

Appendix E. Comment Letters from Recurring Comment Letter #2

From: [Sheng Lim](#)
To: [undisclosed-recipients:](#)
Bcc: info@southbayconnect.com
Subject: I oppose the Capitol Corridor South Bay Connect Project
Date: Sunday, June 30, 2024 5:18:03 PM

Hello,

I live in Union City, CA. I oppose the Capitol Corridor South Bay Connect Project.

Circumstances have changed and projected costs have increased by more than 3x since the Project was initially scoped. The Project has not presented any compelling evidence that the Project will meaningfully increase ridership, and thus decrease traffic. Indeed, ridership on the Capitol Corridor has decreased by 50% since 2019. Even assuming ridership increases by 2,000 passengers in accordance with the Project's expectations, that removes less than 1% of cars daily from I-880 traffic. For the \$1 billion price tag, this seems like a low return on taxpayer investment. Furthermore, the draft EIR itself admits that, by 2040, environmental benefits resulting from reduced vehicle motor traffic become less beneficial because cars will have lower emissions due to improved technology and more stringent regulations. Since the Project has been delayed many years and it's unclear when an additional \$500-700 million of funding will be secured, whether the Project will even be completed by 2040 is questionable.

135-1

Moving passenger rail service from the Oakland-Niles rail line to the Coastal rail line will enable Union Pacific to substantially increase freight traffic on the Oakland-Niles rail line, up to 50-60 trains per day. This will negate and overcome any reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from increased ridership. However, the draft EIR does not address this increase because the Capitol Corridor does not manage freight traffic. This is an abrogation of Capitol Corridor's ethical responsibilities to the community. They should at least attempt an estimate so that the community can understand the true benefits and costs of the Project.

135-2

The draft EIR assumes the Project will be completed and operational by 2025. Clearly, this is an outdated assumption. The environmental impact assessments and the Project scoping should be redone based on updated data and assumptions, including expected ridership, construction timeframe, likely completion date, and time needed to obtain an additional \$500-700 million in funding.

135-3

Furthermore, the draft EIR does not adequately address significant risks to the impacted communities and environment. For those living in the community near the Coastal rail line, the draft EIR does not identify any adverse noise or vibration impacts during on-going operation of the rail line. However, this ignores the very real increase in noise and vibration we will feel, which studies have shown leads to chronic stress, diabetes, and even breast cancer. Also, the draft EIR does not anticipate any additional needs for fire or police, even though the Ardenwood train station will bring additional traffic and crime to the area. Fremont will not get any additional resources to deal with the increased traffic and crime.

135-4

I urge you to put a stop to the South Bay Connect Project. For \$1B, we should consider other alternatives that will be more effective.

135-5

Sincerely,
Sheng Lim

From: [Senthilkumar Gopal](mailto:info@southbayconnect.com)
To: info@southbayconnect.com
Subject: Opposition to Capitol Corridor South Bay Connect Project
Date: Friday, July 12, 2024 9:27:38 AM

Hi,

I live at 33685 Simple Ct, Fremont CA 94555. I oppose the Capitol Corridor South Bay Connect Project.

Circumstances have changed and projected costs have increased by more than 3x since the Project was initially scoped. The Project has not presented any compelling evidence that the Project will meaningfully increase ridership, and thus decrease traffic. Indeed, ridership on the Capitol Corridor has decreased by 50% since 2019. Even assuming ridership increases by 2,000 passengers in accordance with the Project's expectations, that removes less than 1% of cars daily from I-880 traffic. For the \$1 billion price tag, this seems like a low return on taxpayer investment. Furthermore, the draft EIR itself admits that, by 2040, environmental benefits resulting from reduced vehicle motor traffic will become less beneficial because cars will have lower emissions due to improved technology and more stringent regulations. Since the Project has been delayed many years and it's unclear when an additional \$500-700 million of funding will be secured, whether the Project will even be completed by 2040 is questionable.

175-1

Moving passenger rail service from the Oakland-Niles rail line to the Coast rail line will enable Union Pacific to substantially increase freight traffic on the Oakland-Niles rail line, up to 50-60 trains per day. This will negate and overcome any reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from increased ridership. However, the draft EIR does not address this increase because the Capitol Corridor does not manage freight traffic. This is an abrogation of Capitol Corridor's ethical responsibilities to the community. They should at least attempt an estimate so that the community can understand the true benefits and costs of the Project.

175-2

The draft EIR assumes the Project will be completed and operational by 2025. Clearly, this is an outdated assumption. The environmental impact assessments and the Project scoping should be redone based on updated data and assumptions, including expected ridership, construction timeframe, likely completion date, and time needed to obtain an additional \$500-700 million in funding.

175-3

Furthermore, the draft EIR does not adequately address significant risks to the impacted communities and environment. For those living in the communities near the Coast rail line, the draft EIR does not identify any adverse noise or vibration impacts during on-going operation of the rail line. However, this ignores the very real increase in noise and vibration we will feel, which studies have shown leads to chronic stress, diabetes, and even breast cancer. Also, the draft EIR does not anticipate any additional needs for fire or police, even though the Ardenwood train station will bring additional traffic and crime to the area. Fremont will not get any additional resources to deal with the increased traffic and crime.

175-4

The draft EIR also only evaluated potential impact of sea level rise and inundation to year 2050, even though the design life of Project is at least 75 years (i.e., to year 2100). It also does not assess impact of the Project on the regional parks, shoreline, and wildlife refuges located near the Coast rail line.

175-5

As a resident of the Ardenwood community, I deeply oppose this proposal to move more trains to the existing Union Pacific Railroad Coast Subdivision between Oakland and Newark. I believe this is mischaracterized as a more reliable passenger rail route, without taking into critical considerations on the impact on residents around the rail route, noise and environmental pollution in the immediate vicinity of these routes. There are 100s of houses who endure the multiple goods trains, associated ground rumbling, the constant horns on a daily basis. This is already causing sleep related illness for folks living around these areas, which leads to multiple complications such as distracted driving, domestic issues etc., Relocating more train routes to these residential areas seems to be ill-fated for the current residents and should be considered as a serious disservice to the community who are already trying to cope with

175-6

the current goods trains that are constantly travelling on this route. Adding a passenger service brings in additional issues around safety as well as these routes are not currently isolated well from the residential areas that they pass through. This would increase the crime rates in these routes significantly, making these neighbourhoods less safe, especially when there are trails that run close to these routes and are frequented by elderly folks and children.

175-6 cont.

This project would be a disaster for the Ardenwood community and I deeply implore you to reconsider other alternatives than the current proposal.

Yours Sincerely,
Senthilkumar Gopal

From: [Ryan O"Keefe](#)
To: [Teurn, Tammy](#)
Subject: New South Bay Connect Comment
Date: Friday, July 12, 2024 8:52:47 AM

CAUTION: [EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

New South Bay Connect Comment

Name:

Senthilkumar Gopal

Email:

senthil777@gmail.com

Phone:

(408) 839-3815

Organization:

ZIP Code:

94555

Subject:

Opposition to Capitol Corridor South Bay Connect Project

Comment:

I live in 33685 Simple Ct, Fremont CA. I oppose the Capitol Corridor South Bay Connect Project.

Circumstances have changed and projected costs have increased by more than 3x since the Project was initially scoped. The Project has not presented any compelling evidence that the Project will meaningfully increase ridership, and thus decrease traffic. Indeed, ridership on the Capitol Corridor has decreased by 50% since 2019. Even assuming ridership increases by 2,000 passengers in accordance with the Project's expectations, that removes less than 1% of cars daily from I-880 traffic. For the \$1 billion price tag, this seems like a low return on taxpayer investment. Furthermore, the draft EIR itself admits that, by 2040, environmental benefits resulting from reduced vehicle motor traffic become less beneficial because cars will have lower emissions due to improved technology and more stringent regulations. Since the Project has been delayed many years and it's unclear when an additional \$500-700 million of funding will be secured, whether the Project will even be completed by 2040 is questionable.

182-1

Moving passenger rail service from the Oakland-Niles rail line to the Coast rail line will enable Union Pacific to substantially increase freight traffic on the Oakland-Niles rail line, up

182-2

to 50-60 trains per day. This will negate and overcome any reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from increased ridership. However, the draft EIR does not address this increase because the Capitol Corridor does not manage freight traffic. This is an abrogation of Capitol Corridor's ethical responsibilities to the community. They should at least attempt an estimate so that the community can understand the true benefits and costs of the Project.

182-2 cont.

The draft EIR assumes the Project will be completed and operational by 2025. Clearly, this is an outdated assumption. The environmental impact assessments and the Project scoping should be redone based on updated data and assumptions, including expected ridership, construction timeframe, likely completion date, and time needed to obtain an additional \$500-700 million in funding.

182-3

Furthermore, the draft EIR does not adequately address significant risks to the impacted communities and environment. For those living in the communities near the Coast rail line, the draft EIR does not identify any adverse noise or vibration impacts during on-going operation of the rail line. However, this ignores the very real increase in noise and vibration we will feel, which studies have shown leads to chronic stress, diabetes, and even breast cancer. Also, the draft EIR does not anticipate any additional needs for fire or police, even though the Ardenwood train station will bring additional traffic and crime to the area. Fremont will not get any additional resources to deal with the increased traffic and crime.

182-4

The draft EIR also only evaluated potential impact of sea level rise and inundation to year 2050, even though design life of Project is at least 75 years (i.e., to year 2100). It also does not assess impact of the Project on the regional parks, shoreline, and wildlife refuges located near the Coast rail line.

182-5

I urge you to put a stop to the South Bay Connect Project. For \$1B, we should consider other alternatives that will be more effective.

182-6