Hello,

This message is for MTC Programming & Allocations Committee members, in relation to a Union City project which used TDA3 funding for a paving and bikeway project on Decoto Road.

In April 2024 Union City staff provided a presentation about the Decoto Road project to their bike/walk committee per the MTC requirement associated with Transportation Development Act Article 3 funding applications. At the time, staff clearly described the project to the committee, both verbally and in their presentation materials, as a continuous Class 4 separated bikeway. This included flex posts installed between the bikeway and car travel lanes, as recommended in Union City's 2021 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

However the project was delivered later that year as a Class 2 painted bike lane, without the continuous flex post separation as presented to the committee members several months earlier. Staff did not provide an update to the committee members highlighting or explaining the change. I followed up with city staff on this multiple times and they have refused to acknowledge the project misrepresentation as part of the bike/walk committee's TDA3 application review.

I have also followed up with MTC staff about this, and they have confirmed that they will not be attempting to enforce Union City's TDA3 funding application for a Class 4 separated bikeway project, despite the misrepresentation to the bike/walk committee.

As such Bike East Bay has now published a blog post at the link below which highlights the Union City Decoto Road project among others with similar issues around the East Bay, related to projects that aren't meeting bike plan recommendations nor all ages/abilities bikeway design best practices. This will be republished in Streetsblog soon as a guest post, so it may be getting more attention from the public.

https://bikeeastbay.org/east-bay-cities-on-notice-for-substandard-bikeways/

MTC staff suggested I follow up with Programming & Allocations Committee members, so I am bringing this to your attention now.

I have to express my disappointment with a lack of enforcement in this case, especially after Union City staff blatantly misrepresented the Decoto project to their own BPAC during the TDA3 application review. I don't know how to approach these reviews going forward, if the information provided can't be relied upon as an accurate description of the project in question.

I welcome any follow up or questions you might have on this report. The difference in bikeway classifications may seem minor, but Class 4 separated bikeways are associated with

much better safety outcomes for all road users compared to paint-only facilities, especially on streets with the type of vehicle speeds and volumes we see on Decoto Road. Both NACTO all ages and abilities bikeway standards as well as Caltrans complete streets guidelines recommend against paint-only bikeways on streets like Decoto.

I encourage MTC to follow up with Union City staff on a near term plan for implementation of the Class 4 separated bikeway upgrades on Decoto, as was presented to their bike/walk committee members during the TDA3 funding application review.

I also encourage MTC to develop a different strategy on how these types of issues are addressed going forward, so as to not allow for missed opportunities which leave vulnerable road users at risk due to implementation delays.

Thank you,

Logo

Robert Prinz | Advocacy Director

Pronouns: he/him
Mail: PO Box 1736 Oakland, CA 94604
Office: 466 Water Street Oakland, CA 94607
P: (510) 845-7433 x5 | E: Robert@BikeEastBay.org

****

The **Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Trail** is at risk of weekday closure for all cyclists and pedestrians. The **final vote** is coming up on **March 20**: learn more at BikeEastBay.org/RSR and sign the petition to support bridge access for all!