

Susan Gauthier

From: dukfinder dukfinder <dukfinder@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2020 12:33 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: FW: correspondance to be included in 5/5/2020 FCC agenda IMO Rancho Arroyo Parkway
Attachments: Rancho Arroyo Pkwy Alterations letter from Donald Mooney.pdf

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [dukfinder dukfinder](#)
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:16 PM
To: [CClerk](#)
Cc: [Don Mooney](#); lmei@fremont.gov; rdaulton@fremont.gov; tkeng@fremont.gov; vbacon@fremont.gov
Subject: correspondance to be included in 5/5/2020 FCC agenda IMO Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Please include the following items as correspondance received in the packet for Fremont City council Meeting May 5, 2020

- 1) Letter to Mark Danaj from Don Mooney, attorney
- 2) Follow up email to Mark Danaj from Don Mooney, attorney
- 3) 5/4/2020 response from City

Since the response from R. Fierro has expressed a timely response to the concerns regarding work performed and scheduled for Rancho Arroyo Parkway is not possible due to the emergency protocols in place, I will acknowledge that is also the case for any scheduled, planned or anticipated approvals for any work or funds approved for same project- and the City will exclude any items pertaining to Rancho arroyo Parkway until the City addresses our April 21st correspondance.

Sharon Scharff

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Don Mooney
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 4:35 PM
To: cof
Cc: Sharon
Subject: Re: Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Mr. Dana,

On April 21st I sent you the attached letter. I would appreciate the courtesy of a response at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

Don Mooney
Law Office of Donald B. Mooney
417 Mace Blvd, Suite J-334
Davis, CA 95618
530-758-2377
dbmooneylaw@gmail.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rocio Fierro <RFierro@fremont.gov>
Subject: Rancho Arroyo Parkway
Date: May 4, 2020 at 8:56:46 PM PDT
To: "dbmooneylaw@gmail.com" <dbmooneylaw@gmail.com>

Mr. Mooney: This acknowledges receipt of the letter you sent to City Manager Mark Danaj regarding Rancho Arroyo Parkway.

The transmission of your letter was delayed due to the COVID19 emergency and home sheltering requirements, and I've just received a copy.

I'll respond to your letter in due course after I'm able to discuss the issues with relevant City and Public Works staff.

Note that additional time will be needed for the City to respond to your inquiries due to the continuing emergency and reduction in City services.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Rocio Fierro
Senior Deputy City Attorney
Fremont City Attorney's Office
(510) 284-4030

LAW OFFICE OF DONALD B. MOONEY

417 Mace Boulevard, Suite J-334
Davis, CA 95618
530-758-2377
dbmooney@dcn.org

April 21, 2020



VIA FACSIMILE
cof@fremont.gov
AND REGULAR MAIL

Mark Danaj
City Manager
City of Fremont
3300 Capitol Avenue, Bldg A
Fremont, CA 94538

Re: Alterations to Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Dear Mr. Danaj:

This office represents Sharon Scharff regarding the City of Fremont's proposed alterations to the Rancho Arroyo Parkway. The alterations include bulb outs and sidewalks on Rancho Arroyo Parkway and allowing parking when it has been specifically eliminated by previous Council actions. The previous changes and the proposed new alterations to Rancho Arroyo Parkway violate City of Fremont Ordinance 847 (1971); Ordinance 1114 (1976); and Ordinance 6660 (1986) that established there was to be no parking and no sidewalk on Rancho Arroyo Parkway. The City's Resolutions and previous conditions of approval specify state that the road is to remain a certain width and a loading and unloading zone placed near the office of the apartments and that parking is otherwise prohibited.

Despite the City's previous changes and the proposed changes to Rancho Arroyo Parkway, the City has taken no action to modify or amend the applicable Conditions of Approval or the governing Ordinances and Resolutions. While the City Council amended the parking prohibition in 1986 to allow parking near the apartment office to address a problem associated with the postal service's delivery of mail and packages, there have been no other actions by the City Council to modify the parking prohibitions on Rancho Arroyo Parkway. (See *Resolution of the City Council of the City of Fremont Establishing a 50-Foot Loading Zone at 405 Rancho Arroyo Parkway to be Effective 24 Hours a Day, Seven Days a Week*, Resolution No. 6660, dated February 18, 1986.) The City's recent elimination of the loading and unloading also violates Resolution No. 6660.

While Public Works may have some discretion in creating and eliminating parking on public streets, such discretion is not allowed when it contradicts ordinances and resolutions duly passed by the City Council. As such, any action by Public Works on Rancho Arroyo Parkway must be consistent with the Council's Resolutions and Ordinances.

It is also my understanding that the City asserts that the current activities are exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code, §§ 21000 *et seq.* To this end, the City relies upon a Notice of Exemption filed on April 6, 2015. The NOE describes the Project Description as "the project will perform pavement

preventive maintenance work using cape and slurry seals at various locations throughout the City of Fremont.” Despite the City’s representation that the 2015 NOE applies, the clear language of the Project description indicates that it does not apply to modification of parking on Rancho Arroyo Parkway or the creation of sidewalks.

To the extent, the City seeks to approve a new notice of exemption for the current project, no such exemption would apply. First, because the exemptions operate as exceptions to CEQA, they are narrowly construed. (*See, e.g., Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce v. City of Santa Monica* (1999) 101 Cal.App.4th 786, 793.) “Exemption categories are not to be expanded beyond the reasonable scope of their statutory language.” (*Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish & Game Commission* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105, 125; *San Lorenzo Valley Community Advocates for Responsible Education v. San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District* (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 1356, 1382.) Previously, the City relied upon CEQA Guidelines section 15301, also known as the “Existing Facilities” exception.

As discussed below, the existing facilities exemption does not apply to the City’s current project. The “existing facilities” exemption provides an exemption for “the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, [or] mechanical equipment ..., involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency’s determination.... The key consideration is whether the project involves negligible or no expansion of an existing use.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15301.) In the present matter, the City intends to expand the use of Rancho Arroyo Parkway to include parking and sidewalks. This constitutes a significant expansion of the existing use. (*See Erven v. Board of Supervisors* (1975) 53 Cal.App.3d 1004, 1012-1014 [a decision to widen the roads or acquire additional roads for improvement purposes would require environmental review because the exemption would not apply].) That is exactly the situation in the present matter. This is not maintenance or minor alteration of the existing road, but an expansion of the road facilities. As such, the existing facilities exemption would not apply.

Based upon the foregoing, my client requests that the City refrain from any work on Rancho Arroyo Parkway unless and until the City Council rescinds and/or modifies the governing Ordinances and applicable conditions of approval and complies with CEQA’s requirements. If the City progresses with the modifications to the Rancho Arroyo Parkway, my client reserves her right to seek any and all administrative and judicial remedies. Additionally, the City should begin the process of reverse the parking, pylon and buffer zone work conducted prior to any notice in 2018. Please let me know within the five days of this letter whether the City intends to proceed with the modifications. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to call me if you would like to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,


Donald B. Mooney
Attorney

cc: Sharon Scharff

Susan Gauthier

From: Ahmadzia, Ahmad <Ahmad.Ahmadzia@bayclubs.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2020 9:10 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Requesting to re-open Tennis in the City of Fremont
Attachments: MJS Guidelines for Safe Tennis Operations 05.03.2020 (005).pdf

Dear Council Members,

Thank you for everything you are doing to keep everyone safe and healthy in our beautiful city. As the Vice President and General Manager of Bay Club in Fremont, which sits as a 120,000 square foot private athletic club in the Warm Springs district, I am reaching out to lend support during these unprecedented times. As a native of the Bay Area for more than 30 years, I grew up in Alameda County, and now working out of the city of Fremont for many years. My family was in the planning stages of purchasing a home to raise our children within this beautiful town. Covid-19 will not get in the way of our long term plans to settle down and make Fremont our forever city.

With our schools and health clubs closed, my two older kids have struggled to stay active. Both Sofia (7) and Soraya (9) were involved in Bay Club Fremont's squash academy, along with soccer leagues on the weekends. They are longing to return to their once active lifestyle. As the operator of one of the largest athletic clubs in the Bay Area and a part-time soccer coach, it will be my responsibility to assist in the reopening of these essential services safely in partnership with the city of Fremont.

Bay Club wants to be part of the solution for reopening active lifestyle opportunities in Fremont – helping to guide all businesses in this category. Active lifestyle includes, but is not limited to golf clubs, swim & tennis facilities, athletic clubs, and smaller fitness centers. We realize everything needs to be a phased approach, especially considering factors such as indoor social distancing (5 people per 1,000 sf) vs. outdoor acreage (social distancing minimum of six feet apart). Given the expansive outdoor space here on the property, we are in a unique position to provide our members and associates with a safe environment for physical activity and promote physical and mental health.

I hope that the attached document reflects the extent of the work that our organization has been putting in to help ensure a safe environment for our members and guests upon returning to our facilities. We plan on utilizing our reservation system that will allow rigorous controls over capacity throughout operating hours, once we are able to welcome back our members and associates. We would like to open our outdoor space, including our Tennis courts, and continue to work with you until we can open up our entire facility safely.

Please let us know how we can work together on a safe and healthy solution. We are willing and able to help wherever possible.

Hope to hear from you soon. I am happy to discuss in more detail on the call.

In good health,

Ahmad Ahmadzia

Vice President/General Manager

The Bay Club Company

c: 510.226.8500, X500

[Bay Club Blog](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)





GUIDELINES FOR SAFE TENNIS OPERATIONS
FOR ANY TENNIS FACILITY (PUBLIC OR PRIVATE)
IN THE NEW NORMAL
PRESENTED BY THE BAY CLUB
April 2020



GUIDELINES FOR SAFE TENNIS OPERATIONS (PUBLIC OR PRIVATE)

OVERVIEW:

Tennis provides a safe environment for players to engage in a healthy and active lifestyle. Because tennis does not require any direct person-to-person contact or sharing of equipment, players may enjoy the health benefits that tennis offers while maintaining safe physical distancing in compliance with CDC and local county guidelines.

PHYSICAL DISTANCING & GUIDELINES FOR PLAY:

- With an average court size of 7,200 square feet, tennis naturally supports a robust level of social distancing between players.
- No equipment is to be shared between players.
- Each Player will bring their own tennis balls and racquet to play with.
- Each player will mark their balls with clear and unique markings.
- Players will wear a glove on their non dominant hand, and refrain from touching their faces.
- Players will only serve and touch their own tennis balls.
- When another player's ball needs to be returned to them, it will be rolled or hit to them with a racquet, without touching the ball in any way, a historical common practice.
- At no time will any player need to touch or hold another player's tennis balls.
- All benches and seating will be removed, whenever possible to prevent social congregation
- Players are asked to leave the facility immediate after play. No congregating.
- Reservation systems, available at many USTA, private, and public facilities, provide an additional means via which to limit capacity, usage, and congregation.

PERSONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY:

- Players will be required to wash their hands prior to arrival, and upon leaving the facility
- Players are encouraged to wear a face mask during play
- Players will not be permitted to play if:
 - They exhibit any symptoms associated with the coronavirus: (mild to severe respiratory illness with fever, cough and difficulty breathing, or other symptoms identified by the CDC)
 - Have been in contact with someone with COVID-19 in the last 14 days
 - Are a vulnerable individual. A vulnerable individual is an elderly individual and/or an individual with underlying health conditions

FACILITIES:

- Where possible, each facility should be clearly marked with designated paths of travel
- In the absence of a barrier, such as fencing, between courts, alternating courts will be available for play
- All moveable furniture will be removed from the area to prevent congregating and touching
- All stationary furniture will be roped off to prevent congregating and touching
- All court gates will remain open to prevent touching
- All water dispensers will be removed or roped off to prevent touching
- All court entrances equipped with signage communicating CDC and county guidelines and expectations.



Safe Social Distancing



Glove on Non-Dominant Hand



Marked

Tennis Balls

PHYSICAL DISTANCING & GUIDELINES FOR PLAY:

- With an average court size of 7,200 square feet, tennis naturally supports a robust level of social distancing between players.
- No equipment is to be shared between players.
- Each Player will bring their own tennis balls and racquet to play with.
- Each player will mark their balls with clear and unique markings.
- Players will wear a glove on their non dominant hand, and refrain from touching their faces.
- Players will only serve and touch their own tennis balls.
- When another player's ball needs to be returned to them, it will be rolled or hit to them with a racquet, without touching the ball in any way, a historical common practice.
- At no time will any player need to touch or hold another player's tennis balls.
- All benches and seating will be removed, whenever possible to prevent social congregation and physical proximity.
- Players should arrive to the facility no more than ten minutes prior the time expected to play
- Players are asked to leave the facility immediate after play. No congregating.
- Reservation systems, available at many USTA, private, and public facilities, provide an additional means via which to limit capacity, usage, and congregation.

California Locations Already Allowing Tennis (Public & Private):

Allowing persons not in same household to play based on above physical distancing & guidelines

- Sacramento (Spare Time opening Wednesday May 5, 2020)
- Orange County (Spearman Tennis Complexes open for tennis & swim) May 4, 2020
- Ojai – Public Courts – Open May 2, 2020
- Santa Cruz – Open May 2, 2020
- Riverside County (Palm Springs) – Mission Hills & PGA West opened April 24, 2020



BAY CLUB HISTORY

Founded in 1977, The Bay Club Company is an active lifestyle company that owns and operates a growing collection of resort-inspired properties across nine campuses located within the Bay Area, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Portland markets.

Bay Club's comprehensive approach to lifestyle is founded on four points of focus: fitness, sports, family, and hospitality. Our clubs exist to promote health and wellness, to bolster physical and mental wellbeing, and to strengthen community and family relationships.

As California and Oregon's communities move into Phase One of their coronavirus response and recovery strategies, the Bay Club stands ready, with state-of-the-industry protocols, to be an essential resource for health and wellbeing across our communities. The Bay Club is uniquely positioned within the Active Lifestyle Industry to ensure that physical distancing protocols are maintained at all times.

THE BAY CLUB DIFFERENCE:

Rigorous Standard Operating Procedures, governing all aspects of club operations, have been documented by the company to ensure proper levels of physical distancing, reflective of CDC as well as state and county guidelines. Strict protocols have been developed in order to maintain proper levels of sanitization and cleanliness, across all facilities at all times.

Our Active Lifestyle Clubs include expansive outdoor recreation spaces for tennis, golf, and cardio fitness, activities which naturally support high levels of physical distancing. Our indoor facilities are spacious and flexible, providing high levels of physical distancing and individual spaces for safe exercise. Our professional staff are uniquely qualified to manage and maintain physical distancing protocols. Our associate-to-member ratios, among the highest in the industry, provide for rigorous supervision of all scheduled activities.



Pam Shriver

[@PHShriver](https://www.linkedin.com/company/phshriver/)



Here is how to play tennis points without touching the balls. Some may feel safer using this old school method of picking up tennis balls. Any other good ideas how to have safe tennis post lockdown? pic.twitter.com/sL7cn1lx7G

4/30/20, 10:14 AM

Susan Gauthier

From: Cindy Sakihara
To: Hans Larsen
CC: Noe Veloso; City Council
Date: 04/21/2020 11:33 PM

Subject: Re: a hold off of any decisions on Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Dear Mr. Larsen,

It has been over 2 weeks and I have not officially heard back from you regarding the documents requested, indicating City Council resolutions of 1971 and 1986 have been overruled and that Ordinance 874 has been changed. Hence, it is by default I gather these legal rulings are still in effect and I will take this e-mail (unless disputed with documents that say otherwise by this Wednesday) as the City's official response that what I have alleged is true. In fairness, as with all correspondences with the City of Fremont, I have allowed you the 10 day window (actually more if you look at the date of my last e-mail) to gather your response but none has been produced.

I also wish to communicate that the island of pylon additions and various road markings and additions added to Niles Boulevard have led to increased confusion of drivers on the road. As you already know, several cars have gotten into accidents after the implementation of Public Work's new road design.

Be aware: pedestrian traffic on the road, obstructed views by motorists exiting the Casa Arroyo apartment complex (from pedestrian, bicycle, and motorist traffic), inability to load and unload at the complex, and illegal parking still persist on Rancho Arroyo Parkway. (Note: All these problems that did not exist with the prior design of the roadway and I highly encourage you to restore it to its original configuration.)

I have mentioned these numerous safety problems throughout many conversations, letters, and oratory participation at meetings, but so that it is official, I wish for this e-mail to serve as a warning under Governmental code 835.2 (1977) that the design implementation and decisions you and Public Works made regarding non-needed street parking on Rancho Arroyo Parkway, and harmful road additions on Rancho Arroyo Parkway and Niles Boulevard have resulted in unnecessary dangers to all who use those roads. You have recently been given the opportunity to rectify the issues compromising safety, and thus serious consideration needs to be given to the issues I've raised above. Please bring the road in compliance to Municipal laws and past city council resolutions regarding Rancho Arroyo Parkway by restoring it to its original configuration. Additionally removing the pylons and confusing markings along Niles Boulevard is also essential to prevent further accidents. Reversion back to a design that was proven safe is imperative before further harm comes to road users of these streets. Thank you for your time and careful consideration.

Sincerely,

Cindy Sakihara

Susan Gauthier

From: Cindy Sakihara

To: Hans Larsen

Date: 04/03/2020 1:00 AM

Subject: Re: a hold off of any decisions on Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Dear Hans,

Thank you for your response. I am glad to know social distancing is being practiced by city employees.

I do feel it's important to let you know from my extensive research, your comment about "the policy actions from 1971 and 1986 were made in context of Rancho Arroyo being planned as a major 4 lane road," is incorrect. I would like to ask that you personally take the time and look carefully at all Fremont City records. There you will find the actions of City Council rulings regarding these policies were in fact based on discussions and agreements that took into account feedback from the public, the developer, and the final recommendations of the Planning Commission of Fremont. There currently remains the specific clause "elimination of a sidewalk" written into an active ordinance/municipal law (Ordinance 847) for Rancho Arroyo Parkway because the NO PARKING rule was agreed to by Fremont city leaders for what they intended to be the life of the street. What you also need to understand is the strict resolution of No Parking was only amended in 1986 because not being able to park near the apartment office was a problem for the postal service's delivery of mail and packages. Only after there was a very careful look at all prior agreements, and a public discussion, the resolution was amended to add a loading and unloading zone for deliveries in front of the office yet still honor the no parking rule that had carefully been crafted before. There are several documented discussions and City Council notes as well as Planning Commission notes and actions that all verify my claims. To be fair, please direct me to what written references you can provide that verify your claim that policy actions were only because the street was meant to be a 4 lane major road. Because of the shelter in place orders, please know it's fine to just e-mail me with the documents.

I also feel it's important to mention, even during this pandemic, a live count shows ALL PARKED CARS on Rancho Arroyo Parkway CAN FIT into the Casa Arroyo Apartment parking lot. As you know, street parking has caused all sorts of problems and I feel it is imperative at first opportunity (and before your department considers any plans of keeping the on street parking), you personally make it a priority to check the counts and verify that on street parking is in fact a dire necessity.

Secondly take a serious look at the problems you caused by eliminating the loading and unloading zone for the 394 unit complex. Deliveries never stopped at the apartment units, and the truth be told, they probably increased. Why did you eliminate the needed loading and unloading zone? It was and still is needed.

And lastly and most importantly, please double check the rules and reasoning of why Ordinance 847 is in place as well as City Council actions of 1971 and 1986 that were taken. As a reminder, as far as my research has revealed, these policies are in effect and have not been overruled on this stretch of road.

I agree it may be true that Public Works has some leeway to do what they need to in certain situations, but I'm sure you'll agree, no matter when, (in olden years or contemporary times), all entities of the city and public must act within laws and rules already established.

Please understand, Rancho Arroyo Parkway is special and not just like any other street. If you look further into things, in addition to no street parking and no sidewalk, there are written resolutions and specific planning commission agreements that require the apartment complex to be responsible for providing adequate parking, keeping the gutters and tree medians clean, as well as upkeep and maintenance of the grounds to reflect the historic entrance to the 100 year old California trees. There is even a specific reference which states how wide the street needs to be as well.

In closing, if you can prove I am wrong, please e-mail back and provide me with the official documents that show the City Council resolutions of 1971 and 1986 have been overruled and Ordinance 847 has been changed. When a Public records search of the City of Fremont's records was done, the above was all I could find, and I would appreciate the updated information. Thank you, and I hope you and your family are staying safe and healthy.

Sincerely,

Cindy Sakihara

Susan Gauthier

From: Hans Larsen

To: Cindy Sakihara

Date: 04/02/2020 8:34 PM

Subject: Re: a hold off of any decisions on Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Cindy -

City Public Works staff is working virtual from home and is continuing to design important safety improvements, like the Niles Boulevard Safety Improvement project near the Rancho Arroyo area, as funded and supported by the City Council.

As we have done in the past, we are using the project webpage, email surveys, and postcard notices to keep the community informed about the project and to seek input on design preferences.

The plan is to have the City Council consider approval of a project construction contract in Spring (June) and with construction to proceed during the Summer and Fall. Of course, this may be subject change in order to comply with any Health Orders in effect at that time.

As has been stated many times, the policy actions from 1971 and 1986 were made in the context of Rancho Arroyo being planned as a major 4-lane road. The subsequent contemporary policy action to reclassify the road to a 2-lane neighborhood street has superseded the past actions which date back to nearly 50 years ago.

I hope you and your family are well during these unprecedented times.

Hans

Bcc - City Council

Susan Gauthier

From: Cindy Sakihara

To: Mayor Mei; City Council; Public Works

Date: 04/2/2020 7:44 PM

Subject: Re: a hold off of any decisions on Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Dear Mayor Mei, City Council members, and Public Works,

In case you were not aware, a postcard was sent out last week regarding work to be done on Rancho Arroyo Parkway and Niles Boulevard. I have included my dated letter on March 16th below, when I had respectfully asked that in light of the shelter in place orders that any decisions, related to Rancho Arroyo Parkway be suspended until the public is allowed to be present at the meetings. The current post card sent states work is planned to be done on these roads in Spring of 2020. Thus I am reaching out to you to know if the sending of the postcard was a mistake or if the City is actually planning to work on these roads at this time.

As a reminder, Governor Newsom has declared a State of emergency of the State of California. Shelter in place orders have been extended until May and currently our nation, and the World are doing our best to deal with the COVID 19 pandemic. Only the most essential work has been ordered to be conducted at this time. Frankly, the delivery of the postcard came as a bit of a shock to me and made me question who was still working on this project after the shelter in place orders were enlisted in early March.

In these uncertain times, I imagine you are all working from home, so I ask that you take the time to look over City Council resolutions in 1971 and 1986 as well as active Ordinance 847 so you will be able to see that all roadwork proposed on the street violates city and municipal policies actively in place.

Lastly I am respectfully asking Mayor Mei, Dr. Shao, and Public Work to provide a response to this e-mail the end of the week, April 2nd. I cannot know you are actually reading my letters without a reply. Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Cindy Sakihara

Susan Gauthier

From: Don Mooney
To: City of Fremont
CC: Sharon
Date: 04/29/2020 4:35 PM
Subject: Re: Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Mr. Danaj,

On April 21st I sent you the attached letter. I would appreciate the courtesy of a response at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

Dan Mooney

Law Office of Donald B. Mooney

417 Mace Blvd, Suite J-334

Davis, CA 95618

530-758-2377

dbmooneylaw@gmail.com

Susan Gauthier

From: Rocio Fierro

Subject: Rancho Arroyo Parkway

Date: May 4, 2020 at 8:56:46 PM PDT

To: "Don Mooney

Mr. Mooney: This acknowledges receipt of the letter you sent to City Manager Mark Danaj regarding Rancho Arroyo Parkway.

The transmission of your letter was delayed due to the COVID19 emergency and home sheltering requirements, and I've just received a copy.

I'll respond to your letter in due course after I'm able to discuss the issues with relevant City and Public Works staff.

Note that additional time will be needed for the City to respond to your inquiries due to the continuing emergency and reduction in City services.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Rocio Fierro

Senior Deputy City Attorney

Fremont City Attorney's Office

(510) 284-4030