of course water is needed for it to be continuously riparian, but we are relying on storm water. The research agencies agreed that this could be a great opportunity to help put water in an area that currently has none to allow for more biodiversity.

- Chair Gill's response: As long as it can be garbage free and mosquito abated, this is certainly nicer than having retention ponds.

ii. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Corinne Winter provided an update on the FAQ for the QLP project. The city staff and consultant team have been putting together a FAQ document from the questions received from the public and through the BPAC meetings. The FAQ still needs to be finalized, and it will either be sent out to people via email to ask for feedback or included in the next meeting.

6. GOOD OF THE ORDER

Commissioner Swenson shared that he will be giving a historic walking tour at 11am on October 15th. The meeting place is at the elementary school. The tour will take an hour and a half to two hours.

7. UPCOMING BPAC MEETINGS

- a. October 18, 2022
 - i. Quarry Lakes Parkway: Intersections and Complete Street Design
- b. November 15, 2022 – TBD
 - i. Note: There are some challenges with scheduling in November and December. It is likely that the next meeting after October 18th will be in January. BPAC members will solidify this scheduling and notify everyone soon.

Mr. Kadavanich asked if bringing in a speaker to present on video cameras and evidence collection related to traffic incidents was still planned. Commissioner Kirby responded that he is working with an organization called Cyclist Video Evidence who will be brought in when they are available.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 pm.