CITY COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 27, 2025

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLISHED AGENDA

Item #13

WS 25-023

Hayward Boulevard Feasibility Study

From: Robert Stevens
Sent: Monday, May 26, 2025 10:45 PM
To: List-Mayor-Council; Hugh Louch ; Alex Ameri
Cc: Cynthia Talmadge ; Robert Carlson ; John Morton ; Elgin Lowe ; Sherman Lewis ; Becky
Ridgeway; Linda Schmid ; David DeLeonardo;
Subject: WS 25-023 - Hayward Boulevard Feasibility Study

CAUTION:This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Thank you for your attention to public comment regard the Hayward Boulevard Feasibility Study. Please find attached my thoughts and exhibits for consideration at the Council meeting.

Thank you,

Robert Stevens

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Alex Ameri and Hugh Louch
FROM:	Robert Stevens (26530 Parkside Drive, Hayward)
CC:	Old Highlands Homeowners Association and Members of the City Council
DATE:	May 26, 2025
SUBJECT:	Hayward Boulevard Feasibility Study (Project Number 05217)

This memorandum addresses the proposed revisions to the Hayward Boulevard improvements, with a focus on community feedback presented during the February 26, 2025, Council Infrastructure and Airport Committee (CIAC) meeting and the April 28, 2025, outreach event at California State University, East Bay. While I appreciate the staff's additional analysis of projected vehicle delays and the modifications made to the proposed design, I remain concerned about the project's overall direction, particularly the selection of the preferred alternative, the segmented planning approach, and the justification for investing public funds.

The project website indicates that the April 2021 community engagement effort identified two top priorities:

- 1. Safer or more comfortable sidewalks and closure of sidewalk gaps
- 2. Reduction in vehicle speeds

Public comments included in the May 27, 2025 City Council staff report continue to reflect these priorities, along with concerns about the current proposal. Key community feedback included:

- Strong opposition to reducing Hayward Boulevard from four lanes to two, with concerns centered on:
 - o Emergency evacuation risks from hillside communities such as Stonebrae and Bailey Ranch
 - Increased congestion, particularly near major intersections (e.g., Farm Hill Drive, Civic Avenue, Carlos Bee Boulevard)
 - o Skepticism regarding the traffic analysis and its assumptions
- Limited support for protected or buffered bike lanes, especially in the uphill direction, due to:
 - o Very low observed bicycle volumes
 - o The steep grade being impractical for all but the most advanced or motor-assisted cyclists
 - Preference for alternative bike routes

According to the staff report, the revised concept will convert Hayward Boulevard between Campus Drive and Farm Hill Road into a two-lane roadway—one lane in each direction with dedicated turn lanes, a center median, and buffered Class 2 bike lanes. In select locations, such as near Campus



Flexible bollards along Campus Drive contribute to visual clutter, require frequent maintenance, and offer limited protection for bicyclists from vehicle traffic.

Drive, the project retains two westbound lanes. The elimination of the flexible bollards would provide additional area for evacuation if necessary. Note that the plans contained in the staff report do show posts in the uphill direction through this segment.

While I acknowledge that the traffic data suggest the lane reduction would result in only modest increases in peak-period delay, I am concerned that the fragmented, phased nature of the improvements does not adequately respond to the community's concerns. This approach risks creating a false sense of safety, particularly where facility continuity or emergency capacity is compromised. A corridor-wide, integrated project that addresses the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists should be developed and implemented as a complete package—not as a byproduct of a paving schedule.

A central issue raised by the community is the availability of emergency evacuation routes. The California Department of Transportation's Design Information Bulletin 93 (DIB-93), issued in December 2020, offers explicit guidance on this topic. DIB-93 recommends that evacuation routes serving constrained hillside neighborhoods, particularly those with limited access and high fire risk should maintain or enhance capacity and support dualdirection emergency access. The document identifies four-lane corridors as the appropriate configuration to support both outbound evacuations and inbound emergency response. Given that Hayward Boulevard may serve up to 3,000 households, the implications for evacuation planning are significant. It remains unclear whether Hayward Fire or other emergency services have formally adopted the best evacuation practice or issued guidance consistent with DIB-93. Given the recent wildfires in Southern

California, it is possible that best practices are still in development and further study is needed to plan for evacuation in communities like the Hayward Hills.

My particular focus is the 4,700-foot segment of Hayward Boulevard between Parkside Drive and Farm Hill Road. As a regular pedestrian along this stretch, I am familiar with its challenges. This segment includes the steepest grade of the corridor and has a documented history of serious crashes, including at least two fatalities and frequent run-off-road incidents—particularly in the eastbound (uphill) direction. Staff-reported data indicate the highest 85th percentile speeds occur near Call Avenue (a straight section where the roadway's grade steepens), though the data do not distinguish between travel directions. My own limited radar survey suggests that eastbound vehicle speeds are approximately 10 mph higher than westbound.



The alignment of Hayward Boulevard includes reversing curves, where high speeds and adverse superelevation increase the risk of collisions.



Walking along Hayward Boulevard against uphill vehicle traffic can be intimidating due to high vehicle speeds. Without a physical buffer, the facility is likely to be used only by the most confident and experienced bicyclists.



A vertical and horizontal alignment change near Parkside Drive creates instability for vehicles traveling at high speeds, increasing the risk of run-offthe-road collisions.

Geometrically, as shown in the attached **"Study Area 1"** exhibit, this segment transitions from a straight alignment to a series of reversing horizontal curves with 600-foot radii. High-speed vehicles frequently fail to navigate these transitions, particularly where vertical grades flatten near Conterras Place, compounding the risk of collisions. This is evidenced by repeated incidents of vehicles colliding with fences on the south side of Hayward Boulevard and striking utility poles.

Reducing the number of travel lanes while omitting physical buffers or vertical deflection measures offers no effective traffic calming and may exacerbate risk by encouraging higher speeds in a narrowed cross-section. More concerning, it places eastbound cyclists and downhill-bound pedestrians at heightened risk of vehicle conflict. Based on the corridor width shown in **"Study Area 1 – Hayward Boulevard Cross Section,"** it appears feasible to construct the following:

- Class IV bikeways protected by a raised concrete buffer
- Two westbound (downhill) vehicle lanes
- One eastbound (uphill) vehicle lane
- A center turn lane or median

This configuration would maintain emergency egress capacity, provide physical separation for active transportation users, and enhance operational flexibility.

To further meet community expectations and align with Complete Streets policies, the project should also include the following pedestrian enhancements:

- Sidewalk widening on the south side of Hayward Boulevard between Civic Avenue and the CSUEB campus, as shown in the attached "Study Area 2" exhibit.
- 2. A pedestrian crosswalk at Parkside Drive, consistent with the Federal Highway Administration's guidance in *Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Intersections*, as shown in **"Study Area 3."**

I recognize that resources and phasing constraints are real, but these trade-offs should be weighed transparently alongside community safety concerns. A comprehensive, corridor-wide approach to improving multimodal access and safety on Hayward Boulevard is essential. Implementing piecemeal changes solely because a paving project is scheduled undermines the City's stated goals and shortchanges the community's desire for meaningful, lasting improvements. The City should commit to a full redesign that proactively addresses traffic safety, emergency preparedness, and mode shift—not simply reactive striping revisions.



Completing missing sidewalks, particularly the segment east of Parkside Drive across from Cal State. Visible ground erosion indicates clear and consistent pedestrian use.



Numerous pedestrians cross from Cal State to Parkside Drive. Deferring this crossing to Phase 2 is inconsistent with the project's original goals and undermines efforts to improve pedestrian safety



The sidewalk on the south side of Hayward Boulevard, between University Plaza and Cal State, should be widened to accommodate high pedestrian demand. The current width makes it difficult for users to pass each other without stepping off the sidewalk.



1"=8'



STUDY AREA 1 - HAYWARD BOULEVARD CALL AVENUE TO PARKSIDE DRIVE 1"=60'

BUFFEF 10' TURN/ MEDIAN 6' TRAVEL TRAVEL BIKE - RAISED CURB STUDY AREA 1 - HAYWARD BOULEVARD CROSS SECTION LOOKING EAST

60' CURB TO CURB



STUDY AREA 3 - HAYWARD BOULEVARD AT PARKSIDE DRIVE 1"=40'





Designed Drawn Checker		
Description		
Rev Date		
HAYWARD BOULEVARD	ALIGNMENT STUD	HAYWARD
	City Of Hayward County Of Alameda State Of Californi	d a a irection of:

NONE

D-XXXX-XX

Project Number:

Plan File:

From: Jaymee Li Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 9:39 AM To: Alex Ameri Cc: List-Mayor-Council Subject: WS-25-023

CAUTION: This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

For today's agenda meeting

I'll speak for myself and my family, I'm clearly not for eliminating lanes on Hayward Blvd for safety reasons in the event of a mass evacuation.

Jaymee Varias-Li

Bailey Ranch Resident

From: sara schupack
Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2025 10:10 AM
To: Hugh Louch
Cc: Byron Tang
Subject: Re: Hayward Blvd Study - 2/27 Presentation to Council

CAUTION:This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

I tried to submit a comment, but I never got the email confirmation code.

I feel that the bike lane is being pushed by a noisy, entitled minority. Think how many drivers use that road! I walk a segment of it 2x a day every day with my dog, and see aggressive, impatient driving that will only get worse if there are fewer lanes. I also see bicyclists, 99% of whom do that on weekends, when traffic is very light. They do not need their own lane!

The crosswalks are very important. I still feel that at Spencer Lane, that isn't enough. We need a left turn lane onto Hayward Blvd. Several times, I have almost been hit by cars when crossing not Hayward Blvd, but Spencer lane! Drivers are so focused on getting across Hayward Blvd that they don't even see a human being with her dog.

Thank you,

Sara

From: Sherman
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 5:54 PM
To: Robert Stevens ; List-Mayor-Council ; Hugh Louch ; Alex Ameri
Cc: Cynthia Talmadge ; Robert Carlson ; John Morton ; Elgin Lowe ; Sherman Lewis ; Becky Ridgeway ; Linda Schmid ; David DeLeonardo
Subject: Re: WS 25-023 - Hayward Boulevard Feasibility Study

CAUTION:This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

I don't have time to study this as much as I'd like.

I see no problem with two lanes and curves between intersections if the visual design slows speeds (chicanes, trees, narrowing). Bailey R has two lanes now. The traffic circle works with 2. A single lane has more than enough capacity, 1500 vpd, each way. The farther a driver can see ahead the faster they go. Use stats about reality, not imagination. The speed is controlled by what the driver sees, not signs.

Intersections.

Keep speeds below 30 km/hr (about 25 mph)

Prohibit right on red and make the turn sharp. The stats show death to peds from drivers looking left and turning right.

Have raised platform intersections so bikes, peds, and esp. wheelchairs do not go down and up and the platform acts as a speed hump.

The sidewalks are level to serve people, not cars.

Bicycles.

I don't see a problem with low bicycle use if there were a culture of making it work, which there is not.

Do we hope for a bit of progress and fix it later?

As Jerome Slaughter documents over and over again, there is no problem with steepness. There is a problem with auto speed, bicycle gutters, and connectivity. We don't have connectivity for the Eden Bikeway i to downtown. We don't have a Mission Bl. concept, or an incremental prioritized non-car access to BART.

We're still letting cars slow down buses. It is hard to make a bit work with concept of system.

Traffic control sticks are second rate but better than nothing.

Real separation requires as two foot raised curb with landscaping including trees.

As Slaughter shows, a two way bicycle lane is excellent for emergency vehicles while four lanes can fail du to cars in all four lanes. He show emergency vehicles using the bicycle lane that are designed correctly, about a foot wider that the truck. If the correct cross section used of about 9 feet for bikes and 4 for sidewalks (with a rolled cur between so the effective emergency lane is even wider.