

Appendix A STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Fall 2020





E. 14th St./Mission Blvd. and Fremont Blvd. Multimodal Corridor Project

FINAL Outreach Summary Report

September 2020

This memo provides an Outreach Summary for the E. 14th/Mission Blvd. and Fremont Blvd. Multimodal Corridor Project.

Outreach Purpose

The purpose of conducting stakeholder outreach for the E. 14th St./Mission Blvd. and Fremont Blvd. Multimodal Corridor Project was to solicit input and feedback from residents, community groups, businesses, and partner agencies along the Project Corridor to inform technical decision making around recommended multimodal improvements. In partnership with local and other implementing agencies, the project team engaged stakeholders to better understand local issues and opportunities along the corridor. This input informed the development of stakeholder-supported improvements to the corridor that will accommodate future growth and balance the needs of all corridor users. The stakeholder outreach included online surveys, focus groups, and open houses to engage members of the community and receive feedback. In addition, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was created, consisting of agency staff from the City of San Leandro, County of Alameda, City of Hayward, City of Union City, Union City Transit, City of Fremont, Caltrans, AC Transit, and BART.

Stakeholder outreach was conducted over three Project phases:

- Phase I: TAC #1, CrowdSpot Survey
- Phase II: TAC #2, Focus Groups
- Phase III: TAC #3, Open Houses, Online Survey, TAC #4

The remainder of this report summarizes these three phases of outreach and key learnings.

Outreach Phase I

The first phase of outreach for the project included a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting and an online map-based survey. The purpose of conducting public outreach for this phase was to inform the development of the Baseline Conditions Report, which includes the Goals and Objectives for the project, the summary of key findings, as well as a plan of action for future public engagement. Within this phase, the project team held the first TAC

meeting for the project, which provided feedback on important local groups and venues for future public outreach.

TAC Meeting #1

The first TAC meeting was conducted on June 27th, 2018 and included presentations on the following items:

- Project overview and meeting objectives
- Baseline conditions analysis and summary of key findings
- Stakeholder engagement plan
- Next steps

CrowdSpot Survey

Purpose

The purpose of the survey was to obtain direct feedback from a broad cross-section of existing users on location-specific improvement needs. Findings from the survey helped the project team: (1) verify existing conditions (i.e., where people are coming from, how they travel, barriers to access), and (2) identify gaps in improvement needs.

Methodology

The survey instrument was a digital, map-based platform that allowed users to mark a location on a map of the project area to identify barriers to multimodal access and barriers to active modes of transportation connectivity. The survey also had a series of questions designed to understand the responders' connection to the corridor. The survey concluded with an optional demographic questionnaire designed to help the project team determine if this outreach included a broad cross section of the community and understand the needs represented in the survey findings, as well as to target outreach to additional segments of the community if needed, in order to ensure broad public participation.

Process

The survey period began on Tuesday, May 22 and ended Sunday, July 15—approximately eight weeks. The website address for the CrowdSpot survey was distributed to stakeholders through existing partner agency communication channels, including email lists, constituent newsletters, and social media. The City of Fremont did not distribute the Crowdspot survey to their constituents in order to avoid confusion with a concurrent transportation survey related to their community outreach for the Fremont Mobility Action Plan (MAP). However, the City did share the responses and outcome from their survey with the project team.

The Crowdsport survey was made available in English, Spanish, and Chinese, and was available in mobile formats in addition to a desktop format. 658 unique visitors to the website left a total of 293 comments identifying 177 discrete locations ("Spots") in need of attention within the Project study area.

Key feedback received from Crowdsport survey was analyzed in two ways:

- Issues and concerns
- Values and desires

The following sections outline the most prevalent concerns, in each jurisdiction, for each of these categories.

Phase I Key Feedback: Issues and Concerns

The most common mobility issues and concerns identified through the Crowdsport and Fremont MAP surveys, organized by jurisdiction, are as follows:

<p>San Leandro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicyclist safety • Pedestrian safety • Bike facilities • Driver safety • Blight and personal safety <p>Unincorporated Alameda County</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate pedestrian facilities • Speeding cars • Pedestrian safety <p>Hayward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hayward Loop • Driver safety • Bicyclist safety • Auto travel times 	<p>Union City</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicyclist safety • Auto travel times • Bike facilities <p>Fremont (Crowdsport and Fremont MAP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicyclist safety • Auto travel times • Pedestrian safety • Cut-through traffic
--	--

Concerns related to safety for pedestrians and/or bicyclists were among the most common comments across all the Study Area jurisdictions. Other common issues and concerns shared among multiple jurisdictions include driver safety (in San Leandro and Hayward); bike facilities (in San Leandro and Union City); and auto travel times (in Union City and Fremont).

The issues reflected in the online survey were also reflected in the baseline conditions analysis findings. Specific exceptions are blight and personal safety (San Leandro), speeding cars (unincorporated Alameda County) and cut-through traffic (Fremont). Based on this feedback, these three topic areas received further technical analysis as concepts were developed.

The issues and concerns were used to inform the Project's Purpose and Need Statement, which reflected a combination of community stakeholder input (through the online surveys and agency stakeholder meetings) and technical data (through the baseline conditions analysis).

Phase I Key Feedback: Values and Desires

The most common values and desired improvements identified through the Crowdspot and Fremont MAP surveys, ranked by jurisdiction, are as follows:

<p>San Leandro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better bike facilities • Better pedestrian facilities • High-visibility crosswalks • Traffic calming <p>Unincorporated Alameda County</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic calming • Better bike facilities • Better pedestrian facilities • High visibility crosswalks <p>Hayward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better bike facilities • Traffic calming • Better traffic control • Better transit service 	<p>Union City</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better pedestrian facilities • Better bike facilities • Better traffic control <p>Fremont</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better bike facilities • Better pedestrian facilities • High-visibility crosswalks • Better bike/ped programming • Traffic calming • More enforcement • More education programs • Better transit service • Lower transit fares • Better transit facilities • Better traffic control • Better highway connectivity • Reduce drive-alone rate • Regulate transportation network carriers (TNCs, e.g., Lyft/Uber)
--	---

A stated desire for improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities was common the Study Area jurisdictions. Other desired improvements stated across multiple jurisdictions were implementation of traffic calming (San Leandro, unincorporated Alameda County, Hayward, and Fremont), high-visibility crosswalks (San Leandro, unincorporated Alameda County, and Fremont), and better transit service (Hayward and Fremont).

These improvements were incorporated into the list of potential near-term, mid-term, and long-term concepts for further evaluation and refinement.

Outreach Phase II

The second phase of outreach for the Project included a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting and Focus Group meetings. The primary purpose of input during Phase II was verifying baseline conditions and obtaining feedback on the draft long-term concepts and related near-term and mid-term improvements.

TAC Meeting #2

The second TAC meeting was conducted on January 10th, 2019 and included presentations on the following items:

- Project overview and schedule
- Baseline conditions overview
- Presentation of draft project concepts
- Upcoming stakeholder engagement
- Next Steps

Focus Group Meetings

Focus groups presented an opportunity to receive detailed input from a smaller number of key stakeholders. A total of 48 community members participated in focus groups conducted between January and March, 2019.

Geographical focus groups were held in San Leandro, Alameda County (Ashland/Cherryland), and Hayward/Union City. In place of a geographical focus group meeting for Fremont, the City of Fremont held a community workshop where the project team presented project information and spoke with community members.

In addition to the geographical focus groups, the project team held a bicycle focus group and a transit focus group meeting; a senior focus group meeting was originally planned but combined with the San Leandro meeting.

Format

The focus groups were structured as two-hour meetings on a weekday evening, with the invited stakeholders generally identified by technical and community relations staff from the partner agencies. At each meeting, the project team welcomed the participants and gave a presentation on the project focused on long-term concepts and the near- and mid-term priorities. The presentation was followed by discussion, questions, and verbal feedback. The meeting closed with the participants taking a written survey on various improvement needs.

Accessibility

Interpretation was made available in Spanish. No other language needs were requested by focus group participants.

Key Phase II Feedback

This section summarizes the changes and additional considerations for project improvements based on the feedback obtained through the focus group meetings. The changes and additional considerations are grouped as follows:

- Additional Improvements – were additional types of near-term and mid-term improvements identified?
- Stated Priorities or Preferences – were there overarching priorities or preferences that should be given special consideration as part of the technical evaluation of improvements to occur during Phase III?
- Additional Considerations or Concerns – were additional considerations or concerns expressed regarding specific improvements, suggesting that analysis or vetting should be undertaken?

The remainder of this section summarizes these three items.

Additional Improvements: Long Term Concepts

The following were identified as additions to the long-term concept elements under consideration:

- Dumbarton Corridor transit improvements from Redwood City to Union City BART
- As part of mobility hubs, incorporate bus driver amenities such as bathroom facilities
- Establish reduced speed limits in conjunction with multimodal improvements

Additional Improvements: Near-Term and Mid-Term

The following were identified as potential additions to the near-term and mid-term improvements under consideration:

Pedestrian Circulation

- Pedestrian improvements connecting to the future San Lorenzo Creek walkway

- Pedestrian scramble at selected intersections with high pedestrian volumes (examples cited were at Mission Blvd./Hampton/Mattox and E. 14th St./Ashland Ave.)
- Leading pedestrian intervals at selected intersections (i.e., giving pedestrians a head start before traffic), particularly for pedestrians walking along E. 14th St.
- Right turn on red prohibitions at intersections with high pedestrian volumes to remove conflicts with pedestrians
- Higher visibility crosswalks
- Use of historical signage (example cited was in downtown Hayward) to reflect local history
- Pedestrian walk signals that accommodate varied walking speeds

Bicycle Circulation

- Additional bike parking along the corridor
- East-west bike facility connections to/from corridor
- Protected intersections

Transit Circulation

- Improvements to address trash and blight around transit stops
- Historical markers incorporated into bus stop design
- Extension of AC Transit Flex in Castro Valley to connect with the Project Corridor (approximately ½ mile to E. 14th/Mission at Medford)
- Audible features (for visually impaired) at shelter locations where AC Transit NextBus arrival screens are added
- Lighting at shelters so that bus drivers can see waiting passengers at night

Vehicular Circulation

- None identified

Response to Feedback

The long-term concepts and near-term and mid-term improvements were updated to reflect these items. These additional improvements were also incorporated into the evaluation process.

Stated Priorities

The following overarching priorities were identified through a combination of focus group meeting discussion and the written surveys.

Pedestrian Circulation

- Pedestrian safety, in particular for crossing E. 14th St. and perpendicular streets
- More time at signalized crosswalks for pedestrians to cross the street
- Audible signals are important for the visually impaired (and remain audible throughout the entire crossing interval)
- Pedestrian HAWK (high-intensity activated crosswalk) beacons
- Pedestrian improvements around schools
- Pedestrian comfort, including pedestrian-scale lighting in downtowns and commercial areas

Bicycle Circulation

- Off street multi-use trail (East Bay Greenway Extension)
- Protected bike lanes
- Protected intersections
- Lane restriping for wider bike lanes

Transit

- First-mile and last-mile station access improvements (mobility hubs)
- Secure bike parking at transit stations
- Bus-only lanes in San Leandro
- Bus queue jump lanes
- Sidewalk improvements around bus stops

Vehicular Circulation

- Speed management/speed reduction for automobiles
- Pavement rehabilitation in San Leandro
- Traffic signal retiming

Response to Feedback

The priorities identified through the focus group meetings were incorporated into the evaluation process by giving additional consideration to these improvement types and the corresponding locations.

Additional Considerations or Concerns

The following additional considerations or concerns were expressed regarding specific improvements.

Pedestrian Circulation

- Pedestrian safety needs to be addressed in light of rapid bus service
- Look at where people are jaywalking to inform where more frequent crossings are needed
- Consider pedestrian safety needs for people with strollers

Bicycle Circulation

- Consider pop-up demonstrations of proposed bike and pedestrian projects
- Concerns about protected bike lanes – crosswalks are not as visible to drivers, particularly for seeing wheelchair users

Transit Circulation

- Concern about the level of commitment and tradeoffs associated with bus-only lanes
- Need to consider bus lane impacts on traffic congestion
- Consider whether queue jump lanes can provide comparable level of benefit to bus-only lanes
- BRT lanes should be available to non-AC transit buses as well (Links, Carlton shuttles, etc.)
- Evaluate whether rapid bus services would compete with BART
- Plan for facilities that would accommodate autonomous transit
- Consider how to consolidate responsibilities for waste receptacles along the corridor
- Consider that bus shelters may lead to undesirable uses and are difficult to remove. Get input from law enforcement officers trained in Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)

Vehicular Circulation

- Consider whether improvements to E. 14th St. would make corridor less friendly to drivers, diverting traffic to neighboring streets

Other

- Parking removal is a concern in Cherryland, given that it is seen as an existing problem
- Consider repurposing on-street parking in South Hayward, which is seen as underutilized
- Consider environmental impacts of proposed improvements

- Consider whether analyses should account for anticipated growth demands or targets based on new legislation (i.e., beyond what is stated in adopted regional models)
- Consider establishing a mode share target for the corridor

Response to Feedback

The evaluation process incorporated these considerations and concerns into the analyses where feasible. Further stakeholder discussion through partner agency meetings, TAC meetings, and community workshops during Phase III were also used to vet stated concerns and the associated analyses.

Outreach Phase III

The third phase of outreach for the project included two Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings, a series of in-person public workshops, and an online version of the workshop that included a survey. The purpose of outreach during this phase was to receive broad feedback on the draft long-range vision and draft recommended projects, and to further confirm the findings of the baseline conditions analysis and help to grow public support and cultivate champions for future project implementation.

The long-term concepts and near-term and mid-term improvements were evaluated through three tiers of analysis. The analysis results were presented to partner agencies and community members as part of the Phase III outreach activities.

- **Tier 1 Analysis:** This analysis was a high-level engineering feasibility assessment that focused on existing right of way widths and other physical constraints that could impact project improvement costs and implementation timeframes.
- **Tier 2 Analysis:** This analysis quantified demographic and accessibility benefits associated with the long-term concepts, in addition to community priorities and preferences.
- **Tier 3 Analysis:** This analysis quantified the long-term (year 2040) multimodal system performance of the proposed improvements in terms of transit ridership, traffic volumes, and bicycle trips.

TAC Meeting #3

The third TAC meeting was conducted on September 5, 2019 and included presentations on the following items:

- Project status overview and schedule
- Overview of concepts evaluation and findings
- Presentation of draft recommended long-term concept
- Approach for identifying near-term and mid-term safety and operational improvements
- Upcoming stakeholder engagement
- Next Steps

Public Workshops/Open Houses

The workshops were conducted in an open house format in which attendees could circulate through stations that characterized each mode of transportation and improvement: Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit, Traffic Operations, and Technology. Each workshop had representation from the local jurisdiction where the meeting was held. A representative from AC Transit was also available at each workshop. Attendees could talk and ask questions with the project team and agency staff.

110 community members attended five workshops along the corridor:

- San Leandro: Tuesday, Oct 22nd, 6:00-8:00pm, San Leandro Senior Center
- Alameda County: Saturday, November 9th, 10:00am–12:00pm, REACH Youth Center
- Hayward: Monday, October 28th, 5:30-7:30pm, Hayward Main City Library
- Union City: Tuesday, October 29th, 6:00-8:00pm, Kennedy Youth Center
- Fremont: Thursday, October 24th, 6:30-8:30pm, Fremont Main Library

Format and Topics

Each workshop included a verbal welcome presentation from Alameda CTC leaders and a rolling slide deck with general information about the Project Corridor.

Multiple stations were set up for participants to learn about the project. Attendees could ask questions and give feedback directly to project staff or by using sticky notes and dots. Stations included the following topics, with information shared on display boards including questions for participants organized by topic as follows:

- Transit: Bus-Only Lanes and Rapid Bus and Microtransit/Flex
- Bike/Ped: East Bay Greenway Extension
- Bike/Ped: On-Street Protected Bike Lanes & Near-Term Safety
- Pedestrian Safety: Near-Term Improvements
- Mobility Hubs
- Technology and Traffic Signal Infrastructure
- Open Comment Board: What else would you like us to know?

Accessibility

Interpretation was available in person at all workshops in Spanish. Vietnamese interpretation was available at the San Leandro, Hayward, Union City, and Fremont workshops. Interpretation was also available on-demand over the phone in 244 additional languages at each workshop. Fact sheets and booklets distributed at the workshops were available in English, Spanish, and Chinese. The slide deck presentation was available with voice-over for sight-impaired attendees.

Activities appropriate for children were available at all five workshops to simplify participation for parents.

Public Workshop Promotion

The workshops were promoted via a number of channels:

- Alameda CTC email list, Facebook, and Twitter, media contact list
- Notices in the East Bay Express
- Patch in San Leandro/Castro Valley, Union City and Fremont
- Event submitted to Hayward Stack
- E. 14th/Mission Project email list
- Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC) members
- Elected officials in the Study Area
- Chambers of Commerce in the Study Area
- Partner jurisdictions' email lists, Facebook, Nextdoor, Twitter, and web calendars
- Bike East Bay
- Facebook advertisements
- Fliers in English, Spanish, and Chinese

Online Workshop/Survey

The online survey was formatted as an online workshop to allow community members to visit the website and view the materials that were presented at the in-person workshop. It comprised of six separate informative survey pages and resulted in over 700-page interactions. Four pages included open-ended questions, which together received 294 distinct comments, indicating a high level of interest from those who visited the site.

Format and Topics

The interactive website had six pages, each featuring one survey topic:

- Bus-Only Lanes and Rapid Bus
- East Bay Greenway Extension
- On-Street Bike Lanes
- Pedestrian and Bike Safety
- Mobility Hubs
- Technology and Traffic Operations

Content for each of these pages mirrored the content highlighted at the workshops, with the goal of sharing information about the project and then soliciting meaningful feedback.

Participants were also able to look at the "Frequently Asked Questions" section of the website to learn about the study, Alameda CTC, and other details.

Accessibility

The website followed Federal Section 508 Accessibility Standards which are the highest Federal accessibility standards

Survey Promotion

The online survey was promoted via a number of channels:

- Alameda CTC email list, Facebook, and Twitter
- E14th/Mission Project email list
- Chambers of Commerce in the Project area
- Partner jurisdiction's email lists, Facebook, Nextdoor, Twitter, and web calendars
- Bike East Bay
- Facebook advertisements
- San Leandro Weekly

TAC Meeting #4

The fourth TAC meeting was conducted on June 30, 2020 and included presentations on the following items:

- Project status overview and schedule
- Near-term safety and operational improvements
- Draft implementation approach
- Project development approach

Key Phase III Feedback

This section summarizes additional considerations for project improvements based on the feedback obtained through the workshops and the online survey. The changes and additional considerations are grouped as follows:

- Key Takeaways – what priorities and preferences were shared for each category of travel that should influence project recommendations?
- Additional Ideas – what additional ideas were identified that had not previously been considered?
- Implementation Considerations– were ideas or issues identified that should be considered in specific implementation cases?

The remainder of this section summarizes these three items.

Key Takeaways

Bus-Only Lanes and Rapid Bus

- General support for making buses faster and people gave significant feedback on this topic
 - Mixed support for Bus-Only Lanes at Hayward and Union City workshops
 - Stronger support for Bus-Only Lanes at Ashland/Cherryland and Fremont workshops
 - On the web survey, people who would be more likely to take the bus with Bus-Only Lanes outnumbered people who would not, but not by a large margin
- Concern about safety on all public transit and at transit stops was a major emphasis in comments
- Cleanliness, convenience, frequency, and reliability are all important factors

On-Street Bike Lanes

- General support for expanding on-street bike facilities and people gave significant feedback on this topic
 - Support for both Class II buffered and Class IV in San Leandro
 - Support for both Class II buffered and Class IV with a slight preference for Class IV in Hayward and Union City
 - Strong support for Class IV in Ashland/Cherryland and in Fremont
 - In the online survey, there was a strong correlation between interest in biking and Class IV facilities

Near Term Bike/Ped Safety

- Pedestrian safety was identified as a priority standing alone and also as it pertains to people walking to/from transit. There was general support for all of the improvements mentioned, with highest priorities including:
 - Crosswalk improvements
 - Signalized intersection improvements
 - Bike lane restriping
 - Sidewalk gap closures
 - Pedestrian-scale lighting
 - Streetscape improvements (ped)
 - Streetscape improvements (bike)
 - Pedestrian scramble crossing
 - Facilities on parallel and connecting streets
 - Leading pedestrian interval
 - ADA ramp improvements

East Bay Greenway

- There is strong support for the implementation of the East Bay Greenway Extension
 - Some concerns raised on intersections with busy streets and specific concerns with routing
 - Maintenance, planting, and safety need to be prioritized

Mobility Hubs

- There is fairly strong support for the Mobility Hub concept supporting BART and transit use
 - People identified the importance of e-bike charging in addition to the improvements identified

Technology and Traffic Operations

- Support for signal timing and other technology
- Interest in using technology to make pedestrians safer at intersections
- Significant interest in more speed and traffic enforcement
- Interest in using technology to improve safety and traffic operations

Additional Ideas

- Provide education and skill building for children to learn about the corridor and how/why to use mobility hubs
- Provide open spaces and youth/elderly spaces for more ""eyes on the street""
- Institute a system that passengers can use to let bus drivers know which bus riders at a stop want to board
- Do not give prime parking spots at mobility hubs to charging stations instead of handicapped spaces
- Mobility hubs need space with rain/sun protection
- Non-smart-phone payment (ie, cash) should always be a payment option for mobility services
- Mobility hubs need to provide visible security to deter crime
- Would it be practical and feasible to have sensors located within the crosswalk to not only sense pedestrians but at the same time sync with the signals so that the wait time is less? For example, as a pedestrian walks across, normal set time is 30 seconds. Say it takes a pedestrian 20 seconds so then instead of waiting 10 more seconds, the signals cycle ahead.
- Signalizing right-turning traffic for pedestrian safety
- Level crossings at East Bay Greenway trail/road intersections for bicyclists and pedestrians
- Mobility hubs should include package delivery/pick up locations as well as lots of plants
- Get the rights to the abandoned railroad tracks along Western in Cherryland and make that part of the East Bay Greenway

Implementation Considerations

- A bike route is needed east of 2nd Street from the BART station in Hayward
- On Mission Blvd. between Fremont and Hayward, traffic lights seem to be timed such that cross traffic gets a green even when there are no cars there-There is a need for smart signals.
- Traffic lights on Mission Blvd. in Union City are difficult to trigger with a bicycle
- Close Fremont Blvd to cars and make it a nice main street with patio dining, etc.
- Ensure safety where the East Bay Greenway would pass Hesperian Blvd (speeding cars)
- East Bay Greenway should have emergency call boxes that are accessible to deaf people
- It would be nice to have separate bike and ped lanes on the East Bay Greenway

Appendix 1: General Open House Feedback Summary

San Leandro Open House Feedback

- Participants prefer enhanced bus service
- Attendees stated a preference for either Class II buffered or Class IV bike lanes
- Near term bike/ped priorities: Wayfinding signage, pedestrian scale lighting, mid-block ped refuge, leading ped interval, bike parking in front of retail, ADA ramp improvement
- Feedback on Mobility Hubs was neutral
 - People voiced support for FLEX-type service from San Leandro BART to Marina, Kaiser Hospital, Fairmont Hospital
- Additional ideas
 - Need integrated fares between BART, AC Transit, and other services

Ashland/Cherryland (Unincorporated County) Open House Feedback

- Attendees indicated a strong preference for enhanced bus service and prefer bus-only lanes
 - Comments included a desire for better bus seats, spaces for things like strollers and bags, better access for people with disabilities (ramps must be flush with bus and curb), more frequent and reliable service, more bus stops
- One attendee shared a desire to extend bus service to Pacific Commons
- The purposes listed for bus trips include work, school, and shopping
- Attendees overwhelmingly stated a preference for Class IV bike lanes over Class II bike lanes
- Near term bike/ped priorities in stated order of preference:
 - Pedestrian scramble crossings (including a comment that every school should have these and another claiming these are very effective at busy intersections)
 - Protected intersections (comment that longer ped intervals need to be tested using crutches or a wheelchair)
 - Mid-block pedestrian refuge
 - Pedestrian scale lighting
 - High visibility crosswalks
 - Leading pedestrian interval
 - Pavement resurfacing
 - ADA ramp improvement (ramps need to be flush to street and ADA is the law in addition to good planning)
 - Additional comment in Spanish suggesting improvements should not be forced if there is not sufficient right-of-way

- There was a question on the EBGW board from one attendee asking how to get to the trails since they aren't at a BART station (is there a bus, shuttle?)
- On the Mobility Hubs board:
 - Some concern that this will only be possible at BART stations that have lots of adjacent open land
 - There is support for smaller buses to travel to local areas to connect with library, school, businesses, parks, shops, hospitals
 - Desire for safe, well-lit stops, connections to BART and CalTrain
 - One person would like to see enough charging stations
- On the Technology and Traffic Operations board:
 - Be sure to place cabinets for signal controllers in a way that won't impair mobility for people with wheelchairs, walkers, crutches to walk around

Hayward Open House Feedback

- Attendees expressed mixed views regarding bus-only lanes
 - The purposes listed for bus trips include work and entertainment
 - One person expressed a desire to see rapid bus connect to smaller, local bus routes in the downtown area
 - One person commented that rapid bus needs to be accessible to people with disabilities and vision impaired, in particular
- One person shared a desire to have microtransit (FLEX) in Hayward to serve the 60 loop, outlying destinations, South Hayward BART, and CSU
- There was support for both Class II and Class IV bike lanes, with slightly stronger support for Class IV
 - One person noted that bicyclists need to be visible, there is an issue with debris in the lanes, and parking enforcement is important
 - One person commented that if A St is converted to two-way, there may not be room for bike lanes so we should consider adding bike lanes to B Street
- Near term bike/ped priorities in stated order of preference:
 - High visibility crosswalks, protected intersections, leading ped interval, and pavement resurfacing were indicated as top priorities, followed by ADA ramp improvement, hawk signals, bicycle parking in front of retail (comment: better than U-racks), wayfinding signage, pedestrian scale lighting
 - Pedestrian-focused comments included that pedestrian recall should be implemented at all intersections with high ped volumes, that in general pedestrian phases need to be longer, and specifically at Foothill and A St for elderly tours
 - Bicycle-focused comments included that retail bike parking should be better than U-racks, that leading bike intervals should also be considered, and that traffic signal controllers need to be better at detecting bikes
- There was general support for Mobility Hubs; comments included:

- Need safe and accessible pedestrian facilities
- A desire for e-bike charging
- There were two comments regarding Technology and Traffic Operations:
 - Video detection for Peds?
 - Speed detection with automatic fines should be sent in the mail using license plate detection

Union City Open House Feedback

- There was a balance between those who said they supported faster travel through bus-only lanes, and those who said they did not
 - One person identifying as older said security is a concern on the bus, and that cameras help but it would be best to have two cameras—one low and one high—to discourage people with head coverings trying to evade the higher camera
 - One person expressed concern that adding bus only lanes, or having buses stop in a travel lane, would cause many drivers to seek out other routes on side streets
 - Clean buses are a priority
 - The purposes listed for bus trips include work and shopping
 - One person expressed support for making buses faster to motivate people to take them
 - One person stated that we need bus access on both sides of Union City BART station
- There was support for both Class II buffered and Class IV bike lanes, with slightly stronger support for Class IV
 - One person commented that Class I and IV are best
- There were no votes for near term bike/ped
 - One comment stated that streetlights need to point down fully and comply with the standards to not contribute to light pollution
- One person expressed enthusiasm for the EBGW ("this is an awesome vision!")
- There was some support expressed for the Mobility Hubs concept, and a comment that EV charging matters for E-bikes and a preference for 3 bike racks on each bus
- On the Technology and Traffic Operations Board were the following comments:
 - Many older cars on the road don't talk technology, so probably twenty years before this idea is the norm
 - TSP for the buses is the priority in the short term
- One person asked that Quarry Lakes Pkwy be included in this study.

Fremont Open House Feedback

- There was general support for faster travel through bus-only lanes, with several comments:
 - One attendee expressed desire for bus only lane on Fremont Blvd near BART in Fremont
 - Someone asked about the last mile from the bus stop to home
 - Clipper integration and seamless transfers need to be a priority
 - The bus isn't going to work for shopping, so I will drive
 - High frequency is important, as is reliability and better timing on connections
 - Real time arrival data is very important
 - The purposes listed for bus trips include recreation, shopping, and work
- For bike lanes, there was a clear preference for Class IV
 - One participant voiced a desire for safer bikes and faster transit as good alternatives to driving
 - Another expressed concern about sidewalk riding even in the presence of bike lanes
- Near term bike/ped priorities in stated order of preference:
 - Mid-block pedestrian refuge, high visibility crosswalks, bicycle parking in front of retail, protected intersections
 - Leading pedestrian interval, hawk signals, pedestrian scramble crossings, pavement resurfacing
 - ADA ramp improvements (preference for perpendicular ramps), wayfinding signage, pedestrian scale lighting
- There was general support for Mobility Hub improvements, comments included:
 - Sheltered waiting areas are important
 - BART to Oakland airport is very convenient with the BART people mover
 - EV charging can be low current at BART stations as vehicles will be there most of the day
 - EV charging stations should be a priority
- Additional comments included:
 - Expedite long term improvements, 7-year timeframe should be shortened to allow for over-runs and problems
 - Concern about earthquake resiliency

- PG&E should not be allowed to put up its wireless router in proximity to the roadway – it reads like a cell tower (some people have EMF sensitivity)
- Roads and traffic should be the priority, followed by trails later
- A desire for hard copy newsletters to update citizens year to year on progress
- For local travel, reducing the number of lanes for cars through these types of improvements will make living in Fremont more miserable
- Priorities are a) e-scooters, b) bikes on bus for everybody, c) last mile from bus stop to home, especially for the elderly, d) security of bikes, specifically at bus stops, and e) bike lockers

Appendix 2: Web Survey Feedback Summary

Bus-Only Lanes and Rapid Bus

If bus travel is made faster through Bus-Only Lanes, would you be more likely to take the bus?

Definitely	51
Probably	27
Probably Not	35
Definitely Not	43

Themes in comments include the importance of safety, cleanliness, convenience, frequency, and reliability.

On Street Bike Lanes

Participants were asked how likely they were to use Class II buffered and IV bike facilities for themselves, or to recommend their use to a family member (child or older relative). The results are in the following table, indicating a strong correlation between Class IV facilities and likelihood of bicycling.

Totals	Class II buffered (self)	Class II buffered (family)	Class IV (self)	Class IV (family)
Definitely	38	31	74	70
Probably	39	37	24	31
Probably Not	32	37	18	14
Definitely Not	37	40	30	32

Near Term Bike/Ped Safety

Participants were asked to select any number of improvements that they felt were important.

Improvement	Votes
Crosswalk improvements	83
Signalized intersection improvements	78
Bike lane restriping	74
Sidewalk gap closures	72

Pedestrian-scale lighting	68
Streetscape improvements (ped)	63
Streetscape improvements (bike)	56
Pedestrian scramble crossing	56
Facilities on parallel and connecting streets	55
Leading pedestrian interval	55
ADA ramp improvements	47
Wayfinding	37
Driveway consolidation	34

East Bay Greenway

Participants had overwhelmingly positive things to say about the East Bay Greenway, with some specific routing and intersection safety concerns.

Mobility Hubs

Participants were asked if these types of improvements were implemented on this corridor today, would they be more likely to take the bus and/or BART?

Definitely	46
Probably	29
Probably Not	21
Definitely Not	15

Technology and Traffic Operations

Themes heard include:

- Better enforcement is needed
- Technology needs to prioritize pedestrian safety (for example, no turn on red)
- Signal timing is important to help traffic flow

Appendix 3: List of Stakeholder Organizations

The following is a list of community stakeholder organizations that the project team contacted to participate in stakeholder engagement activities. Outreach to additional stakeholder organizations was completed by the local jurisdictions along the Project Corridor and their respective public information offices.

- Alameda County Arts Commission
- Alameda County Fire Department
- Alameda County Sheriff's Office
- Ashland Place
- Bay Area Trails Collaborative
- Bike East Bay
- Bike Fremont
- Bike/Walk Castro Valley
- Bike/Walk San Leandro
- Broadmoor Homeowners Association (San Leandro)
- Cal State University East Bay
- California Highway Patrol
- Carlton Senior Living (San Leandro)
- Castro Valley/Eden Area Chamber of Commerce
- Chapel of the Chimes Memorial Park & Funeral Home
- Cherryland Community Association
- Colonial Gardens Homeowners Association (San Leandro)
- Communities for a Better Environment
- Community Resources for Independent Living
- Decoto Neighborhood Association (Union City)
- Downtown Business Association (San Leandro)
- Dundee Homeowners Association (San Leandro)
- Eden Area Food Alliance
- Eden Housing
- Eden United Church
- Estudillo Estates Homeowners Association (San Leandro)
- Fairway Park Neighborhood Task Force (Hayward)
- Farrelly Pond Neighborhood Association (San Leandro)
- Fremont Unified School District
- Garden Terrace Homeowners Association (San Leandro)
- Guy Emanuele, Jr. Elementary School
- Hayward Area Planning Association
- Hayward Area Recreation and Park District
- Hayward Chamber of Commerce
- Hayward Downtown Specific Plan Task Force
- Hayward Fire Department



- Hayward Police Department
- James Logan High School
- Kidango
- La Clinica
- La Familia
- Madison Marquette
- Moreau Catholic High School
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
- Pacific Plaza Homeowners Association (San Leandro)
- Padres Unidos
- Peralta Creek Adobe Homeowners Association (San Leandro)
- PG&E, EBMUD & other utilities
- Prospect Hill Neighborhood Association (Hayward)
- Rails to Trails
- REACH Ashland Youth Center
- Resources for Community Development
- San Leandro Chamber of Commerce
- San Leandro Improvement Association
- San Leandro Planning Board
- San Leandro Senior Commission
- San Leandro Youth Advisory Commission
- South Hayward Neighborhood Group
- South San Leandro Business Association (formerly Halcyon Business Association)
- Spectrum
- Supervisor Miley's Transportation Advisory Committee
- Tiburcio Vasquez Ashland Health Center
- TransForm
- United Merchants (Hayward)
- United Seniors of Oakland and Alameda County
- Union City Senior Commission