APPENDIX 5-B, APPENDIX C: BIANNUAL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE OUTREACH REPORTS
SAN JOSE TO MERCED PROJECT SECTION
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE OUTREACH SUMMARY
April 16 – October 15, 2016

Overview

The following report summarizes environmental justice outreach activities conducted for the California High-Speed Rail Authority San Jose to Merced Project Section between April 16 and October 15, 2016. These activities are consistent with the overall approach and specific strategies outlined in the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan and the High-Speed Rail Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines, Version 5 (or, EMGv5).

Similar to the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan, the activities in this report are organized into the following outreach categories:

- Public meetings
- Organizational stakeholder contact
- Stakeholder group meetings
- Local stakeholder contact

I. Public Meetings

During the reporting period, the Authority conducted four public meetings in the San Jose to Merced Project Section, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2016</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>Los Banos Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17, 2016</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Berryessa Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 2016</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy Senior Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2016</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Gardner Community Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these cities includes substantial low-income and limited English-proficient (LEP) populations. For each of the public meetings, the Authority provided interpreters for languages commonly spoken (i.e., 5% or more of the population speaks the language as its first language) in each respective community (Spanish for Gilroy and Los Banos; Spanish and Vietnamese for San Jose). The meeting invitation flyer was translated and made available in the following languages: English, Spanish, Mandarin, Vietnamese and Tagalog (note: these are the five most commonly spoken languages in the San Jose to Merced Project Section). In addition, several factsheets were available in Spanish at the meetings.

Title VI reports were submitted to the Title VI Coordinator within 5 days after each public meeting.
II. Organizational Stakeholder Contact

A series of interviews was conducted in July and August of 2016 with stakeholders serving environmental justice populations along the San Jose to Merced Project Section to inform the Authority’s outreach efforts to these populations. The primary objectives of the interviews were to:

- Better understand the interests and concerns of low-income and minority populations and how they relate to the High-Speed Rail project;
- Inform the Authority’s strategy for meaningfully engaging low-income and/or minority stakeholders, including anticipating and responding to potential challenges; and
- Identify specific environmental justice outreach opportunities (events, meetings, neighborhood groups, etc.) and additional stakeholders with whom to partner moving forward.

The following stakeholders were interviewed for the San Jose to Merced Project Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Point of Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans for Community Involvement</td>
<td>Cam Vu and Anne Marie Tran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Arsenio Mataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>David Bischoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose District Three</td>
<td>Lucila Ortiz and Heidi Sickler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delmas Park Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Andrew Tubbs and Bert Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt Alliance</td>
<td>Brian Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Health Foundation</td>
<td>Manuel Alvarado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransForm</td>
<td>Chris Lepe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following high-level themes emerged from the interviews:

- **Building credibility and trust** within an environmental justice community is essential to effective engagement. This can be accomplished by partnering with local community organizations and thought leaders to share information and co-convene meetings, and demonstrating an understanding of their interests and concerns. Environmental justice communities often have an acute mistrust of government agencies, and while this can be overcome, it will take time and commitment.

- Environmental justice communities have varying degrees of familiarity with the HSR project. To build understanding, project information should be communicated in simple, non-technical terms and translated in-language, and graphics and visuals should be used to explain complex topics.

- To ensure constructive interactions with environmental justice stakeholders, the Authority should provide comfortable, convenient, and culturally relevant opportunities for stakeholder participation. This approach includes leveraging existing community meetings and gatherings, and engaging residents where they live, shop and play.

- Environmental justice stakeholders often do not attend Authority-convened events because they have competing, higher-priority needs. By addressing these needs through providing food and childcare, and holding meetings at times convenient to residents, the Authority can demonstrate it values their time and wants to make the process as convenient as possible.

- When engaging environmental justice communities, the Authority should frame the project more as a quality of life issue than exclusively a transportation issue, which will make it more relatable to local needs and priorities. If the Authority can demonstrate that the HSR project can help improve the overall quality of their lives by alleviating current community challenges (e.g.,
poor air quality, traffic congestion, poverty) while providing tangible benefits (e.g., job creation, economic development, improved mobility and accessibility), residents of these communities are more likely to want to participate in the process.

The Summary of Interviews with Environmental Justice Stakeholders – San Francisco to San Jose and San Jose to Merced Project Sections report was developed to capture and summarize these interviews.

III. Group Stakeholder Meetings

The Authority convened Community Working Groups (CWGs) in the San Jose to Merced Project Section to discuss and gather input on project alternatives with community members representing a broad range of local interests. Each of the CWGs includes representatives of environmental justice communities in the project section. During the reporting period, the Authority conducted the following CWG meetings:

- April 18, 2016: Los Banos CWG
- August 9, 2016: Gilroy-Los Banos Technical Working Group (note: members of the Los Banos CWG were invited to participate as members of this group)
- August 11, 2016: Morgan Hill-Gilroy CWG
- August 17, 2016: San Jose CWG

Title VI reports were submitted to the Title VI Coordinator for each CWG meeting.

IV. Local Stakeholder Contact

In addition to hosting public meetings and CWG meetings, the Authority and/or regional consultant staff also attended community events in the San Jose to Merced Project Section to provide project information and gather stakeholder input from stakeholders in environmental justice communities, including:

- August 20, 2016: Gardner Community Flea Market (San Jose)
- September 18, 2016: VivaCalle San Jose
- October 9, 2016: Day on the Bay Multicultural Festival (Alviso)

Title VI reports were submitted to the Title VI Coordinator for each outreach event.

In addition, Authority and/or consultant staff participated in the following small group meetings and briefings with representatives of environmental justice communities:

- June 7, 2016: Meeting with San Jose District 6 neighborhood residents
- September 12, 2016: Presentation to Gilroy City Council
- September 13, 2016: Meeting with San Jose District 2 staff and City of San Jose staff to discuss outreach to residents along Monterey Highway corridor
The Authority’s definition and application of the term “environmental justice” as it relates to the High Speed Rail project is as follows: “Environmental Justice (EJ) is the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws and policies. Implementation of environmental justice principles in how the Authority plans, designs, and delivers the high-speed rail projects means that the Authority recognizes the potential social and environmental impacts that project activities may have on certain segments of the public.” (HSR Authority, Title VI Report, 2013)

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, states that “no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives Federal financial assistance” (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI).
Overview

The following report summarizes environmental justice (Title VI) public involvement activities conducted for the California High-Speed Rail San Jose to Merced Project Section between October 16, 2016 and April 30, 2017. These activities are consistent with the overall approach and specific strategies outlined in the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan and the High-Speed Rail Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines, Version 5 (or, EMGv5).

Similar to the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan, the activities in this report are organized into the following outreach categories:

- Public meetings
- Stakeholder group meetings
- Local stakeholder contact

Public Meetings

During the reporting period, the Authority conducted three public meetings in the San Jose to Merced Project Section, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2017</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>I.F.D.E.S. Lodge-Portuguese Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2017</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Southside Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2017</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>Los Banos Community Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the cities where the public meetings were held includes substantial low-income and limited English-proficient (LEP) populations. For each of the public meetings, the Authority provided interpreters for languages commonly spoken (i.e., 5% or more of the population speaks the language as its first language) in each respective community (Spanish for Gilroy and Los Banos; Spanish and Vietnamese for San Jose). The meeting invitation flyer was translated and made available in the following languages: English, Spanish, Mandarin, Vietnamese, and Tagalog. In addition, several factsheets were available in Spanish at the meetings.

Kearns & West developed Title VI reports for each public meeting and they are available on the California High-Speed Rail project SharePoint site. Title VI reports were submitted to the Title VI Coordinator within 5 days after each public meeting.
• **Group Stakeholder Meetings**

The Authority convened Community Working Groups (CWGs) in the San Jose to Merced Project Section to discuss and gather input on project alternatives with community members representing a broad range of local interests. Each of the CWGs includes representatives of environmental justice communities in the project section. During the reporting period, the Authority conducted the following CWG meetings:

- January 23, 2017: San Jose CWG (Edenvale Public Library)
- January 26, 2017: Morgan Hill-Gilroy CWG (I.F.D.E.S. Lodge-Portuguese Hall in Gilroy)

Kearns & West developed Title VI reports for each CWG meeting and they are available on the California High-Speed Rail project SharePoint site.

• **Local Stakeholder Contact**

In addition to hosting public meetings and CWG meetings, the Authority and/or regional consultant staff also hosted information tables at community gathering locations in the San Jose to Merced Project Section to provide project information and gather stakeholder input from stakeholders in environmental justice communities, including:

- November 29, 2016: Edenvale Public Library (San Jose)
- December 19, 2016: Gilroy Downtown Library
- April 6, 2017: Gilroy Downtown Library
- April 17, 2017: Arteaga’s Market (Gilroy)

In addition, Authority and/or consultant staff participated in the following small group meetings and briefings with representatives of environmental justice communities:

- October 27, 2016: Meeting with San Jose residents at the Edenvale Public Library. The meeting was hosted by San Jose District 2 City Councilmember Ash Kalra.
- November 14, 2016: Meeting with Gilroy neighborhood representatives to discuss outreach to residents of environmental justice communities in Gilroy.
- December 7, 2016: Meeting with Edenvale Great Oaks Plan Implementation Coalition (EGOPIC) at the Edenvale Community Center in San Jose.
- February 1, 2017: Meeting with the Seven Trees Neighborhood Association at the Seven Trees Community Center in San Jose.
- February 13, 2017: Meeting with the Gardner Neighborhood Association at the Gardner Community Center in San Jose.
- March 8, 2017: Meeting with the Goodyear-Mastic and Alma Neighborhood Associations at the Alma Senior Center in San Jose.

Kearns & West developed Title VI reports for each local stakeholder outreach event and they are available on the project SharePoint site.

The following items emerged from the environmental justice outreach events:

- Questions and concern about impacts to property value and how compensation would occur
- Questions and concerns about noise impacts from train operation and construction
- Concerns about traffic impacts from train operation and construction
- Concerns about increased graffiti on aerial structures and sound walls
- Concern about urbanization in East Gilroy
- Questions and concerns about the reliability of funding for High-Speed Rail
- Concern about amount of right of way available along Monterey Corridor
- Questions about the timeline for construction
- Questions about the choice of station locations
- Questions about the cost of tickets and speed of trains

---

i The Authority’s definition and application of the term “environmental justice” as it relates to the High Speed Rail project is as follows: “Environmental Justice (EJ) is the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws and policies. Implementation of environmental justice principles in how the Authority plans, designs, and delivers the high-speed rail projects means that the Authority recognizes the potential social and environmental impacts that project activities may have on certain segments of the public.” (HSR Authority, Title VI Report, 2013)

ii Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, states that “no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives Federal financial assistance” (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI).
Overview

The following report summarizes environmental justice outreach activities conducted for the California High-Speed Rail Authority San Jose to Merced Project Section between May 1, 2018 and October 31, 2018. These activities are consistent with the overall approach and specific strategies outlined in the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan and the High-Speed Rail Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines, Version 5 (or, EMGv5).

Similar to the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan, the activities in this report are organized into the following outreach categories:

- Public meetings
- Stakeholder group meetings
- Local stakeholder contact

I. Public Meetings

During the reporting period, there were no Authority-hosted public meetings in the San Jose to Merced Project Section.

II. Group Stakeholder Meetings

The Authority convened three meetings with Community Working Groups (CWGs) across the San Jose to Merced project section to discuss and gather input on the 2018 Business Plan and project alternatives with community members representing a broad range of local interests. Each of the CWGs includes representatives of environmental justice communities in the project section. During the reporting period, the Authority conducted the following CWG meeting:

- May 1: Business Plan Webinar with NorCal Community Working Groups
- May 2: San Jose CWG
- August 16: San Jose CWG

The following items emerged from the CWG meetings:

- Concern regarding impacts to existing infrastructure (e.g., Diridon Station, Monterey Highway, historic structures).
- Questions about the feasibility of tunneling and aerial approaches.
- Questions about the process/rationale for selecting a preferred alternative and which crossings will have grade separations.
- Concern regarding noise, vibration, aesthetic and pollution impacts and potential mitigations during construction and operation.
- Concern about connections to local transit.
• Concern that blended service will result in slower trains, longer travel times and increased traffic congestion.
• Concern regarding the increase in the number of trains and people in the Diridon station area.
• Concern that the community lacks awareness of the project.
• Concern about lack of coordination with other agencies and external planning efforts.

III. Local Stakeholder Contact

During the reporting period, the San Jose to Merced Project Section’s outreach consultant participated in eight local outreach events, conducted zero neighborhood canvasses and two stakeholder/service provider interviews.

Outreach Events
• June 8: Gilroy Right-of-Way Workshop
• July 2: Oak Grove Neighborhood Association Meeting
• August 14: Morgan Hill Morning Community Meeting
• August 14: Morgan Hill Evening Community Meeting
• September 20: Gilroy Small Business Workshop
• September 24: Gilroy Unified School District and City Council Meeting
• October 18: San Martin Neighborhood Alliance Meeting
• October 23: Delmas Park Neighborhood Association Meeting

Stakeholder/Service Provider Interviews
• October 29: Beatriz Sanchez (Biblioteca Latinoamericana, San Jose)
• October 31: Ky Le (Santa Clara County Office of Supportive Housing, Santa Clara County)

The following items emerged from the environmental justice outreach activities:
• Concern about impacts to local businesses during construction.
• Concern about property acquisition and receiving fair compensation.
• Concern about noise, vibration and visual impacts.
• Concern that more train crossings will increase traffic congestion and reduce parking availability.
• Concern about the project’s viability in terms of whether there is sufficient funding to see it through.
• Concern regarding coordination with other projects.
• Questions about relative cost of various alternatives.
• Concern regarding safety at crossings.

1 The Authority’s definition and application of the term “environmental justice” as it relates to the High Speed Rail project is as follows: “Environmental Justice (EJ) is the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws and policies. Implementation of environmental justice principles in how the Authority plans, designs, and delivers the high-speed rail projects means that the Authority recognizes the potential social and environmental impacts that project activities may have on certain segments of the public.” (HSR Authority, Title VI Report, 2013)
Overview

The following report summarizes environmental justice outreach activities conducted for the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) San Jose to Merced Project Section between November 1, 2018 and April 30, 2019. These activities are consistent with the overall approach and specific strategies outlined in the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan and the High-Speed Rail Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines, Version 5 (or, EMGv5).

In keeping with the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan, the activities in this report are organized into the following outreach categories:
- Public meetings
- Stakeholder group meetings
- Local stakeholder contact

I. Public Meetings

During the reporting period, there were no Authority-hosted public meetings in the San Jose to Merced Project Section.

II. Group Stakeholder Meetings

The Authority convened five meetings with Community Working Groups (CWGs) along the San Jose to Merced project section to discuss and gather input on the 2018 Business Plan and project alternatives with community members representing a broad range of local interests. Each of the CWGs includes representatives of environmental justice communities in the project section. During the reporting period, the Authority conducted the following CWG meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Attendees</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill–Gilroy CWG</td>
<td>11/7/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Program Updates, San Jose to Merced Project Section, community engagement and outreach, CWG input on community resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose CWG</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Statewide project update; review of alignment alternatives; outreach and engagement; introduction to CWG activity on community resources, community outreach, project interfaces and integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td># of Attendees</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose CWG</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rationale and process for identifying Preferred Alternative, role of the early train operator, updated flyover video, project benefits, outreach update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill–Gilroy CWG</td>
<td>3/5/2019</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rationale and process for identifying Preferred Alternative, role of the early train operator, updated flyover video, project benefits, outreach update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill–Gilroy CWG</td>
<td>4/22/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Build understanding of the safety and security characteristics of a high-speed rail system. Preview the format and types of information that will be shared about the Staff Recommended Preferred Alternative in Summer 2019. Provide an overview of the proposed process for CWG feedback on the Staff Recommended Preferred Alternative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following items emerged from the CWG meetings:

- Concerns regarding the relationship of the Authority to other agencies, projects and planning efforts.
  - The status of Caltrain electrification and its relation to the High-Speed Rail project.
  - Concern regarding interagency coordination and connection to other projects (e.g., Diridon Station planning).
  - Concern regarding the status of negotiations with Union Pacific and the potential impact on the selection of a preferred alternative.
  - Questions regarding the role of the Early Train Operator and its relationship to the Authority.

- Concerns regarding High-Speed Rail’s potential impacts.
  - Parking and traffic
    - Concerns regarding impacts to parking availability.
    - Concerns regarding the impact of at-grade crossings on traffic congestion, neighborhood separations, emergency vehicle access, and connectivity.
  - Property
    - Concern regarding impacts to agricultural land in San Martin (especially in Alternative 3).
    - Concern regarding potential impacts to existing infrastructure depending on which alternative is selected.
    - Concern that a viaduct would significantly impact many neighborhoods.
  - Safety
    - Concerns that more frequent trains pose a greater safety risk.
    - Concern regarding the consistency and efficacy of pedestrian crossings across the corridor.
    - Concern regarding the vulnerability of High-Speed Rail to terrorist attacks.
• Concerns regarding the design, operation and efficacy of safety features (including fencing, quad gates, Automatic Train Control, barrier skirt)
  o Noise and vibration
• Concerns regarding methodology.
  o Concern regarding the metrics being used for evaluating impacts to buildings and agricultural land.
  o Interest in the methodology used for traffic analysis in the environmental document.
  o Concern that safety is not considered a differentiating factor in comparing alternatives.
• Concerns regarding project viability.
  o Concern regarding levels of funding and responsibility for grade separation projects.
  o Concern about the project status given the 2019 State of the State address.
  o Concern about project schedule, delays, and funding.
• Concerns regarding public input.
  o Recommendation to expand outreach efforts and to provide more opportunities for input (i.e., a process for providing comments on the Staff-Recommended Preferred Alternative).
  o Interest in how public input is being incorporated and concern that CWG members’ opinions will not be considered.

III. Local Stakeholder Contact

During the reporting period, the San Jose to Merced Project Section’s outreach consultant participated in two local outreach events, conducted two canvasses, and led 36 stakeholder/service provider interviews.

Outreach Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Attendees</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resource Partners/ Advocacy Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIVO In-Language Meeting</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>The event purpose was to engage, for the first time, the Vietnamese community in Santa Clara County, provide updates on the project, and solicit input on the alternatives.</td>
<td>Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volta Elementary School In-language meeting</td>
<td>3/26/2019</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Engage the Volta Elementary School and broader community in Los Banos, provide basic information and updates on the project, and solicit input on impacts to the community.</td>
<td>Volta Elementary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Neighborhood Canvasses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Attendees</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Recreation Senior Center Canvass</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Solicit input from senior citizens living in Morgan Hill on potential impacts from High-Speed Rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner Community Center Canvass</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>Gardner, San Jose</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Solicit input from community members at the Gardner Community Center regarding potential impacts from High-Speed Rail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Stakeholder/Service Provider Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Rose</td>
<td>11/8/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gavilan College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Hernandez</td>
<td>11/9/2018</td>
<td>Gardner, San Jose</td>
<td>Biblioteca Latinoamericana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Barry</td>
<td>11/9/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Saint Mary Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Flores</td>
<td>11/9/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Cordova</td>
<td>11/12/2018</td>
<td>Gardner, San Jose</td>
<td>Santa Maria Urban Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Vasquez</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Cuevas</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>San Martin</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Little, Tiffany Brown &amp; Edith Ramirez</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quyen Mai</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation (VIVO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cythina Sutter-Tkel</td>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Salvation Army Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Callahan-Johnson</td>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>Merced County Community Action Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Akhter</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>San Martin</td>
<td>The Cordoba Center: South Valley Islamic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Mondragon</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>South Valley Middle School in Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karolinnne Livingston</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Rebekah Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Lane</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Morgan Hill Community Adult School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Reeves</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Learning and Loving Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Guhl</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Salvation Army Emmanuel House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Thomas</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>Volta Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heim</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>Los Banos Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma Torres</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
<td>Kings View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Sved</td>
<td>12/14/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Navigator Schools (Gilroy Prep School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin O’Brien</td>
<td>12/18/2018</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Community Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Rebboah</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Rebekah Children's Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Darling</td>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>San Andreas Regional Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinthia Sazio</td>
<td>1/8/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Head Start Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Dinsmore</td>
<td>1/29/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Hope Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Armendariz</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>CARAS South County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Vasquez</td>
<td>2/12/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Glen View Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Selo</td>
<td>2/12/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>West Valley Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Escobar</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Downtown Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Stevens</td>
<td>2/19/2019</td>
<td>San Martin</td>
<td>San Martin Lions Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Bernstein-Chargin</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Compassion Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milina Jovanovic</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Office of Immigrant Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Sanchez</td>
<td>3/14/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Cortez</td>
<td>4/18/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Alexander Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Martín</td>
<td>4/22/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>St. Joseph’s Family Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following items emerged from the environmental justice outreach activities:

- **Potential Impacts**
  - Concern regarding neighborhood separations and the separation of communities from the services upon which they rely.
  - Concern regarding noise and vibration and the aesthetic impact of sound barriers.
  - Displacement
    - Concern that High-Speed Rail will exacerbate the lack of affordable housing and further raise housing costs.
    - Concern regarding property acquisition that may be necessary depending on the alternative selected.
  - Traffic and parking
    - Interest in how the alignment will impact congestion on local roadways.
  - Safety
    - Concern regarding security at train stations and on-board trains.
    - Concern regarding safety at grade crossings (especially near schools).
    - Concern regarding the proximity of High-Speed Rail to homeless individuals in the rail right-of-way.

- **Potential Community Benefits**
  - Interest in more information regarding mitigation measures to lessen impacts in environmental justice communities.
  - Concern regarding the affordability of fares and whether low-income individuals will be able to make use of High-Speed Rail.
  - Optimism that High-Speed Rail will result in additional customers for local businesses (due to increased traffic at stations).
  - Optimism that High-Speed Rail will lead to improved access to jobs and higher education (shorter commutes and reduced traffic congestion).
  - Optimism that High-Speed Rail will lead to the preservation of agricultural land (depending on the alternative selected).

- **Public Engagement**
Interest in varied modes of engagement because some populations have limited access to technology.
Concern that there is a lack of awareness about the project in environmental justice communities.

- Project Costs and Operation
  - Concern that taxpayer money should be spent judiciously (especially in regard to the demolition of recently constructed buildings and infrastructure).
  - Interest in fair labor practices.
  - Concern regarding project timeline, availability of funds, and viability.
  - Concern regarding the lack of funding for grade separation projects (and the associated financial burden placed on local jurisdictions).

- Connectivity
  - Concern regarding the speed and frequency of train service and connectivity to other forms of transit.
  - Concern regarding safe bicycle and pedestrian access.

---

1 The Authority’s definition and application of the term “environmental justice” as it relates to the High Speed Rail project is as follows: “Environmental Justice (EJ) is the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws and policies. Implementation of environmental justice principles in how the Authority plans, designs, and delivers the high-speed rail projects means that the Authority recognizes the potential social and environmental impacts that project activities may have on certain segments of the public.” (HSR Authority, Title VI Report, 2013)
Overview

The following report summarizes environmental justice outreach activities conducted for the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) San Jose to Merced Project Section between May 1, 2019 and October 31, 2019. These activities are consistent with the overall approach and specific strategies outlined in the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan and the High-Speed Rail Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines, Version 5 (or, EMGv5).

In keeping with the San Jose to Merced Environmental Justice Outreach Plan, the activities in this report are organized into the following outreach categories:

- Public meetings
- Stakeholder group meetings
- Local stakeholder contact

I. Public Meetings

During the reporting period, there were no Authority-hosted public meetings in the San Jose to Merced Project Section. The Authority hosted open houses (focused on the selection of a preferred alternative), but these are not being included as they neither focused on environmental justice nor did they target environmental justice communities.

II. Group Stakeholder Meetings

While the Authority convened several Community Working Groups (CWGs) along the San Jose to Merced Project Section during this time period, these meetings were not focused on environmental justice topics and they did not target environmental justice communities.

III. Local Stakeholder Contact

During the reporting period, the San Jose to Merced Project Section’s outreach consultant participated in 11 outreach events and also led 11 stakeholder/service provider interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Attendees</th>
<th>Resource Partners/Advocacy Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardner Community Meeting</td>
<td>5/13/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gardner Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy Community Meeting</td>
<td>5/28/2019</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gilroy Unified School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following items emerged from these environmental justice outreach events:

- **Project Timeline/Sequencing/Process**
  - Interest in the project timeline (e.g., the sequencing of construction phases, coordination with local infrastructure projects, and the timing of property acquisitions) and the process for selecting a preferred alternative.
  - Concern regarding news reports of project delays, mismanagement and cost overruns.

- **Displacement/Property Impacts**
  - Interest in pinpointing the specific homes that will be affected by the project and acquired by the Authority.
  - Concern regarding potential impacts to historic buildings and public spaces (e.g., Fuller Park) and relief that the preferred alternative may minimize such displacement.
  - Concern that the project may raise housing prices.

- **Coordination with External Agencies**
  - Interest in the logistics of how the Authority will coordinate service with other transportation agencies (e.g., Union Pacific, Caltrain, Amtrak, BART, local buses).
  - Interest in how the High-Speed Rail timeline relates to the development of the Diridon Integrated Station Concept.

- **Funding**
  - Concern regarding the availability of funding to complete the project given the lack of Federal funding forthcoming.
  - Concern that additional funding will necessitate raising taxes and suggestions that support should come from technology companies in Silicon Valley (especially those providing shuttles for employees).

- **Noise**
  - Concern regarding noise impacts of train operation and interest in mitigations including quiet zones and sound walls.
• **Train Stations**
  - Interest in the location and construction timeline of train stations (including East Gilroy Station and Diridon).
  - Disappointment that there are no plans for a station in Morgan Hill.

• **Traffic**
  - Concern regarding traffic congestion at at-grade intersections, especially given the higher frequency of trains.
  - Optimism that the project may benefit all commuters by relieving traffic congestion (specifically in the Peninsula Corridor).

• **Project Benefits and Equity**
  - Concern that project benefits will not be distributed equitably and that individuals and communities with the least social/political capital will bear the greatest negative impacts.
  - Optimism regarding potential project benefits (e.g., economic opportunities for downtown Gilroy, increased commuting options especially for non-drivers, job opportunities, more investment in Gilroy, alternative means of travelling to Southern California).

• **Community Cohesion/Separation/Connectedness**
  - Optimism regarding greater access to other cities across California.
  - Concern that the project is dividing the community “both physically and spiritually.”

• **Public Awareness/Outreach/Engagement**
  - Interest in having outreach materials translated into additional languages and distributed to non-English speaking communities.
  - Widespread belief that the project had been canceled.
  - Concern that the public isn’t being sufficiently engaged in the process.
  - Concern that youth lack awareness of the project.

• **Homeless**
  - Concern regarding the use and proximity of high-speed rail infrastructure (e.g., train stations, tracks, tunnels, archways) to numerous existing homeless encampments; the difficulty of relocating homeless individuals, and the potential future development of similar encampments.
  - Concern for the safety of homeless individuals who cross the train tracks as part of their daily routine.

• **Safety**
  - Interest in safety features and other infrastructure that might mitigate risks, including pedestrian bridges, ramps, walls, gates, fences and caged entrance systems to the public (especially vulnerable populations such as children and the homeless).
  - Concern with safety impacts to at-risk youth living near tracks who may attempt to inflict self-harm (specifically regarding those alternatives going through downtown Gilroy that will be adjacent to Rebekah Children’s Services).
  - Concern regarding safety impacts from electrification and at-grade crossings.

• **Alternatives**
  - General
    - Interest in whether there will be a single alternative for the entire project section, or if elements of different alternatives can be combined.
  - Support for Alternative 4
Belief that Alternative 4 would have the smallest impact on properties (including homes and historic buildings).
Belief that using existing tracks is the most efficient, cost-effective solution and would cause the fewest disruptions.

- **Opposition to Alternative 4**
  - Concern that Alternative 4 will contribute to the Mexican community’s segregation as it will serve as a barrier from the rest of Gilroy.
  - Concern with safety issues along the alignment, especially regarding schools and their proximity to tracks.
  - Concern that Alternative 4 poses the greatest risk to the Gilroy community because of the many educational institutions along the alignment.
  - Concern regarding the speed of trains under Alternative 4.

- **Opposition to Other Alternatives**
  - Concern that Alternative 3 will negatively impact farmers.
  - Concern that a viaduct may disrupt traffic along Monterey Road and thereby negatively impact businesses in Gilroy and Morgan Hill.
  - Concern about the cost associated with constructing a viaduct.

- **Support for Other Alternatives**
  - Preference for a viaduct in the median of Highway 101 to mitigate safety concerns.

### Stakeholder/Service Provider Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desarie Abeyta</td>
<td>6/25/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Bill Wilson Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Gonzalez</td>
<td>6/26/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>De-Bug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalinda Aguilar &amp; Ray Moreno</td>
<td>10/29/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Guadalupe Washington Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mags Petkewicz</td>
<td>10/29/2019</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Gardner Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Quintanilla</td>
<td>10/29/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Better Tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nastaran Nazarian</td>
<td>10/30/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>PARS Equality Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Keel</td>
<td>10/17/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Family and Children Services of Silicon Valley (LGBTQ Youth Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vy Nguyen</td>
<td>10/18/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Environmental Services Communications Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Norris</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quyen Vuong</td>
<td>10/24/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>International Children Assistance Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Ngo</td>
<td>10/4/2019</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>UStar Productions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following items emerged from these environmental justice outreach interviews:

- **Safety**
  - Concern regarding people crossing the tracks (e.g., students accessing schools, children accessing libraries, adjacent homeless encampments, and community members who do not have cars and therefore rely on walking and bicycling).
Concern regarding adequate fencing and barriers.
Concern regarding adequate signage and the need for a public awareness campaign to warn people of danger (especially given the substance abuse and mental health issues in the homeless community).

- **Homeless Issues**
  - Concern regarding the proximity of homeless encampments to the tracks and associated safety risks and displacement.

- **Noise**
  - Concern regarding noise impacts (both during construction and once service begins).

- **Displacement**
  - Concern about increased property values leading to community members losing their homes.

- **Air Quality**
  - Concern regarding air quality impacts during construction.

- **Access/Affordability**
  - Concern that the benefits of high-speed rail will not be equitably shared if the service does not offer an affordable mode of travel.

- **Traffic**
  - Concern regarding the impact on traffic congestion, especially during school drop-off and pick-up times.

- **Project Benefits**
  - Optimism that the project will provide constituent communities with greater access to Southern California.

- **Public Outreach**
  - Concern that local EJ populations are not aware of the project.
  - Concern that materials should be translated into additional languages (e.g., Farsi).
  - Concern that EJ communities must have a voice in the process.
  - Concern that the youth have not been adequately engaged.
  - Recommendations for how best to reach various EJ communities (including collaborating with trusted local service providers, cultural events, local in-language media outlets, and door-to-door communication).

---

1 The Authority’s definition and application of the term “environmental justice” as it relates to the high-speed rail project is as follows: “Environmental Justice (EJ) is the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws and policies. Implementation of environmental justice principles in how the Authority plans, designs, and delivers the high-speed rail projects means that the Authority recognizes the potential social and environmental impacts that project activities may have on certain segments of the public.” (HSR Authority, Title VI Report, 2013)