



## Alameda County Fire Department

6363 Clark Avenue · Dublin, CA 94568  
Tel (925) 833-3473 · (510) 632-3473 · Fax (925) 875-9387  
[www.acgov.org/fire](http://www.acgov.org/fire)

WILLIAM L. McDONALD  
Fire Chief

October 29, 2020

### SERVING:

City of Dublin

City of Emeryville

City of Newark

City of San Leandro

City of Union City

Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory

Lawrence Livermore  
National Laboratory

Unincorporated Areas  
of Alameda County

Alameda County  
Regional Emergency  
Communications Center  
"Accredited Center  
of Excellence"

Pauline Cutter

Chair, Alameda County Transportation Commission

[pcutter@sanleandro.org](mailto:pcutter@sanleandro.org)

1111 Broadway, Suite 800

Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Public Safety, Quarry Lakes Parkway

Dear Chair Cutter:

As the Fire Chief of the Alameda County Fire Department, I respectfully request that the Alameda CTC support the construction of the Quarry Lakes Parkway project. Quarry Lakes Parkway is a long-planned four-lane corridor that will provide a crucial second point of access to the new high-density housing built and proposed for the area to the Union City BART Station and station district.

The existing Decoto Road creates a major obstacle for emergency service vehicles traveling between the east and west sides of town when the crossing arms on the two railroad tracks malfunction, blocking all vehicle access on Decoto Road thereby diverting emergency vehicles onto residential streets in the Decoto neighborhood that could have a negative impact on fire department response times.

It should be noted that the Quarry lakes Parkway project is also part of the required California Fire Code access roads system for projects in the area. The road is necessary to meet the requirements set forth in Section 503 of the 2019 CFC and Appendix D as adopted by the City of Union City.

Union City lies in an area that is vulnerable to significant earthquakes along the nearby Hayward Fault, heavy freight rail crossing through the Station District, and potential for wildland fires and infrastructure failures (gas and water pipelines) that are becoming more and more prevalent in the Bay Area. Quarry Lakes Parkway will provide a safer evacuation route for Union City in the event there is a need to evacuate portions of Union City. Please review additional initiatives below that positively support the advancing progress regarding the Quarry Lakes Parkway Project:

Pauline Cutter  
October 29, 2020  
Page Two

- Protected bike lanes increase safety for pedestrians, increase business for local shops, and have the potential to reduce traffic
- Reduce roadway traffic; each bike on the road is one less car on the road
- Reduce wear and tear on roadways
- Decrease pollution carbon emissions
- Create a healthier community environment

I respectfully urge you to support the Quarry Lakes Parkway project. This project is necessary to comply with the fire code and is critical for public safety access to station district in Union City and supports established evacuation routes.

Sincerely,



William L. McDonald  
Fire Chief

cc: Mark Evanoff, Union City Deputy City Manager  
Derrick Thomas, ACFD Division Chief

November 3, 2020

Pauline Cutter  
Commission Chair  
Alameda County Transportation Commission

Sent via email: [pcutter@sanleandro.org](mailto:pcutter@sanleandro.org)  
Copy: Tess Lengyel – [tlengyel@alamedaactc.org](mailto:tlengyel@alamedaactc.org)  
Copy: Marilou Ayupan - [mariloua@unioncity.org](mailto:mariloua@unioncity.org)

RE: Letter of Support for Quarry Lakes Parkway Project (previously the I-880 to Mission Blvd East-West Connector Project)

Dear Ms. Cutter,

I have been a resident of Union City for almost 11 years, and I came across the subject project recently with great enthusiasm. I live in the Foothill Glen neighborhood and have been seeking a trail and roadway that lead to Quarry Lakes without going down the very busy Mission Blvd or Decoto Road. These roadways are not conducive to novice bicyclists or pedestrians given the high speeds of vehicular traffic. Safety is a major issue down these roadways.

My husband, children and I constantly take leisurely walks through our neighborhood and would appreciate a route that easily goes to Quarry Lakes. There is also a great need for a complete streets project connecting my neighborhood to Quarry Lakes and am in full support of the Quarry Lakes Parkway Project. I appreciate the planning and engineering work that has been done to date, and I strongly encourage the commission to support this local project. I look forward to the completion and use of Quarry Lakes Parkway.

Sincerely,



Charmaine Zamora  
34240 Aspen Loop  
Union City, CA 94587  
[charmaine.zamora@sbcglobal.net](mailto:charmaine.zamora@sbcglobal.net)

## ACTC PPC Meeting – November 9, 2020

### Comments on Agenda Item 5.2

Dear Commissioners and Staff of the Alameda County Transportation Commission,

We ask that you deny Union City's request for additional funding for the East West Connector and do so until Union City satisfies their responsibilities as smart transportation planners and public stewards of public funding.

In March 2018, the Alameda County Transportation Commission established several necessary conditions for the transfer of the East West Connector project to Union City. Three of these conditions included

1. *"Union City shall evaluate whether an update, amendment or addendum to the current environmental document is required."*
2. *"This evaluation shall include preparation of an updated traffic study covering at least the area from the Dumbarton Bridge to the Union City BART station."*
3. *"As part of the final design work, Union City shall work with transit, pedestrian and bicycle groups to ensure that the design meets the needs of those interests, in terms of connectivity, safety and related concerns."*

Contrary to what City staff claims, ***the above conditions have not been met:***

Instead of an informative and thorough traffic study with documentation, the new Transportation Memorandum provided little hard data, no details on model inputs, and mostly only listed hypothetical benefits that were not supported with data. More specifically:

1. Unlike the original traffic study from 2008, the Transportation Memorandum does not show a breakdown of traffic by street or intersection. It does not even show the expected traffic for the Quarry Lakes Parkway itself. How can the need for the parkway, its size or required mitigations be assessed without knowing traffic volumes on the new parkway?
2. Similarly, the memorandum predicts 18% more peak-hour traffic with the project than without it, but it provides no information where that new traffic will be.
3. This new memorandum does not cover the area to the Dumbarton Bridge, as was specifically required in the transfer agreement with Alameda CTC.
4. The Transportation Memorandum provides little information on model inputs and assumptions. This is important, especially because the original study from 2008 failed to properly predict 2019 traffic counts. It predicted a 19% increase for the no-project scenario, but the 2019 traffic counts show that combined peak hour traffic had actually gone down by 2.5%, partly due to the BART extension to Warm Springs and the

emergence of employer shuttles. Most curiously, the Transportation Memorandum then concludes that the non-increase in predicted traffic is a justification of the project--that makes no sense!

5. It is not clear how the design choices and stated benefits are related to the little data that is actually shown in the Kittelson memo. For example, Paseo Padre Parkway is one of the few roads for which traffic data is shown, but the numbers shown do not support the proposed widening to 6 lanes. Similarly, the Union City portion of Decoto Rd is one of the few sections for which traffic data is provided, but the celebrated congestion relief is only 5.8% for the morning peak hours and an even smaller 3.2% for the evening peak hours. These numbers are smaller than the 8 to 12% validation errors for the Union City-Fremont screenline in the 2019 Countywide Transportation model.
6. The memorandum falsely claims that other transit and active transportation projects in the area are “predicated” on the Quarry Lakes Parkway. All the referenced projects can proceed independently, as are transit improvements on Decoto Road. In fact, transit improvements on Decoto Road are moving forward independently of this project.
7. Transit got a scant ½ page of analysis in the Transportation Memorandum, limited to questionable transit benefits of the project, but omitting how more robust transit improvements could affect the travel demand modeling. This is a main concern of ours. It is our understanding that this project does not help transit and it is our understanding that Decoto Road in Union City is not planned for bus only lanes. Thus, planned transit improvements on Decoto Road in Union City, and the travel forecast of the model, both do NOT necessitate this project.
8. Former Governor Jerry Brown in 2017 signed a law requiring California to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. This is a new environmental condition since the 2009 EIR and it has to be analyzed with alternatives considered. ***It is a legal requirement.*** We are asking for a major transit analysis of how funded transit improvements for the Dumbarton Corridor can reduce driving in the corridor in a way that helps California meet its 2030 clean air target. There is over \$200 million for this.

Rather than an arms-length transportation analysis that could inform the most rational, cost effective and environmentally sensible way to proceed, the Kittelson memorandum appears written to justify a predetermined end-point. The Memorandum appears misleadingly selective in what information it chooses to show or withhold. Despite all this, the little data shown poorly supports the stated conclusions.

The perfunctory nature of the Transportation Memorandum is also problematic because the assessment on the validity of the old EIR was exclusively based on the Transportation Memorandum. But how can new impacts, such as increased traffic in front of the new BART pedestrian entrance, be evaluated without a breakdown of traffic volumes by road? Furthermore, no attempt was made to look for new conditions beyond the traffic study. For example, the construction impact on BART was listed as significant and unavoidable in the old EIR. But now that BART has been extended into Berryessa, significant and unavoidable impacts are less acceptable. These examples illustrate that insufficient effort was put into the EIR review.

The conditions set forth at the March 2018 ACTC meeting were clear and it is important for future credibility that conditions mean something. What has been shared by Union City is far from sufficient. Before any other steps are considered, the first next step should be to demand that a properly documented traffic study, covering the area to the Dumbarton Bridge, is made publicly available, followed by a proper process to evaluate the validity of the 11 year old EIR.

As for the final requirement listed above, Union City has talked with transit, walking and bicycling representatives, but does not have any agreement from us or AC Transit as far as we know, and it is because this project does not *“meet the needs of people walking, bicycling and taking transit.”*

This letter is jointly signed by

Dave Campbell  
Advocacy Director  
Bike East Bay

Mandeep Gill  
Member of the Union City Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC)

Sarabjit Kaur Cheema  
Trustee New Haven Unified School District &  
Former Transportation Engineer for California Department of Transportation

Elizabeth Ames  
BART Director - District 6

Flavio Poehlmann  
Pedestrian Safety Representative on the Fremont Mobility Commission

Eva Kamakea  
Union City Resident

November 6, 2020

Pauline Cutter  
Commission Chair  
Alameda County Transportation Commission

**Sent via E-mail:** [pcutter@sanleandro.org](mailto:pcutter@sanleandro.org)

**Copy to Tess Lengyel:** [tlengyel@alamedactc.org](mailto:tlengyel@alamedactc.org)

**RE: Letter of Support for Quarry Lakes Parkway Project**

Dear Ms Cutter:

I grew up in the Mission Lakes neighborhood adjacent to the proposed Quarry Lakes Parkway (QLP) Project with memories of biking along the Alameda Creek Trail either to Coyote Hills or Niles. My siblings and I even used to ride along the paved trail adjacent to Old Alameda Creek. I still reside in the City of Fremont, travel locally within the Tri-City area, and have commuted to local Bay Area cities such as Oakland, Pleasanton, and San Jose.

The residents of Fremont that travel between Fremont, Union City, and Hayward know that there are limited options to cross UPRR railroad tracks and the Alameda County Flood Control. Mission Lakes residents must leave their homes early during commute hours just to cross the Isherwood Bridge in a timely manner. Decoto Road has narrow bike lanes, large corner radii, and many curb cuts that present dangerous conflict points between vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians.

I have heard the complaints of Mission Lakes residents that the State Route 84 re-alignment and the addition of the Quarry Lakes Regional Recreation Area (QLRRA) would cause traffic, noise, and parking issues for the residents. However, QLRRA has presented no neighborhood parking issues and the residents of Mission Lakes are one of the biggest users of this park.

I believe the residents of Mission Lakes will greatly appreciate a soundwall to mitigate the sights and sounds of the new QLP roadway and will enjoy less traffic on Isherwood Way since the project will help alleviate vehicular ingress/egress from the neighborhood. It provides the area with a fresh start to incorporate complete streets, which creates better safety and mobility for bikes and pedestrians.

Some of the safety features include less conflict points than Decoto Road, small corner radii, good sight distances, and bike lanes for both commuter cyclists and recreational cyclists. Multi-modal access between Paseo Padre, Station District, and Mission Blvd will also be increased. Finally, the grade separation from BART, UPRR, and Green Street will provide better safety for all users as well as faster response times for emergency vehicles.

I strongly encourage the commission to support this much needed complete streets project.

Sincerely,



Mark Saturnio



california

## POLICE DEPARTMENT

October 27, 2020

Pauline Cutter  
Chair, Alameda County Transportation Commission  
[pcutter@sanleandro.org](mailto:pcutter@sanleandro.org)  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Public Safety, Quarry Lakes Parkway

Dear Chair Cutter:

As the Chief of Police in Union City, I respectfully request that the Alameda CTC support the construction of the Quarry Lakes Parkway. Quarry Lakes Parkway is a long-planned four-lane corridor that will provide a crucial second point of access to the new high-density housing built next to the Union City BART Station.

The existing Decoto Road creates a major obstacle for emergency service vehicles travelling between the east and west sides of town when the crossing arms on the two railroad tracks malfunction blocking all vehicle access on Decoto Road; thereby, diverting emergency vehicles and extending response times.

Union City lies in an area that is vulnerable to significant earthquakes along the nearby Hayward Fault; heavy freight rail crossing through the Station District; and potential for wildland fires and infrastructure failures (gas and water pipelines) that are becoming more and more prevalent in the Bay Area. Quarry Lakes Parkway will provide a safer evacuation route for Union City in the event there is a need to evacuate portions of Union City.

I urge you to support the Quarry Lakes Parkway. This project is critical for public safety access in Union City and as an evacuation route.

Sincerely,

Jared Rinetti  
Chief of Police

CITY OF UNION CITY

34009 Alvarado-Niles Rd • Union City • CA • 94587  
[unioncity.org](http://unioncity.org)





We are Fremont, Union City and Newark residents passionate about improving bikeways in our area so that people will choose to bicycle to work, schools, and shopping.

Nov 6, 2020

To: ACTC Programs and Projects Committee (PPC)

Dear ACTC Commissioners

Below comments are with regards to agenda item 5.2 for the PPC meeting on November 9, 2020, "Approve Allocation for the Plans Specifications and Estimate Phase of East West Connector Project." (Note: We will use the updated term of Quarry Lakes Parkway, QLP, to refer to the project, rather than East West Connector to be consistent with the most recent project plans.)

Bike Fremont is a grass-roots organization dedicated to improving access to bicycling for transportation in the Fremont/Union City/Newark area. Part of our mission is evaluate the impact of significant public infrastructure projects such as the QLP on accessibility and safety for bicyclists.

We have concerns with the proposal to proceed to the next phase, based on insufficient completion of the current phase. The ACTC transfer agreement<sup>1</sup> funding the current phase for \$2.5 million in its March 2018 meeting, stipulated the following objectives:

- 1. Union City will complete the design packages (Segments A-D) to 95% complete.***
- 2. Union City will take over as lead agency for the CEQA document.*
- 3. Union City will prepare an updated traffic study covering at least the area from the Dumbarton Bridge to the Union City BART station.***
- 4. Union City shall determine whether an update, amendment or addendum to the current environmental document is required. Union City shall return to update the Commission on the environmental assessment.*
- 5. As part of the final design work, Union City shall work with transit, pedestrian and bicycle groups to ensure that the design meets the needs of those interests, in terms of connectivity, safety and related concerns.***
- 6. Union City will report to the Commission upon completion of the design work and preparation of a final cost estimate.*

With regards to item 1., there have been several presentations of the plans, most recently at the Union City BPAC meeting on October 20. None of them show a final design of the intersections along the QLP. The October 20<sup>th</sup> meeting was the first one to show at least concepts of what those intersections are meant to look like, based on designs from several other cities. No detail was provided as to how these designs will be adapted to local conditions. For instance, the 3-way intersection concepts shown will need additional provisions for some left turn movements. Intersections are the most safety critical part of any roadway project, as this is where most conflicts occur. Without further design details, we cannot properly do our part for item 5 and

---

<sup>1</sup> Transfer agreement: <https://unioncity.novusagenda.com/agendapublic/AttachmentViewer.ashx?AttachmentID=3449&ItemID=1839>

ensure that the design meets the needs of the local cycling community. It is our assessment that the current design packages have not achieved 95% completion.

This ties into another concern we have raised previously. In our view, the design of the QLP as a 4-lane arterial with a 45 mph speed limit does not make for a good multimodal design. Our preferred alternative is a 2-lane local road with a maximum speed limit of 35 mph (designed with lane widths such that this speed is achieved in real-life). Having fewer lanes vastly simplifies the task of designing intersections that are safe for all road users.

The same concerns have been raised previously by several commissioners, and the traffic study in item 3 was supposed to clarify whether it is truly necessary to have a 4-lane road. However, the study materials submitted to date (Kittelsohn memo<sup>2</sup>) omits this analysis.

Another point the study was meant to address is the regional impact on the transportation system, especially induced demand in the surrounding regional network. For this reason, the study area was extended to include the area west of I-880 up to the Dumbarton Bridge. However, the Kittelson memo merely re-analyses the original study area east of I-880 using an updated version of the Countywide Transportation model. This clearly does not fulfill the requirements of the 2018 transfer agreement.

Besides the failure to meet the goals of the transfer agreement, we also find the study generally deficient. Unlike the original 2008 study referenced in the FEIR, the Kittelson memo provides no raw data (by intersection and road segment) whatsoever, so it is impossible to verify whether the conclusions of the memo are in fact supported by the model. This is particularly confounding for the VMT analysis, which shows no change with the project, despite increased intersection volumes. Kittelson claims that reduced trip distances make up for the increased vehicle volumes, but doesn't actually show how that calculation is performed. And the result likely is very dependent on the assumptions feeding into the calculation. These assumptions currently are not clearly stated. Most importantly, the model needs to be evaluated for a range of assumptions, such that the results can be presented with error margins. In the absence of such error analysis, conclusions can be highly misleading and are prone to bias.

The Countywide Transportation model in fact does error analysis as part of its validation process for the model itself<sup>3</sup>. The acceptance threshold for validation is 20% in most cases. This is just about the same as the error in the predictions of the 2008 traffic study for the 2019 intersection volumes shown in the Kittelson memo. What this means is that if one wants to be certain that VMT's do not increase, the model actually needs to show a 20% reduction. Otherwise the conclusion of "no VMT increase" falls outside the confidence limits of the model.

---

2 Kittelson memo: [https://www.unioncity.org/DocumentCenter/View/4496/23493\\_QLP-Transportation-Memo\\_10-22-2020](https://www.unioncity.org/DocumentCenter/View/4496/23493_QLP-Transportation-Memo_10-22-2020)

3 Countywide Transportation model, 2019 version: [https://www.alamedactc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Rpt\\_Alameda\\_Countywide\\_Model\\_Draft\\_20190110.pdf](https://www.alamedactc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Rpt_Alameda_Countywide_Model_Draft_20190110.pdf), validation is shown in section 6



*We are Fremont, Union City and Newark residents passionate about improving bikeways in our area so that people will choose to bicycle to work, schools, and shopping.*

Given that the QLP design has not achieved the required 95% completion level and that the current traffic study does not meet the stipulations of the 2018 transfer agreement, we respectfully request that ACTC do not proceed with the proposed next phases until these targets have been met.

We also request that the traffic study publish sufficient details and analysis as described above, such that it can be meaningfully analyzed by stakeholders. As explained above, this is actually a prerequisite to finishing the design, since the 4-lane arrangement may not be appropriate to the area.

We are deeply worried that there is a rush to proceed to the next phase without due diligence. We are already seeing signs that this rush is affecting the ability of the public to participate in the process. For instance the October 20 Union City BPAC meeting was called on short notice (outside the regular meeting cycle) following the October 12 PPC meeting and not properly noticed on the city's website. (As of this writing, it is still not listed on the city's calendar<sup>4</sup>). Rather than accelerate this trends, please take this moment to reiterate the importance of following normal processes and ensure that all agencies fulfill their stated commitments.

Sincerely yours,

Andreas V. Kadavanich  
Bike Fremont

---

4 <https://www.unioncity.org/calendar.aspx?view=list&year=2020&month=10&day=20>