

## Chapter 6. Public Outreach and Agency Consultation

---

Pursuant to CEQA requirements, the CCJPA, as the lead agency under CEQA, has been implementing a public outreach program as part of the environmental review process for the proposed Project. This chapter describes the public outreach and involvement activities previously conducted, as well as those planned for future action. Coordination and outreach are fundamental components of effective transportation planning and the CEQA process. This process promotes informed decision-making by considering potential social, economic, and environmental impacts. Throughout the development of this draft EIR, CCJPA has engaged state, regional, county, and local governments as well as the general public and tribal representatives.

### 6.1 Project Public Involvement Plan

A multi-faceted Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was developed at the Project onset and has been consistently implemented throughout the proposed Project public outreach process. The PIP focuses on delivering a robust communications program to reach and engage diverse audiences primarily through virtual tactics. The PIP includes policy briefings, regular Project development team meetings, community presentations, stakeholder focus group meetings, and responses to inquiries. Additionally, the PIP employs digital tools such as an interactive Project website, online chats, virtual forums, electronic notices, social media, informational videos, and distribution of educational materials.

Per the PIP, ongoing communication has occurred and will continue throughout the proposed Project planning efforts to build awareness, educate, and obtain input on the purpose, needs, and potential impacts of this rail improvement Project. The Project team collaborates with decision makers and conducts meetings with various community stakeholders to set expectations and address concerns prior to engaging the public. CCJPA is collaborating with community leaders, representatives, and stakeholders to share timely and effective information through established communication tools to build trust with the community and create transparency throughout the Project process. Agency consultation and public participation for the proposed Project were accomplished through several formal and informal methods, including regular Project team meetings, agency coordination meetings, public meetings, online tools made available to the public, and informational meetings with community organizations, public agencies, private groups, and affected residents and business owners.

#### 6.1.1 Notice of Preparation and Public Information Materials

##### 6.1.1.1 Notice of Preparation

The Project's scoping process was initiated with the preparation and distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP). The NOP was posted at the State Clearinghouse (SCH#2020060655) on June 29, 2020, and circulated to public agencies and other interested parties in compliance with Section 15082(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. The NOP notified the public of the EIR being prepared along with public scoping meeting information and how to provide comments on the proposed Project during the formal 45-day public comment period. The NOP package, including the NOP, the Notice of

Completion (NOC), and the Environmental Document Transmittal, can be found in Attachment A of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

### **6.1.1.2 Public Information Materials**

Several promotional tactics were deployed to build awareness about the proposed Project during the NOP release and subsequent public comment period and scoping meetings. Utilizing Capitol Corridor's established website and social media following, the Project team posted key information on the site to drive viewers to the proposed Project website and launched a social media campaign to promote the initial Project activities and environmental milestones. The Project team also released information in local and regional media publications, mailed postal notices to a large corridor-wide property owner/stakeholder database, and sent several electronic notices, as detailed below.

#### **Public Notice Newspaper Advertisements**

Public notices for the scoping comment period were published in *East Bay Times* and *Mercury News* (in English, Spanish, and Mandarin) on June 29, 2020, and in *Vision Hispana* (Spanish) on June 27, 2020. Copies of the public notice advertisements are included in Attachment B of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

#### **Newsletter Mailer**

A newsletter mailer announcing the environmental scoping information and online public meeting logistics was mailed on June 23, 2020, to 15,095 homeowners within 1,000 feet of the Project corridor and to regional stakeholders. Copies of the mailer and database methodology are included in Attachment C of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

#### **News Release**

One news release and two media advisories were sent to over 200 media contacts in the surrounding area. Copies of the media releases are included in Attachment D of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

#### **Stakeholder E-Blasts**

Four e-blasts were sent to the Project's stakeholder database list providing a brief proposed Project update and notification of the public meetings and 45-day public comment period. Copies of the e-blasts are included in Attachment E of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

#### **Social Media**

Throughout the 45-day scoping comment period, an extensive social media strategy was implemented to educate the public about the proposed Project. The campaign included use of Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), and LinkedIn.

A copy of the social media schedule with post graphics can be found in Attachment F of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

Social media analytics refer to the collection and analysis of data that help to measure overall social media performance. Social media analytics captured during the 45-day scoping period include:

- 9,130 total impressions.<sup>1</sup>
- 525 total engagements (includes “likes”, comments, and shares).
- Facebook postings:
  - 16 total posts (including 3 boosted posts).
  - 1 paid advertisement:
    - 5,996 individual Facebook accounts reached.
    - 7,582 total impressions.
    - 34 total clicks by public.
- X (formerly Twitter) postings:
  - 16 total tweets.
- LinkedIn postings:
  - 16 total posts.

## 6.1.2 Public and Agency Scoping Meetings

For public convenience, and to allow participation in a safe environment while social distancing, an online public meeting, which consisted of prerecorded audio and a series of presentation slides that the public could review on own, was available during the 45-day public comment period from June 29 to August 13, 2020, at SouthBayConnect.com. The online public meeting provided an overview of the proposed Project and hosted important Project information including the scope of environmental resource areas to be studied during this phase of Project development, and to receive input regarding the proposed Project’s goal and objectives, proposed passenger route relocation and new station, environmental issues, and the suggested scope and content of the EIR. The Project website is ADA accessible. Screenshots of the online public meeting presentation slides are included in Attachment G of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

The prerecorded online public meeting was created as a separate page on the Project’s website and served as its own microsite that held a series of presentation slides that incorporated content with visuals and audio for ease of understanding for participants. Attendees were able to visit the prerecorded online public meeting at any time during the 45-day public comment period (24 hours a day/7 days a week) and walk through the information at their own pace, while also having the opportunity to provide comments at any time via electronic submittal.

Along with the prerecorded online public meeting, further effort was made to reach diverse target audiences through interactive engagement via two telephone town hall events and an online live chat event. The goals for each of these engagement platforms were to provide attendees with proposed Project information and seek valuable input for the scope of the proposed Project and environmental review.

---

<sup>1</sup> Impressions are the total number of times content is displayed; it does not require interaction (for example, clicking on ad) from users. This is also the total number of unique users that see the content.

The following provides a summary of analytics from the online public meeting and Project website from June 29 to August 13, 2020.

- South Bay Connect Website:
  - Total Users (visitors): 5,039.
  - Total Sessions (visits to website): 7,064 sessions.
  - Average time of individual user on page: 1:53.
  - 2,279 sessions from desktops.
  - 1,891 sessions from social media platforms.
  - 167 sessions from tablets.
- South Bay Connect Online Public Meeting:
  - Total Sessions (visits): 1,906 sessions.
  - Average time of individual user on page: 3:29.

## 6.1.3 Live Interactive Sessions

### 6.1.3.1 Telephone Town Hall

Two telephone town halls were hosted where members of the public could hear about the Project, speak with Project team members, ask questions, and submit formal comments. Both telephone town halls were held in English, Spanish, and Mandarin. All questions and comments received during the telephone town hall events were included as official scoping comments. A copy of the final *All Comment Report* can be found in Attachment H of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

- July 15, 2020, Telephone Town Hall | 6–7:30 p.m.
  - 140 callers dialed in.
  - 40 callers entered the queue with questions.
  - 19 callers spoke live on the phone.
- August 5, 2020, Telephone Town Hall | 5:30–7 p.m.
  - 87 callers dialed in.
  - 32 callers entered the queue with questions.
  - 18 callers spoke live on the phone.

### 6.1.3.2 Live Chat Session

A live chat session was established on the Project website where members of the public could interact with Project team members in a one-on-one setting. All chat conversations received were

logged and included as official comments during scoping. As noted previously, a copy of the final *All Comment Report* can be found in Attachment H of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

- July 15, 2020, Live Chat Session | 12–1:30 p.m.
  - 122 visitors on Project website during live chat.
  - 40 chats were established and responded to from the Project team.

### 6.1.4 NOP Scoping Comments

During the 45-day public comment period, comments could be submitted through several media to provide convenience to participants. Methods to provide comment were established electronically through the website, email, online meetings, and interactive live chat sessions. Comments could also be submitted via hard copy mail, telephone town hall sessions, and by leaving a voicemail on the Project information line. The goal was to provide feasible methods for all interested audiences to submit proposed Project comments. In total, 465 comments were collected during the Project’s scoping period. A copy of the final *All Comment Report* can be found in Attachment H of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

Some analytics captured during public scoping period include:

- Received 3 comment letters regarding the NOP from State agencies (that is, California Department of Transportation, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and California Native American Heritage Commission).
- Received 127 emails sent to [info@southbayconnect.com](mailto:info@southbayconnect.com).
- Recorded 13 hotline calls.
- Scoping comments included 7 postal letters.
- Captured 137 individual online meeting comments.
- Submittal of 83 comments via the website.
- Received 65 “live” telephone town hall questions.
- Communicated with public during 32 live chat sessions.

#### 6.1.4.1 Comments Documentation/Review

A final step during the formal solicitation of comments during the scoping period was the collection, categorization, and review of all public input. The Project team documented all comment letters (often including multiple individual comments) and tracked individual comments submitted during the 45-day period. Individual comments were organized by resource category. A “By the Numbers” one-page fact sheet that documents all promotional, engagement, and comments analytics captured during the scoping period can be found in **Attachment I** of the Scoping Report included in Appendix L.

After organizing and categorizing the comments, they were distributed to the Project team, including management, planning, and engineering leads, to facilitate consideration during further design and planning, and to guide resource-specific environmental analysis.

### 6.1.4.2 Comment Themes

Four hundred and sixty-five (465) comments were submitted to CCJPA during the proposed Project’s 45-day scoping period of June 29 to August 13, 2020. Table 6.1-1 provides comment themes identified during the Project’s scoping and public comment period.

**Table 6.1-1. Comment Themes**

Comment Theme	Specific Comments
<b>Primary Concerns:</b>	
Project Cost vs. Community Benefit Ratio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large financial costs and potential negative environmental impacts for relocation of passenger rail service with minimal passenger travel time improvement.</li> </ul>
Increased Rail Traffic at Adjacent Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise, vibration, property value, and safety concerns for rail corridor residents.</li> </ul>
COVID-19 Pandemic Impacts to Commute Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pandemic resulted in reduced ridership, less freeway congestion, and more businesses migrating to telecommuting.</li> <li>• Is there still a need for improved passenger rail operations and an increase in ridership in a post-COVID-19 environment?</li> </ul>
Loss of Current Stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of current Capitol Corridor access in Hayward and Fremont downtown areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Geographic-Specific Concerns:</b>	
<b>Ardenwood Area: 134 comments</b>	
Noise/Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quiet, multi-generational communities adjacent to Coast Subdivision/proposed new Ardenwood Station.</li> <li>• Train traffic already an issue and relocation of passenger rail service will increase number of trains along subdivision.</li> <li>• Vibration impacts to residents and property values.</li> <li>• Diminished quality of life for residents.</li> </ul>
Health/Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor air quality impacts to school-age children and seniors within proximity to rail corridor.</li> <li>• New Ardenwood Station would attract transient population, resulting in increased vandalism and crime.</li> <li>• Rail crossing safety issues.</li> </ul>
Traffic/Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic adjacent to and surrounding new Ardenwood Station.</li> <li>• Challenges to traffic circulation and delays at rail crossings due to increased train traffic.</li> <li>• Lack of parking availability.</li> </ul>
Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for protection of local habitat, sanctuaries and Coyote Hills.</li> </ul>

**Table 6.1-1. Comment Themes**

Comment Theme	Specific Comments
Regional Planning Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of agency collaboration/coordination amongst many corridor transportation projects (Dumbarton Corridor, Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART] Extension, South Alameda County Railway Project, etc.).</li> </ul>
Property Value Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for reduced property values.</li> </ul>
<b>City of Fremont: 98 comments</b>	
Noise/Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to train traffic within Niles Canyon.</li> <li>• Increased vibration impacts to residents and effects on property values.</li> <li>• Diminished quality of life for residents.</li> </ul>
Health/Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor air quality impacts to school-age children and seniors within corridor.</li> <li>• New proposed Ardenwood Station attracting transient population, or resulting in increased vandalism and crime.</li> <li>• Rail crossing safety issues.</li> </ul>
Station Location Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over moving rail station from high-density to low-density areas.</li> <li>• Negative impact of removing widely used stations that residents and businesses depend on.</li> </ul>
Congestion Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Related to an already-growing community.</li> <li>• Lack of parking/increased parking in residential areas.</li> </ul>
Property Value Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents who bought homes before knowing about proposed stations.</li> </ul>
<b>Oakland: 86 comments</b>	
Noise/Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased train traffic would result more noise and vibration.</li> </ul>
Health/Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low income, disadvantaged communities along rail corridor.</li> </ul>
<b>Newark: 47 comments</b>	
Noise/Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased train traffic would result in more noise and vibration.</li> </ul>
Health/Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality impacts to residents in proximity to the corridor.</li> </ul>
<b>Hayward: 44 comments</b>	
Noise/Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased train traffic would result in more noise and vibration.</li> </ul>
Health/Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail corridors attracting transient population, or resulting in increased vandalism and crime.</li> </ul>
Station Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Capitol Corridor Hayward Station.</li> <li>• Consideration of Hayward Station (Route 92).</li> <li>• Loss of existing BART connection.</li> </ul>

**Table 6.1-1. Comment Themes**

Comment Theme	Specific Comments
Sea Level Rise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on transportation infrastructure.</li> </ul>
Regional Planning Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for synergy with Planning and Development.</li> </ul>
Project Cost/Community Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with level of benefits to Alameda County as relates to \$40 million Measure BB funding.</li> </ul>
<b>Union City: 34 comments</b>	
Noise/Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased train traffic results in more noise and vibration.</li> <li>• Impacts to property values.</li> </ul>
Health/Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for rail crossing safety with nearby schools.</li> </ul>
Station Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would result in no station within Union City.</li> <li>• Inconvenient transfer/connections to multi-model transit services.</li> </ul>
Rail Infrastructure (Industrial Parkway/Shinn Connection)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative impacts within Union City resulting from increased rail traffic.</li> </ul>
Regional Planning Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for synergy with existing Planning and Development.</li> </ul>
Property Value Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for reduced property values.</li> </ul>
<b>San Leandro: 22 comments</b>	
Health/Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for rail crossing safety near South San Francisco Bay.</li> </ul>
Regional Planning Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for synergy with existing Planning and Development.</li> </ul>
Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative impacts to Lisjan Creek.</li> </ul>



## 6.2 Outreach During Development of Draft EIR

### 6.2.1 Outreach During Early Development of Draft EIR with Project Development Team

The Project Development Team (PDT) consists of representatives from CCJPA, HDR, HNTB, Convey, Caltrans (HQ and District 4), Alameda County Transportation Commission, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, AC Transit, City of Fremont, City of Newark, and City of Union City. Concurrent with the initial concept development and screening process, the Project team hosted several focus meetings to address specific issues or topics with the PDT. Since then, CCJPA has continued meeting with team stakeholders individually as shown in Table 6.2-1.

**Table 6.2-1. PDT Meetings**

Date	Type of Engagement	Primary Topics
June 20, 2019	Meeting at BART Headquarters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Overview</li> <li>• Project Status and Project Elements</li> <li>• Project Definition Report</li> <li>• Funding Sources</li> <li>• Proposed Ardenwood Station</li> </ul>
August 22, 2019	Meeting at BART Headquarters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Station Identification Criteria</li> <li>• Station Layout and Environmental Footprint for Multiple Potential Locations</li> <li>• Project Schedule</li> </ul>
October 31, 2019	Meeting at BART Headquarters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Purpose and Need</li> <li>• Project Definition Report Findings</li> <li>• Potential Station Conceptual Plans</li> <li>• Project Schedule</li> </ul>

### 6.2.2 Community Working Group (CWG)

CCJPA established two CWGs—one specific to the City of Fremont and the second with the broader Project Corridor stakeholders. As-needed meetings with both CWGs have occurred since Project initiation. The CWGs assisted CCJPA in the distribution of Project information as community liaisons. The goal of a CWG is to build connection and partnerships with community leaders and to share information and address concerns as the Project planning progresses. The Fremont CWG includes representatives from the Niles, Centerville, and Ardenwood neighborhoods. The Corridor CWG includes community members from the Cities of Hayward, Union City, Newark, and San Leandro that represent neighborhoods along the rail corridor, as well as interested stakeholder groups like the local bicycle coalition, and business organizations. The CWGs met at key Project milestones and prior to the release of the draft EIR on May 29, 2024. Six meetings occurred between 2020 and 2024:

- Corridor CWG Meeting #1 on February 23, 2021: Virtual meeting to discuss project goals and objectives, development of proposed Project elements, including rail station location

alternatives and considerations, and early Project schedule. Input was solicited from the CWG on all potential Project elements. Meeting attendees included:

- Alameda Creek Alliance.
- Cherryland Neighborhood Association.
- Centro de Servicios.
- Community Resources for Independent Living.
- East Bay Regional Parks District.
- Eden Shores Community.
- Marina Vista of San Leandro Owners Association.
- Fremont CWG Meeting #1 on February 24, 2021: Virtual meeting to discuss Project goals and objectives, development of proposed Project elements, including rail station location alternatives and considerations, and early Project schedule. Input was solicited from the CWG on all potential Project elements. Meeting attendees included:
  - Ardenwood Business Representative.
  - Ardenwood Forest Homeowners Association.
  - Ardenwood Neighborhood Representative.
  - Centerville Neighborhood Representative.
  - Fremont Mobility Task Force.
  - Niles for Environmentally Safe Trains.
  - Save Niles Canyon.
- Corridor CWG Meeting #2 on May 24, 2021: Virtual meeting to discuss updates to proposed Project elements, including rail station alternatives, and Project schedule. Input was solicited from the CWG on all potential Project elements. Meeting attendees included:
  - Bike East Bay.
  - Cherryland Community Association.
  - Centro de Servicios.
  - East Bay Regional Parks District.
  - Marina Vista of San Leandro Owners Association.
  - Oakland African Chamber of Commerce.
- Fremont CWG Meeting #2 on May 25, 2021: Virtual meeting to discuss updates to proposed Project elements, including rail station alternatives, and Project schedule. Input was solicited from the CWG on all potential Project elements. Meeting attendees included:
  - Ardenwood Business Representative.

- Centerville Business and Community Association.
- City of Fremont.
- Fremont Mobility Task Force.
- Niles for Environmentally Safe Trains.
- Save Niles Canyon.
- Niles Neighborhood representative.
- Joint Corridor and Fremont CWG Meeting #3 on August 24, 2021: Virtual meeting to discuss Project updates, status and proposed Ardenwood Station layout. Meeting attendees included:
  - Altamont Corridor Express.
  - City of Fremont.
  - Fremont Mobility Task Force.
  - Bike East Bay.
  - BART.
  - Cherryland Community Association.
  - Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee of Union City.
  - East Bay Regional Park District.
- Joint Corridor and Fremont CWG Meeting #4 on May 16, 2024: Virtual meeting shall discuss Project Overview, updates, and design as well as development of DEIR and CEQA process. Meeting attendees included:
  - Cherryland Community Association
  - Fremont Mobility Task Force
  - Centerville Business Community Association
  - City of Fremont Community Working Group
  - Fremont Planning Commission Chair

## 6.3 Tribal Consultation

Pursuant to CEQA requirements, CCJPA coordinated with Native American tribal representatives during the preparation of this draft EIR as listed and described below. Between 2019 and 2024, multiple consultation requests via letter and follow-up phone calls were sent to the following tribal representatives:

- Irene Zwierlein, Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista.
- Tony Cerda, Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe.

- Donald Duncan, Guidiville Indian Rancheria.
- Ann Marie Sayers, Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan.
- Charlene Nijmeh, Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Monica Arellano, Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Katherine Perez, North Valley Yokuts Tribe.
- Quirina Luna Geary, Tamien Nation.
- Timothy Perez, North Valley Yokuts Tribe.
- Andrew Galvan, The Ohlone Indian Tribe.
- Corrina Gould, The Confederated Villages of Lisjan.
- Neil Peyron, Tule River Indian Tribe.
- Jesus G. Tarango Jr., Wilton Rancheria.
- Kenneth Woodrow, Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band.

In 2020 and 2021, the Project team received email responses from Katherine Perez (Chairperson, North Valley Yokuts Tribe) and Corrina Gould (Chairperson, the Confederated Villages of Lisjan). Ms. Perez and Ms. Gould requested and were sent information on the record search and Sacred Land File results via email.

The Project team met virtually with Chairperson Gould from the Confederated Villages of Lisjan as part of a requested AB 52 consultation meeting on August 18, 2022. Chairperson Gould requested a survey be performed at a specific location on the alignment and also requested an update if the Project changed.

Additional consultation letters were sent to the same tribal representatives in December 2023 regarding the addition of Alternative E. AB 52 consultation meetings were held with Andrew Galvan from the Ohlone Tribe on January 11, 2024, and a Project update meeting to specifically discuss Alternative E with Chairperson Gould from the Confederated Villages of Lisjan on March 20, 2024. A copy of the confidential archaeological report was sent to Ms. Gould per her request following the meeting. Tribal outreach is ongoing throughout the Project.

## 6.4 Regulatory, Local Government, and Other Stakeholder Consultation and Coordination

Prior to and throughout the development of this draft EIR, CCJPA engaged state, federal, regional, county, and local governments, as well as other stakeholders. See Table 6.4-1.

**Table 6.4-1. Summary of Consultation and Coordination with Non-Tribal Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Dates/ Frequency of Engagement	Types of Engagement	Primary Topics
Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC)	October 12, 2020	Presentation and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Overview</li> <li>• Station planning</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement</li> </ul>
	October 22, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
	April 17, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
	April 12, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Overview</li> <li>• Station planning</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement</li> </ul>
Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Overview</li> <li>• Station planning</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement</li> </ul>
Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	August 28, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Station planning</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Infrastructure overview</li> </ul>
Bay Area Transportation Working Group (BATWG)	July 20, 2023	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capitol Corridor Update</li> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Station planning</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> </ul>
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	October 12, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Draft Purpose and Need</li> <li>• Draft Schedules</li> <li>• Design Exceptions Matrices</li> <li>• Stormwater Data</li> </ul>
	October 2020 to July 2022	Submittal of Draft Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utility Matrix</li> <li>• Other Planning Materials</li> </ul>

**Table 6.4-1. Summary of Consultation and Coordination with Non-Tribal Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Dates/ Frequency of Engagement	Types of Engagement	Primary Topics
Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council	November 19, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Overview</li> <li>• Station planning</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement</li> </ul>
	November 15, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
Cherryland Community Association Presentation	October 26, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
	October 22, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
Citizen’s Committee to Complete the Refuge	February 16, 2021	Presentation and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> </ul>
City of Alameda	December 1, 2020	Vice Mayor briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
City of Fremont	September 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
	October 6, 2020	City Council presentation and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
	November 11, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
	December 5, 2023	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Ardenwood Station meeting</li> </ul>

**Table 6.4-1. Summary of Consultation and Coordination with Non-Tribal Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Dates/ Frequency of Engagement	Types of Engagement	Primary Topics
City of Hayward	January 16, 2019	Presentation and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> <li>• Potential Hayward Station</li> </ul>
	March 26, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> <li>• Hayward/Union City station sites discussion</li> </ul>
	June 3, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Potential station locations</li> </ul>
	September 14, 2020	Mayor briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> <li>• Updated Project schedule</li> </ul>
	February 20, 2024	Mayor briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Updated Project schedule</li> </ul>
City of Newark	December 14, 2023	Virtual meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> <li>• Ardenwood Station meeting</li> </ul>
City of San Leandro	September 10, 2020	Mayor briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
	June 15, 2021	Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
City of Union City	January 16, 2019	Presentation and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> <li>• Hayward/Union City Station Sites</li> <li>• Potential Station Locations</li> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> <li>• Communications and Engagement</li> </ul>
	March 26, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential Station Locations</li> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> <li>• Communications and Engagement</li> </ul>

**Table 6.4-1. Summary of Consultation and Coordination with Non-Tribal Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Dates/ Frequency of Engagement	Types of Engagement	Primary Topics
	June 3, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> <li>• Communications and Engagement</li> </ul>
	September 15, 2020	Mayor briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> <li>• Communications and Engagement</li> </ul>
	November 11, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> <li>• Communications and Engagement</li> </ul>
Eden Area Municipal Advisory Council	December 8, 2020	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
	November 9, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	January to September 2021	Submittal of Draft Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Purpose and Need</li> <li>• Draft Schedules</li> <li>• Design Exceptions Matrices</li> <li>• Stormwater Data</li> <li>• Design Scoping Indices</li> <li>• Other Planning Materials</li> </ul>
Oakland African American Chamber of Commerce	August 18, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
	August 26, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
Newark Rotary Club	March 1, 2022	Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
	April 29, 2022	Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>



**Table 6.4-1. Summary of Consultation and Coordination with Non-Tribal Stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Dates/ Frequency of Engagement	Types of Engagement	Primary Topics
	August 8, 2023	Virtual meeting w/presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project updates and status</li> <li>• Proposed Project schedule</li> </ul>
Union City Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee	March 16, 2021	Virtual meeting and feedback solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview</li> <li>• Environmental review process</li> <li>• Communications and engagement plan</li> </ul>
Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)	Monthly since October 2020	Virtual meetings to discuss multiple projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General feedback from UPRR on infrastructure requirements is to preserve capacity for its existing freight service along the Coast, Niles, and Oakland Subdivisions while ensuring satisfactory on-time performance for Capitol Corridor passenger service.</li> </ul>
	September 22, 2021	Submittal of 10% Designs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% Designs for SBC Project to UPRR with Ops Notes</li> </ul>
	November 1, 2021	Submittal of 10% Designs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% Designs for SBC Project</li> </ul>

## 6.5 Notification and Circulation of Draft EIR

This draft EIR was released for public review on Wednesday, May 29, 2024, which initiated a 45-day public review period from May 29 to July 15, 2024. It was posted to the State Clearinghouse (CEQANet) and the CCJPA website, along with the corresponding Notice of Availability (NOA) and NOC. Planned outreach engagement activities for the draft EIR are described below.

CCJPA is using a number of outreach methods to allow for multiple ways for stakeholders and the public to understand the Project and provide comments. The communications notices provide the public with information on how to review the draft EIR, the time and location of multilingual virtual public meetings, and information on how to provide comments during the 45-day public comment period. The Project team’s efforts to build awareness of the availability of the draft EIR for review and comment were coupled with CCJPA communications through their established (multilingual) website and social media. Materials related to the draft EIR circulation are provided in Appendix L.

To reach interested stakeholders and potentially impacted members of the public during the circulation period for the draft EIR, the Project team conducted engagement and promotional outreach including:

- Direct mailer.
- Newspaper advertisements (NOAs).
- Electronic notifications (e-blasts).
- Media advisory.
- Project website updates.
- Draft EIR repository placement (hard copies or electronic copies).
- Posters at repositories and key community gathering locations.
- Partner agency coordination.
- Virtual public meetings (Zoom), including language options in English, Spanish, and Mandarin Chinese scheduled on June 12 and 20, 2024.
- Project website (with the option to translate into multiple languages).
- Social media posts and advertisements (Facebook, Instagram, X, and LinkedIn).
- Joint CWG meeting scheduled on May 16, 2024.
- Virtual interagency meeting scheduled for June 6, 2024.
- Presentation and public comment opportunity at the CCJPA Board Meeting scheduled on June 26, 2024.

Hardcopy and/or electronic copies of the draft EIR and posters will be available for review at the following public locations:

- Printed Copies:
  - Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority Office (BART Headquarters) – 2150 Webster Street, 3rd Floor, Oakland, CA 94612.
  - Oakland Public Library (Main) – 125 14th Street, Oakland, CA 94612.
  - Alameda County Public Library (Main) – 2400 Stevenson Boulevard, Fremont, CA 94538 .
- Digital copies on USB drive:
  - Oakland Public Library (Elmhurst) – 1427 88th Avenue, Oakland, CA 94621.
  - Alameda County Public Library (Union City) – 34007 Alvarado-Niles Road, Union City, CA 94587.
  - Alameda County Public Library (Newark) – 37055 Newark Boulevard, Newark, CA 94560.
  - San Leandro Public Library (Main) – 300 Estudillo Avenue, San Leandro, CA 94577.
  - San Leandro Public Library (Manor) – 1241 Manor Boulevard, San Leandro, CA 94579.
  - San Leandro Public Library (Mulford-Marina) – 13699 Aurora Drive, San Leandro, CA 94577.

- Hayward Public Library (Main) – 888 C Street, Hayward, CA 94541.
- Hayward Public Library (Weekes) – 27300 Patrick Avenue, Hayward, CA 94544.

It is anticipated that the final EIR will be considered by the CCJPA Board for certification and approval of proposed Project by end of 2024.