

E. PUBLIC MEETINGS

This page intentionally blank

1. Livermore Public Hearing

This page intentionally blank

In The Matter Of:
BART TO LIVERMORE EXTENSION

PUBLIC SPEAKER COMMENTS
August 22, 2017
BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

Bay Area Court Reporters
22320 Foothill Boulevard, Suite 210
Hayward, California 94541
800-339-DEPO

Original File BARTNew82217.txt
Min-U-Script® with Word Index

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

---oOo---

BART TO LIVERMORE EXTENSION PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
PUBLIC REVIEW MEETING

Reporter's Transcript of Public Speaker Comments

Tuesday, August 22, 2017

Robert Livermore Community Center
Palo Verde Room - 4448 Loyola Way
Livermore, California 94550

Reported By CHARLOTTE C. ROCHE, C.S.R.
Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 4486
BAY AREA COURT REPORTERS
22320 Foothill, Hayward, California 94541
510-889-9400

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

INDEX OF PUBLIC SPEAKERS

SPEAKER:	PAGE
Nancy Bankhead	7
Anne Homan	8
Karen Jefferson	10
Thomas Jefferson	12
Robert S. Allen	14
Evan Branning	16
Lisa Tromovitch	17
Merlin Newton	19
Daniel Casner	20
Patricia Munro	21
Mike Kujacich	24
Peta Grimes	25
Lynn Schussel	26
Leo M. Mara	27
Greg Thompson	29
Daniel Tet	31
Patricia Ratto	32
Corrie Karlsen	35
Maria DeLuz	37
Gary Marx	39
Larry Vardanega	42
Marianne Bidwell	43
Jeff Kaskey	46

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX OF PUBLIC SPEAKERS

SPEAKER:	PAGE
Vamsee Lakamsani	48
Ronald Acciaoli	50

---oOo---

INDEX OF BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT SPEAKERS

SPEAKER:	PAGE
Director John McPartland	53

---oOo---

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

2 VERBAL COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

3 BE IT REMEMBERED that pursuant to Public Notice,
4 and on Tuesday, August 22, 2017, commencing at the hour
5 of 6:00 p.m., with public comment commencing at 8:00
6 p.m., at Robert Livermore Community Center, Palo Verde
7 Room, 4448 Loyola Way, Livermore, California, the
8 following Draft Environmental Impact Report Public
9 Meeting was stenographically reported by
10 CHARLOTTE C. ROCHE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in
11 and for the State of California, and thereafter
12 transcribed as follows.

13

14 SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

15 ANDREW TANG, Project Manager, Presenter

16 JOHN MC PARTLAND, Director District 5

17 RACHEL RUSSELL, Senior Analyst

18 (Other Members of BART were also present)

19

20 ARUP NORTH AMERICA

21 CHESTER FUNG, Moderator

22 NANCY MATHISON, Timekeeper

23 (Other Members of ARUP were also present)

24

25 *****

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 PUBLIC SPEAKER COMMENTS

2 MR. FUNG: All right, thank you, Andrew.

3 As he said, we will now move to the Public
4 Comment portion of the meeting.

5 I will just note, if there are any clarification
6 questions, you know, "Where can I find information" on
7 "X" or "Y," feel free to find one of the Project Team
8 Members. We can certainly take care of you.

9 If you want a question asked that you want
10 others to hear and you want it to be part of the public
11 record, please fill out a Speaker Card and bring it up
12 here so we can put you in the queue.

13 And then we can record your opinion for the
14 Final Environmental Impact Report.

15 Here's the process. We have a pile of Speaker
16 Cards. I'll go through them in the order we've received
17 them. And I'll call the speakers' names in the order the
18 cards were received.

19 I'll do my best to pronounce your name
20 correctly. My apologies if I mispronounce your name,
21 apologies ahead of time.

22 The speakers will have three minutes. We may
23 have many speakers tonight. We want to respect
24 everyone's time, and we want to give everyone the
25 opportunity to be heard. So, we're limiting you to three

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 minutes.

2 As I mentioned we do have a Court Reporter who
3 is going to be recording all of the Public Comments, and
4 that would be included in our Final Environmental Impact
5 Report that we will publish.

6 The Timekeeper will use a timer to show how much
7 time is remaining. At three minutes I'll note that the
8 time is up, and we'll have to move on to the next
9 speaker.

10 I may need to interrupt to indicate the time's
11 up. I apologize, we are not trying to be rude. We just
12 want to respect everybody's time here tonight. Okay?

13 And I want to stress we are encouraging people
14 to keep their comments focused on the information that's
15 in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

16 If you can be as specific as you can about your
17 issue, then the team will understand the issue and be
18 able to best address it in the Final Environmental Impact
19 Report.

20 If you want to comment on the project itself as
21 opposed to the environmental information here, you are
22 also welcome to do that and know that that comment will
23 show up in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

24 Okay? And I am going to call three names at a
25 time. Please form a line on that side of the room, and

PH1
S1

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 I'll go through them in the order that we have received
2 them.

3 Okay, the first three names are Nancy Bankhead,
4 Anne Homan and Karen Jefferson. So, we'll start with
5 Nancy Bankhead.

S1
N. Bankhead

6 NANCY BANKHEAD

7 MS. BANKHEAD: Hi. I live on Hartman Road.
8 There's four houses on Hartman Road. You want to take
9 away two of them?

10 But anyway, Livermore's waited I don't know how
11 many years now. You're putting a carrot in front of us,
12 you're going to give us BART. Yeah, it's probably 20
13 years away, who knows.

14 But it's a slap in Livermore's face that you put
15 the maintenance and storage yard out there in a
16 beautiful, pristine valley, and not caring. Take the
17 yard or forget it.

18 I had my pond dug out two years ago because it
19 was filled with silt. The environmentalists found tiger
20 salamanders there, red legged frogs. They're an
21 endangered species.

22 They are not reportable, they cannot report
23 these to Fish and Game, because they go in there. The
24 reason that they don't, the farmers don't want them
25 knowing what's there. I have them there. They're in

1

2

PH1
S1 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 that area over there.

2 cont.

2 Robert Livermore's daughter lived out there. I
3 don't know the name, I'm not good with that. I looked in
4 the archeology part of it, arche... whatever. Anyway, I
5 didn't see any notice of that.

3

6 It just seems that you told us years ago that
7 you would go to Greenville Road. And now, no, we're not
8 going that far. We're just gonna put it in a pristine
9 valley and leave it there.

4

10 I have to sleep out there. You guys don't.
11 It's noisy. And it's very quiet there now. What you
12 guys want to put out there is noisy. So, I'm just
13 frustrated by the whole thing.

5

14 Nobody came out and talked to me. They just
15 sent me a notice, that came out a week later, because the
16 neighbor got one and notified you guys that you hadn't
17 sent out notices to all the neighbors.

6

18 That's just not done in an up-front way that I
19 know what's going on. And I found out this from the
20 neighbor, not from you guys. That's really sad.

21 (End of Nancy Bankhead.)

22 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

23 The next speaker is Anne Homan.

S2
A. Homan

24 ANNE HOMAN

25 MS. HOMAN: I know there are many issues that

1

PH1
S2 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 most of you want to address.

2 And maybe you can see the one I want to talk
3 about, which is on the last map (indicating). And
4 there's a thing that looks like a club and it's pink.
5 You see that?

6 That's what I want to talk about. That's what
7 Nancy was talking about.

8 This is an area that I live near. And it is a
9 very beautiful spot in North Livermore. So far we have
10 saved North Livermore for ag, for agriculture
11 development.

12 We have Measure D which says if you're not
13 agricultural, you don't belong there. We had the
14 reelelections to achieve that. So, that's the first thing
15 to think about.

16 Secondly, Nancy referred to the fact that near
17 Livermore Avenue is an old house. It's now painted I
18 think yellow. And it was built in the late 1800s. And
19 there was a house earlier than that there.

20 And it was, the newer house was, built by
21 Valentine Alviso, who was the son-in-law of Robert
22 Livermore.

23 So, it's one of the oldest houses in the area
24 that we know of that have connection with the actual
25 Livermore family.

1 cont.

2

PH1
S2 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Livermore has been very protective of its
2 scenery, of the hills around it. And believe me that
3 "pink club" will do away with a big bunch of that. And
4 we'll all be sorry to see it go.

3

5 It's an area where two creeks come together, and
6 there is abundance of wildlife there. I guess that's all
7 I need to say. Thank you.

4

8 (End of Anne Homan.)

9 MR. FUNG: Thank you very much.

10 The next speaker is Karen Jefferson, and after
11 that is Thomas Jefferson, Robert S. Allen, and
12 Evan Branning.

13 So, Karen Jefferson.

S3
K. Jefferson

14 KAREN JEFFERSON

15 MS. JEFFERSON: I'm certainly in support of a
16 full conventional BART to Livermore, to the Isabel
17 Station, and then following that to the Greenville
18 Station.

19 Livermore has paid taxes and supported BART for
20 many, many years, decades. I think it's,
21 environmentally, it's a good thing to do.

1

22 However, I am appalled by the Isabel train depot
23 station and the thought of putting it there. If you put
24 it there, I guess my question is, you've had the
25 situation where you've dealt with it currently, in

PH1
S3 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Pleasanton, on the freeway.

2 Why do you need a shop now that you're going to
3 Isabel? Why can't you do it in the same way on the
4 freeway? I don't quite understand that. That wasn't
5 pointed out.

2

6 The other thing is if you put the train depot on
7 Isabel, then what about going to Greenville? Is that
8 just a pipe dream that will never, ever happen? That's
9 my other question.

10 The other question I have, too, about your
11 analysis, I wasn't quite sure about how it was really
12 done; because for example, the point that you brought up
13 about air quality, somehow if you put a bus -- that
14 that's the alternative that you proposed -- by putting a
15 bus there, that's going to "improve" the air quality in
16 the valley?

3

17 When only 400 people are going to be riding it
18 and you're going to be adding another bus? That, to me,
19 it just doesn't make sense.

20 So, I would like some clarification about how
21 you do your analysis.

22 Thank you.

23 (End of Karen Jefferson.)

24 MR. FUNG: Thank you very much.

25 Thomas Jefferson.

PH1
S4

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

S4
T. Jefferson

1 THOMAS JEFFERSON

2 MR. JEFFERSON: Yeah, good evening, I'm

3 Thomas Jefferson. And surprisingly I might even agree

4 with the previous speaker who happened to be my wife.

5 I'm definitely in favor of BART, the

6 conventional BART, everything all the way to Livermore,

7 including not just -- not just -- but all the way to

8 Greenville.

9 I mean, for gosh sakes, I mean, how else are you

10 going to connect to the ACE Train.

11 And it's not just because we happen to have paid

12 millions of dollars over the past decades, people in

13 Livermore.

14 It would be nice if you would advertise how much

15 Livermore people have paid over those years.

16 When we first got here, I asked someone standing

17 over there, a BART person, I said "Why is there a BART

18 requirement for transit-oriented development?" You know,

19 "A lot of houses around a BART Station"?

20 He said "There isn't any requirement."

21 Then we went down there and talked to a BART

22 person. And he said -- We said "Why is there a

23 requirement for" a, you know, "a housing around a BART

24 Station?"

25 And he said "Well, there are points, points

1

2

3

PH1
S4 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 assigned," you know, "to figure out whether we can
2 actually put a station there." You know, "We'd like to
3 see these houses."

4 And then I heard from our speaker "Yes, there is
5 a requirement." I mean, that's what he said. "There is
6 a requirement for BART to put transit-oriented
7 development."

8 So, that's quite confusing.

9 I would have the same question about the BART
10 Yard. I mean, right now you're able to get this BART
11 Yard right on the tracks on the freeway. You don't have
12 to go up and run into somebody's yard.

13 Why can't you do this one more station, extend
14 the tracks down the freeway? After all, that's the way
15 they're gonna go when they go to Greenville. I mean, you
16 have them there already.

17 And the last thing was about the air quality,
18 which my wife happened to mention, independently of me.

19 You said "There's no air-quality impact from
20 D.M.U." A diesel? With no air quality impact? You must
21 have somebody working for Volkswagen to come up with
22 that. That's just incredible.

23 And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

24 (End of Thomas Jefferson.)

25 MR. FUNG: Thank you very much.

3 cont.

4

5

PH1
S5

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 The next speaker the Robert Allen. I think this
2 is the gentleman in the front here.

3 MR. MC PARTLAND: Bob, you're up.

4 ROBERT S. ALLEN

5 MR. ALLEN: I'm sorry, in my advanced years, I
6 can't hear a word that people are saying. So, I have to
7 do the best I can.

S5
R. Allen

8 Early plans called for BART to have a first
9 station at Junction Avenue School. A group of us became
10 very incensed with that, circulated a petition saying
11 that we wanted BART to come to Isabel first and to follow
12 the freeway to a station out to Greenville Road.

13 And we dictated, among other things, this change
14 to Livermore General Plan, activate for a first-stage
15 extension of BART along the I-580 Freeway to a station at
16 Isabel Ave at 580. And then an extension to a station at
17 Greenville Road at 580 as the City's preference.

18 Also advocate for the extension of BART to
19 Greenville Road in the I-580 median as the City's
20 preference.

21 The City and BART, and as soon as that petition
22 qualified for the ballot, they took -- did away with the
23 original plans, and they exercised this idea of the
24 Isabel Station.

25 I would suggest that we make certain changes --

1

2

PH1
S5 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 If I get cut off, I've got the list of these
2 separately.

3 That we defer the yard and shop until plans are
4 made for a further extension along I-580 to a station at
5 Greenville and 580.

6 Until then operate the new tail tracks, much as
7 BART now runs the turn-back at Dublin-Pleasanton.

8 Second change, keep the tail tracks in the
9 freeway median, similar to the present turn-back at
10 Dublin and Pleasanton. Suitable for running the trains
11 later to Isabel -- to Greenville.

12 Third is to design the tail tracks with enough
13 capacity for an added belt to downtown Oakland, Berkeley
14 and Richmond when BART has enough train cars.

15 Fourth, encourage ACE to restore rail to the
16 former Southern Pacific San Ramon Branch between Radum,
17 which is near the Shadow Cliff Park and the
18 Dublin-Pleasanton Station, about three miles to connect
19 ACE with the BART where BART crosses over the former S.P.

20 The Dublin-Pleasanton Station was chosen for
21 that intermodal, for that intermodal potential.

22 Another suggestion, please extend the expanded
23 parking --

24 MR. FUNG: Sir, sir --

25 MR. ALLEN: Oh.

2 cont.

3

PH1
S6

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 MR. FUNG: We're at three minutes. Three
2 minutes.

3 MR. ALLEN: Okay.

4 MR. FUNG: Thank you.

5 MR. ALLEN: I have the complete thing here if
6 anybody wants it.

7 MR. FUNG: Great, thank you.

8 Next speaker is Evan Branning, followed by the
9 next three on deck are Lisa Tromovitch, Merlin Newton,
10 and Daniel Casner.

11 So, Evan Branning.

12 EVAN BRANNING

13 MR. BRANNING: Hello. Thank you for coming out.
14 And I would like to start by thanking you for the very
15 detailed E.I.R. that you've already made.

16 The details in it were very informative and,
17 I think, have helped everyone here get a better picture
18 for what this will actually look like.

19 I personally am speaking on behalf of a
20 Citizens' Coalition, the BART to Livermore Coalition, and
21 we would like to ask you that you consider the
22 conventional BART project as your top priority.

23 Given the project goals of seeking to connect
24 intermodal transportation to reduce greenhouse gases and
25 to reduce congestion, conventional BART is the only one

S6
E. Branning

1

PH1
S6 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 that will actually succeed in reducing the congestion
2 using green house gases by acceptable levels.

3 In addition we are hoping that this project is
4 not the end point but it is made specific that it is a
5 project that will eventually connected to ACE at
6 Greenville.

7 Thank you.

8 (End of Evan Branning.)

9 MR. FUNG: Thank you very much for the comment.

10 Next speaker is Lisa Tromovitch.

11 LISA TROMOVITCH

12 MS. TROMOVITCH: Hi, I'm Lisa Tromovitch. I'm
13 the Livermore Shakespeare Festival.

14 Thank you for the very organized presentation
15 and all the Staff you brought to help us. That was
16 actually really helpful as we were looking at all the
17 charts and things. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. TROMOVITCH: Thank you, Staff.

20 We have increased our local attendance at our
21 Shakespeare Festival, which is two shows outdoors at
22 Wente to over 5000 customers this past summer.

23 40 percent come from outside the Tri-Valley. 10
24 percent come from San Francisco. This is our growth
25 area.

1 cont.

S7
L. Tromovitch

1

PH1
S7 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 We're a locally owned, locally based business
2 here in Livermore. And our whole plan was based on
3 cultural tourism.

4 We were counting on a downtown hotel, which
5 Livermore is working on, and BART to Livermore in order
6 to fulfill the plan.

7 We got through the recession, but we can only
8 hold on so long before we fill out the plan or actually
9 become a sustainable organization based on our income.

10 The only alternative plan that allows us to do
11 that is the conventional BART train, no transfers.

12 They are already going to have to transfer from
13 the station to get out to the businesses in Livermore.

14 I don't BART to Berkeley Rep because several
15 years ago I tried several times. Getting out there is
16 fine, there's a 3- or 4-minute transfer. It's 20 minutes
17 at night. It's just not worth it. I can walk.

18 So, I think a lot of people will have that same
19 response; that if it's too hard to get out here, they
20 just won't come.

21 So, the real trains cost more, yes, but they
22 adhere to the mission, the whole purpose of doing this.
23 They'll increase ridership, decrease greenhouse gas
24 emissions, and also benefit the local citizens and the
25 family owned and locally owned businesses that invested

1 cont.

PH1
S7 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 out here in creating something special.

2 I also applaud your continuing research on where
3 to put the yard and maintenance facility.

4 But thank you very much. This is really very
5 exciting.

6 (End of Lisa Tromovitch.)

7 MR. FUNG: A thank you for the comment.

8 Next speaker the Merlin Newton.

9 MERLIN NEWTON

10 MR. NEWTON: Hi. I'm a resident in the
11 Livermore Valley where the warehouse is supposed to be
12 built. And my concern is how this all came about.

13 And it's basically you're taking an agricultural
14 area and introducing a bunch of noise, which includes
15 light pollution, noise.

16 It's my understanding from an individual here
17 that it's a 24-hour operation. It doesn't make a whole
18 lot of sense.

19 You're going to introduce noise into the north
20 side of the valley where it doesn't exist, yet you have
21 all kinds of noise right on the freeway, with the
22 airport, commercial industry over there, and so forth.

23 I'm just wondering why it either hasn't gone
24 down further, to where industrial businesses are located,
25 near Greenville Road.

1 cont.

S8
M Newton

1

PH1
S8 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Why are we going to introduce noise to the north
2 side when we've already got it right there on the
3 freeway?

4 I know on the map you have a couple of circles
5 in Dublin that didn't agree with the slide, and the term
6 "great visual impact" was used.

7 When we look at the hillside of Dublin, that's a
8 visual impact already. So, to encroach on that doesn't
9 make sense.

10 And then you also address the other location,
11 North Livermore there, with that same philosophy of a
12 "great visual impact."

13 Well, like I said, you've got the airport right
14 there, you've got the freeway, lined with businesses and
15 so forth.

16 So, you're going to create a greater visual
17 impact in the valley back there. It just doesn't make a
18 whole lot of sense to me. And that's my big concern.

19 (End of Merlin Newton.)

20 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

21 Next speaker is Daniel Casner, followed by
22 Patricia Munro, Mike "K," and Peta Grimes.

23 Daniel Casner.

24 DANIEL CASNER

25 MR. CASNER: My name is Daniel Casner. Thank

1 cont.

S9
D. Casner

1

PH1
S9 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 you for the opportunity to make a comment.

2 I'm a Livermore resident and a daily BART rider,
3 and I support full conventional BART to Livermore with a
4 station at Isabel and eventual direct connection to ACE
5 at Greenville.

6 Transfer solutions will not improve commute
7 times or quality of life. As a Livermore resident,
8 conventional BART to Livermore will give me back about
9 five hours week in my community and with my family.

10 It's the only viable option for meaningfully
11 reducing pollution and the congestion on 580 and our
12 other roads.

13 Thank you.

14 (End of Daniel Casner.)

15 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

16 The next speaker is Patricia Munro.

17 PATRICIA MUNRO

18 MS. MUNRO: I rather like that language, a
19 "practical dialogue." So, I will.

20 I'm here to support the only practical and
21 viable option, conventional BART to Livermore. The
22 E.M.U./D.M.U. options have approximately the same costs
23 as does the conventional BART.

24 And I am not even gonna talk about buses, which
25 are in no sense BART. And frankly, I find them....

1 cont.

S10
P. Munro

1

PH1
S10 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Well, anyway.

2 And while it may seem that conventional BART
3 will cost more to maintain, that's not the case.

4 First of all, cap per cap -- the per-capita
5 maintenance rate appears to be relatively similar to the
6 D.M.U./E.M.U. options.

7 And I recognize you've got more work to do on
8 that. But more to the point, the way the per-capita
9 costs are figured omits the larger picture and the
10 indirect costs of any of the other options.

11 Conventional BART removes 12,000 cars from the
12 road. That takes down polutions costs, transportation
13 costs for people and goods on the way to the Port of
14 Oakland, road maintenance, with the concomitant costs of
15 travel delays.

16 Those reductions in cost are felt by individuals
17 in less time on the road, and in better health, and by
18 the agencies responsible for regional traffic control,
19 even though they may not be funded by BART itself.

20 In addition the report shows almost double the
21 ridership for full BART as the D.M.U./E.M.U. option. It
22 shows about a quarter of that ridership for the enhanced
23 bus system. And only about a thirtieth of that number
24 would take that last option.

25 And finally, there is the future to consider.

1 cont.

PH1
S10 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Only the conventional BART enables BART to extend to
2 Greenville, connecting to the ACE Train and the press of
3 traffic from the Central Valley, by reducing the press of
4 traffic from the Central Valley.

5 The spiraling cost of housing in the Bay Area is
6 hardly a secret, nor is that likely to change.

7 BART is designed as a regional transportation
8 system. It is the BART Board's responsibility to see
9 that the system serves the people who need the
10 transportation.

11 And I want to be clear that I am not directing
12 that comment to our representative but hoping that this
13 gets captured for other representatives.

14 I would like to also say that I heard some
15 comment about Dublin not liking the maintenance yard.
16 Neither do we.

17 So, only conventional BART with the possibility
18 of extension to Greenville will meet the needs of the
19 riders, the citizens of Livermore, and the commuters to
20 Oakland and San Francisco.

21 I urge the BART Board to build a system that
22 will address this area's transportation needs now and for
23 the future.

24 Thank you.

25 (End of Patricia Munro.)

1 cont.

PH1
S11

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

2 Next speaker is Mike "K."

3 MIKE KUJACICH

4 MR. KUJACICH: Hello. Honestly, I'm a little
5 conflicted. I would like to see BART come to Livermore.
6 I would like to see BART go out to the Central Valley.
7 However, there's only so much money available.

8 I grew up in San Mateo County in the '60s when
9 BART was first proposed, and I think then it was ahead of
10 its time. But now, 50 years later, it's behind.

11 And BART was promised for, promised at that
12 time, to go all the way around the bay.

13 I think frankly the 1.6 billion dollars that
14 this would cost is probably better spent finishing BART
15 going into downtown San Jose.

16 I mean, there are so many more people there,
17 there are so many more jobs there. I mean, it's not a
18 popular thing and you probably don't want it. You
19 probably want it here in Livermore.

20 But there's only 85,000 people here, and there's
21 hundreds of thousands of people and jobs in Santa Clara
22 County. So, thank you.

23 (End of Mike Kujacich.)

24 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

25 The next speaker is Peta Grimes.

S11
M. Kujacich

1

PH1
S12

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Sorry, next on deck is Lynn Schussel, Leo Mara,
2 and Greg Thompson.

3 PETA GRIMES

4 MS. GRIMES: Okay, why do you have to make it so
5 difficult?

6 We want BART to Livermore. We've been paying
7 for it for years. That's "BART" to Livermore, not buses
8 to Livermore, not diesel trains to Livermore. A real
9 BART connection.

10 Think how much money you could have saved if you
11 hadn't come up with all these stupid alternatives and
12 spent so much time evaluating them.

13 The other thing I wanted to mention was the
14 storage unit.

15 You said you had storage for 175 trains? How
16 are these trains getting there? Are they going to be 175
17 trains going through Isabel every day to get to this
18 storage unit?

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. Yes.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Holy shit.

21 MS. GRIMES: That's all I have to say.

22 (End of Peta Grimes.)

23 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

24 The next speaker is Lynn Schussel. Did I say
25 that right? "Shus-sul"?

S12
P. Grimes

1

PH1
S13

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

S13
L. Schussel

1 LYNN SCHUSSEL

2 MS. SCHUSSEL: My name is Lynn Schussel, and
3 I've lived in the Livermore Valley for about 20 years.
4 And I've been riding BART the majority of my life because
5 I lived in San Francisco and I would take it.

6 My comments are, first of all, I will only ride
7 conventional BART. Do not give me fake BART. I truly
8 will not do transfers.

9 As it is I have a two-hour commute every day one
10 way. So, I have enough to deal with every day.

11 So, transferring is not an option for me at this
12 point.

13 I think that I agree with the rest of the
14 members of our community, that we should have an Isabel
15 Station, but it should go out to Greenville as well.

16 There's no reason why it can't go out there.
17 The population, not just in Livermore but in the
18 Central Valley, supports it.

19 I mean, we need to be able to get the people off
20 of 580. I drive it every day, I want to scream every
21 day, because I have to deal with all that traffic.

22 So, I really believe that BART has a
23 responsibility to us, you know, to get us what we really
24 need so that we can get to work, we can get to see our
25 families, and have a life.

1

PH1
S13 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 None of us have a life right now when we're
2 having to deal with driving to Dublin-Pleasanton, trying
3 to get a train. Get up at 3:30 in the morning.

4 That's not a life.

5 We need BART here in the Valley, and I really
6 believe that BART should put in the Isabel Station and
7 then go right out to Greenville and put the yard there.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

9 MS. SHUSSEL: Thank you.

10 (End of Lynn Shussel.)

11 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

12 Next speaker is Leo Mara.

13 LEO MARA

14 MR. MARA: Hello, everybody.

15 Let's see, I didn't come with any prepared
16 comments, but I spoke to the fellows and ladies that you
17 had here, and so, I've got a couple of questions.

18 Let's see. If this thing doesn't go through,
19 which it looks to me like... and I've been here for 40
20 or 50 or 60 years, I don't know, some time like that, and
21 we've been paying taxes for this thing all that time...
22 so, it looks to me like it's not gonna go through.

23 So, I say, where's the money that we paid into
24 this thing? And are we gonna get it back if it doesn't
25 go through? That's my comment.

1 cont.

S14
L. Mara

1

PH1
S14 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MARR: Uh... oh.

3 If this thing is really a plan that's really
4 going to do this thing, why was the 580 all redone?

5 I mean, they put in new fencing, we had the
6 traffic jams. Why was all of that done and no provision
7 that BART made at that time?

8 I don't know who was in charge of that kind of
9 thing, but you know, not the way to do it.

10 Is the Isabel Station actually in Livermore? Is
11 that Livermore? Yeah? I think I could throw a baseball
12 from there to Dublin. Right?

13 It's in Livermore? All right.

14 And this thing's gonna bring in more people.
15 We're gonna have more houses and more fire stations.

16 And I mean, I've been in Livermore for many
17 years. I moved here because I liked the fact that it was
18 a small town. I don't know, I kind of wonder.

19 So, if we're gonna have BART, let's get it out
20 to Greenville. At least we can get this 580 thing
21 squared away.

22 And a comment about the ladies who live out
23 there, I don't even know what that area is called where
24 you're planning on putting the orange thing --

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hartman.

2

3

4

PH1
S14 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 MR. MARA: Everybody's got their spot to unwind.
2 You know, the place where you can go and just be "away"
3 from things. You know, quiet, peaceful?

4 You go out there... and I don't know how many
5 people have been out there... but go out there. You
6 know, walk out there, bicycle out there, car out there,
7 anything you want. Park your car and get out and just
8 walk for half a mile.

9 It's just the kind of place you want to be.

10 If this thing goes in there, you know what it's
11 gonna be like. It's gonna be noise.

12 Who knows how it's gonna get added to and
13 whatever else is gonna go on. So, I'm not a fan.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

16 The next speaker will be Greg Thompson, followed
17 by Daniel Tet, Patricia Ratto, and Corrie Carlson.

18 GREG THOMPSON

19 MR. THOMPSON: Hi, everyone. Greg Thompson. I
20 live in Downtown Livermore on Third Street.

21 I actually work with a lot of different start-up
22 companies these days. I was a C.T.O. for Larry Carlson
23 Venture Company. I've been an I.T. Director at Cisco.

24 What as I was discovering is a lot of the
25 senior executives and people I worked with lived in the

4 cont.

S15

G. Thompson

1

PH1
S15 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Tri Valley but they had to commute over the Sunol Grade
2 or toward the Central Valley.

3 So, more recently, in the last four years, I've
4 been working with the i-GATE Innovation Hub because we
5 really think the way to solve that is to create more jobs
6 in the Tri Valley.

7 And so, I'm a very strong proponent of the
8 conventional BART solution but also extending it all the
9 way to Greenville to interconnect with ACE, because there
10 is a lot of people in the Central Valley who could
11 participate as well.

12 I'm also supportive of the, what do you call it,
13 T.O.D. area, in other words the Isabel Neighborhood Plan;
14 because in working with that group, the thought is to
15 build a lot of high-class office space around there that
16 we can base a lot of the businesses in that area.

1 cont.

17 And so, the other reason we really need
18 conventional BART is we really need to make it easy for
19 people to go, that live in the Central Valley -- excuse
20 me, in the Silicon Valley to come work at these
21 businesses, and as well as people here to get back to the
22 San Francisco Bay Area.

23 For example, a lot of the high-tech
24 meetings, companies we work with are like in Downtown
25 San Francisco.

PH1
S15 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 So, even though I actually work in Downtown
2 Livermore, I'm a C.T.O. for a global health-care company
3 right now. And I'm often having to travel into the
4 Silicon Valley, especially San Francisco.

5 So, bottom line, conventional BART is the right
6 way to go.

7 And I don't think it makes sense to build that
8 extra line going up to the yard. You know, support it
9 the same way we currently support the Dublin-Pleasanton
10 Station because that's an investment in track that you
11 don't have to waste.

12 Instead you're investing forward toward the
13 eventual station at Greenville. Thank you.

14 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

15 Next speaker the Daniel Tet.

16 DANIEL TET

17 MR. TET: Hi, my name is Daniel Tet, and I'm a
18 commuter to San Francisco. And I go five days a week.
19 And like the previous speaker, I probably would save four
20 to five hours a week in commuting if BART was closer.

21 I definitely support conventional BART to
22 Livermore and none of this mumbo-jumbo fancy
23 train-transfer stuff that hardly ever saves time.

24 I think the previous speaker's comment about
25 extending the line to Greenville, to at least establish

1 cont.

S16
D. Tet

1

PH1
S16 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 the yard at the end of the line, makes a lot of sense.

2 And it proves the point that we do want it to go
3 there.

4 So, I am glad you guys came here today. I do
5 feel like this is a bit of a déjà vu all over again. I
6 think that I'd been to some of these meetings maybe 5
7 to 10, maybe 7, years ago.

8 So, I remember speaking at a meeting similar
9 just like this, and it was an environmental report and
10 everything.

11 So, I'm not sure where that went to and how much
12 money we spent on that. But anyways, I'll leave you with
13 a bunch of questions here, and hopefully you can answer
14 them when you meet with the BART Board.

15 Thank you. And please make this happen.

16 Thank you.

17 (End of Mr. Tet.)

18 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

19 The next speaker is Patricia Ratto.

20 PATRICIA RATTO

21 MS. RATTO: Hi. I'm on the north side of North
22 Livermore, so, it's gonna side my home.

23 And then my gorgeous view... that you guys
24 didn't even come and knock on the door... is gonna be
25 gone. And I paid 1.4 million.

1 cont.

S17
P. Ratto

1

PH1
S17 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Now, the loss in value from this is gonna be
2 about 800,000.

3 So, I'm asking you guys, if you want to save
4 money and not go all the way to Greenville... which
5 you're gonna go further that way, and you're gonna go out
6 to the agricultural... then buy our property.

7 Or I will stand there when the ground is being
8 dug and I will not allow it. I should have been
9 notified. My value is gonna drop.

10 If this was in your front yard, would you allow
11 it? Okay. I'm a little upset.

12 You had three different proposals. You said the
13 other two didn't work. Can you guys come up with other
14 proposals maybe where the garage would go somewhere else?

15 The value is gonna decrease by at least the bare
16 minimum 800,000. I will, even if I try to list my
17 property next week, I will have to disclose it. Even if
18 this takes another 20 years, I have to disclose this
19 (indicating). So, I lost value regardless.

20 You're gonna have 24 hours, you're gonna have
21 noise, you're gonna have a brick wall, you're gonna have
22 light pollution. I am --

23 You're going to ruin my view that I paid so much
24 for. I could have gone right next-door to the other
25 side. And I could have bought property, that's not quiet

1 cont.

PH1
S17 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 and it's in the city, for 800,000.

2 Who is gonna pay for that for me?

3 I want to also know if it's gonna be a
4 two-story? Is it gonna be underground? I'll take it's
5 not going to be underground now. Is it going to be a
6 one-story or a two-story with the garage?

7 I'm asking you guys to please consider
8 Greenville, where there is no property. Why that's not
9 being considered is beyond me.

10 I am here representing four families. The other
11 three couldn't be here. So, you'll be receiving letters
12 from them as well because they have the same thing.

1 cont.

13 I have lived in Livermore since I was 6. I'm
14 now 102.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Laughter.)

16 MS. RATTO: And I have put in for this.

17 And to sit here right now and know that this was
18 gonna be my retirement that I'm losing, it's beyond me.

19 So, I am absolutely asking you, one, to consider
20 Greenville or, two, consider buying my property from me.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

23 The next speaker is Corrie Karlsen. And he
24 will be followed by Maria DeLuz, Gary Marx, and
25 Larry Vardanega.

PH1
S18

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

S18
C. Karlsen

1 CORRIE KARLSEN

2 MR. KARLSEN: So, first of all I wanted to say
3 that, you know, I'm all for conventional BART only to
4 Livermore.

5 I would suggest that you add to your report what
6 it would cost to convert the other two rail options, the
7 diesel and electrical, to BART, because it's gonna
8 eventually get converted to BART because no one will ever
9 use it.

10 So, that could be something that you might want
11 to just put in the report; that when we actually
12 eventually build the real BART, this is how much we'll
13 have to add, or it will be a lot.

14 And then they'll have to shut down BART for all
15 of those years. So, no one would want to do that.

16 So, I also have not heard any support for those
17 proposals. So, it shouldn't be a problem.

18 I also would like to voice support for already
19 planning to extend BART to Greenville. Make that as part
20 of the proposal; that, you know, here's the, you know,
21 next; the next stage of the project is to Greenville, but
22 the money is just for this one.

23 But at least people can see there's tracks
24 stubbed out or there's a plan stubbed out.

25 I think everybody is pointing out that it would

1

PH1
S18 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 make perfect sense to at least extend the tracks straight
2 through the freeway median instead of going north.
3 That's been very obvious through all the comments.

4 So, I would like to also request that, at the
5 next meeting, that you have a very good reason why that
6 doesn't work.

7 Because we didn't see or hear anything about
8 that, why that didn't work. So, I've put that as a
9 request, that you add that.

10 I would also like to say, and this will be
11 perhaps controversial, but it would certainly be the
12 right thing to plan to go to Downtown Livermore.

13 I know there was a petition, people were upset
14 about it. But the right place for BART to go is
15 Downtown Livermore because that's where all the buses go,
16 that's where ACE goes.

17 It makes absolute perfect sense. It can go
18 underground, just like it does in every one of the other
19 places.

20 And it would be a way for people to come to
21 Livermore, to enjoy Livermore, to leave their money in
22 Livermore, to go to the new hotel in Livermore, to go to
23 the Shakespeare, to go to the symphony, to go to the
24 restaurants.

25 Livermore is already a destination.

l cont.

PH1
S18 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 When I moved here 32 years ago, it was not a
2 destination. No one ever went to Livermore. But they
3 actually do go to Livermore now. Quite a few.

1 cont.

4 So, I would at least say, think about that
5 alternative, too, maybe for the future.

6 Thank you.

7 (End of Corrie Karlsen.)

8 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

S19
M. De Luz

9 MARIA DE LUZ

10 MS. DE LUZ: Hello, good evening, thank you for
11 your presentation.

12 I'd like to add my support for all of the
13 previous speakers who asked that we continue with the
14 station to Greenville and please don't put that
15 service-center garage in the north, on North Livermore
16 Valley.

1

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. DE LUZ: My husband and I are recent
19 citizens of Livermore. We moved here three years ago
20 from Fremont.

21 We are not people that move around. We lived in
22 Fremont for over 30 years and decided that Livermore was
23 the perfect place to retire.

24 And we found a real good property On North
25 Livermore Avenue, in open space, agricultural area.

PH1
S19 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Something my husband has longed for for 60 years.

2 And one of the things I think that I admire the
3 most, that I've been so surprised, is the way that we
4 have enjoyed all the wildlife. And also we have
5 tremendous admiration, we have six acres, which is a
6 small place for North Livermore Avenue.

7 And one thing we really admired is how our
8 neighbors are shepherds of the land and how they've taken
9 care of these properties for generations in some
10 families.

11 They take care of the land, they take care of
12 their livestock, they honor their neighbors' faith and
13 the environment. And so, we hope for that.

14 And one of my earlier ones was, have you done a
15 study about noise pollution? One of the things that we
16 love about where we live is the quiet and the peace.

17 My husband is retired but I still work in
18 Fremont. And my blood pressure goes down several notches
19 just driving down North Livermore and up my road to my
20 house.

21 And I think, like I said earlier, we're not
22 movers. You know, this is our end-of-life place. And
23 please don't destroy our peace and quiet and the
24 environment where we live.

25 Thank you.

1 cont.

PH1
S20

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 (End of Maria DeLuz.)

2 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

3 The next speaker is Gary Marx, followed by
4 Larry Vardanega, and Marianne Bidwell.

5 GARY MARX

6 MR. MARX: Hi, my name's Gary Marx, M-a-r-x.

7 So, I'm probably the newest resident, with my
8 wife here, to Livermore. While she's been commuting here
9 for four years, close of escrow for us is in 70 days.

10 So... oh, can you not hear? There we go. Oh, I
11 have an echo.

12 So, we moved down here because we're proponents
13 of BART in more than one aspect.

14 I'm a business owner, so, some of my clients are
15 in San Francisco. I am in the tech world, and it's
16 exciting. She works at the Lab here.

17 We moved down from Oakland to Livermore to
18 minimize her commute. And since I work from home, to
19 minimize my commute doesn't matter.

20 But when I go visit clients, right now it's a
21 hassle to have a motorcycle, go figure out parking in the
22 garage there at Pleasanton, take a ride in.

23 I can get an hour worth of work done on the
24 train. So, if BART comes out here, so, a proponent of
25 the first plan, then I can get that hour of work done

S20
G. Marx

1

PH1
S20 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 from walking out my house, because we bought right off
2 there in that new development to do that.

3 New housing. So, that's very exciting for us.
4 And we were sold partly on the idea that BART will come
5 through.

6 But it's one of those things where it's a
7 government project. So, no offense, I see there's a lot
8 of hard work. But there's politics involved, a lot of
9 dissenters here (indicating), a lot of good will.

10 But it seems like a disconnect, just a
11 disconnect between the intent from the theory where
12 everybody agrees on it and the reality of the
13 implementation.

14 So, I don't think there's any disagreement on
15 the fact that people want a BART system here. I mean,
16 I'm spending a shit-ton of money, no offense -- not as
17 much as you (indicating) -- but to be here and to use
18 BART.

19 I will pay whatever price you charge us to go
20 into the City because it's the convenience factor and a
21 business writeoff for travel.

22 So, with all that in mind, I'm a little confused
23 and dismayed, having come from Oakland, the Downtown
24 West-Oakland area, where you have this industrial area,
25 where you "do" have these yards all around the Bay.

1 cont.

PH1
S20 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 How are they? Do those need improvements?
2 What's the condition of those yards, that you need
3 another yard to build out here?

4 And is there a proposal where some of that can
5 be addressed through, by moving the yard and not having
6 it here, since it is a very big point that can make this
7 not happen at all?

8 I'm concerned and I want to find a solution. Is
9 there another yard that we could help pay for with some
10 of our tax dollars?

11 Granted there's about a billion dollars that you
12 guys did some soft hand-waving on. I get that it's a
13 soft draft. But I've never seen a billion dollar
14 hand-wave except for by Uber.

15 So, I'm excited. I know this could work. And
16 I'd be curious to hear more about why that yard has to be
17 put out here, or why you need another yard or you don't
18 need another yard, what we could do to improve the
19 existing yards.

20 So that whatever root cause you have we can
21 address that and still get BART to come to Livermore.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. MARX: Thank you.

24 (End of Gary Marx.)

25 MR. FUNG: Thank you for your comments.

1 cont.

PH1
S21

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 The next speaker is Larry Vardanega.

S21
L. Vardanega

2 LARRY VARDANEGA

3 MR. VARDANEGA: Hello, everyone. I'm gonna get
4 down to the cost of, you've got that train running down
5 the middle of the freeway, and you want to go up to that
6 Hartman Road.

7 What's it gonna cost to cross that train over
8 that freeway? A stop sign? When the train wants to
9 cross to get to the north side? Or an overpass costing
10 millions and millions of dollars to make?

11 Why waste that money up there in our heaven, and
12 make it where it should be.

13 And it's also kind of like a hill to go over
14 into Hartman. It's not flat land. Really it's kind of
15 like a hill.

1

16 And I don't know if trains can. Do they do that
17 all the time? I don't know.

18 The question is: The cost to make that thing go
19 up there, instead of just going further down the road a
20 little ways... with all that money.

21 Even if you're not gonna use it, at least it
22 will be there for my grandkids or something. That to me
23 is stupid.

24 I think there's a reason for making that. You
25 people put that there.

PH1
S21 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 I don't know, it's like putting the knife in
2 your back. What's the reason for that? Doesn't make
3 sense.

1 cont.

4 Thank you.

5 (End of Larry Vardanega.)

6 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

7 The next speaker is Marianne Bidwell.

S22
M. Bidwell

8 MAIRANNE BIDWELL

9 MR. BIDWELL: Hi.

10 Thank you for the time and opportunity for all
11 of us in the community to speak about this issue.

12 I'm a new resident. I'm a new resident to
13 Livermore. And we moved here from Newark because of the
14 community, because of the small-town feel.

15 One of the things that I'm concerned about with
16 BART and I'm conflicted about BART in general coming to
17 Livermore is the public safety impact, which we talk
18 about environment, the community aspect, the transients,
19 the crime that will increase.

20 And one of the things that I want to ask for on
21 the next meeting is a bigger-picture viewpoint or more
22 detailed information about, how do you mitigate that?

23 The "X" disappeared on the screen as a
24 public-safety issue that went away. How is that
25 mitigated?

1

PH1
S22 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 Is that mitigated by BART Police that never
2 leave the train station?

3 Or is that mitigated by extra funds for the
4 City, for the Police Department, and Municipal Funds for
5 us?

6 And I live in the neighborhood, not necessarily
7 quite as impacted by the people that are right there.
8 But I'm just down the road, off of Airway and Hartman.

9 So, I am walking distance from that BART Station
10 for people that can come down the trail, that runs right
11 behind my house, and come right around to my house, where
12 I now feel I'm safe.

13 I don't know if I'll feel safe when BART comes
14 in. And I really want that issue to be addressed.

15 Obviously the City Council wants BART to come
16 in. It's already a push. This is already on the maps of
17 BART. It's not gonna change.

18 BART's coming. It's just a matter of: How do
19 we do it right?

20 And I'm really concerned about the people that
21 are going to be impacted by their homes. Homes being
22 taken away by BART is, I think, not what the original
23 plan or intent was for BART to come in to this city.

24 And I think that we need to look better at doing
25 it right.

1 cont.

PH1
S22 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 You have new homes that are just being built on
2 Isabel Avenue.

3 Now they're gonna have a traintrack that's
4 coming right by their house? That doesn't seem fair for
5 those people, doesn't seem fair for the people that are
6 gonna have their houses completely taken away.

7 And what if we wait and do it right? What if we
8 do it all the way to Greenville from the beginning?

9 Why don't we have a station at Isabel and a
10 station at Greenville? And do it all the way and make
11 that rail station where it needs to be, hidden away from
12 everything, where it's not gonna impact people's homes,
13 it's not gonna impact the environment as much when we
14 look at things.

15 And I think that if we're looking at
16 alternatives, we already know BART's gonna come; why
17 don't we look at better alternatives for making it, doing
18 it, the right way? Doing it in completion.

19 We just spent millions of dollars, billions of
20 dollars, doing these Express Lanes down the freeway, and
21 now that's all gonna change?

22 I mean, let's just do it right from the
23 beginning. I think that would be better.

24 And that's it.

25 (End of Marianne Bidwell.)

1 cont.

PH1
S23

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments. That was
2 the last Speaker Card.

3 Are there any who wish to speak who have not yet
4 submitted a Speaker Card? Please come up at this point.
5 We'll take a little time to process you and make sure we
6 get your names.

7 MR. KASKEY: Actually, there's a card in the box
8 back there. I put a card in the box in error.

9 I'm Jeff Kaskey.

10 MR. FUNG: Anyone else? Anyone else that wants
11 to speak?

12 MR. FUNG: Okay, the next speaker is
13 Jeff Kaskey.

14 JEFF KASKEY

15 MR. KASKEY: Apologies, my card's probably in
16 somebody's box. They'll be a little surprised.

17 First of all, I'm gonna be a little redundant
18 here. We've actually heard the answer to the whole
19 service-area thing.

20 And I think all I'm going to do is put that
21 together. You've got a service yard, it works, and
22 everything's fine. It's on the freeway, it's not causing
23 anybody any problem.

24 But you want to extend BART farther to the east.
25 Great. You've got a plan. It happens to be shown in the

S23
J. Kaskey

1

PH1
S23 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 D.M.U. plan.

2 But what it shows is that you can run a track
3 along the north edge of the existing yard, and you can
4 get it to where tracks would extend on towards the east.

5 If you do that with the conventional BART
6 project, you have BART tracks going on to the east, to
7 Tracy and Modesto or whatever.

8 But you've taken care of the yard, the yard is
9 where it is now, no additional impact to the people, and
10 it works the way it does today.

11 So, I think that's really your best solution.
12 You've already heard it from everybody here. In fact
13 you've drawn it. Just change the label and you're
14 already done.

15 I think the other thing that I did want to
16 mention is the Alviso Livermore House. It is a piece of
17 local history. Obviously a descendant of the Livermore
18 Family settled that area.

19 It's very important for us to keep that property
20 as historic property.

21 I think it's notable that we have been paying
22 for BART for 50-some-ish years.

23 I know that the story from BART is that we've
24 been paying for the maintenance for the existing BART and
25 not for new BART.

1 cont.

2

3

PH1
S23 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 But from Livermore's perspective we've been
2 throwing money into BART.

3 And to throw money into BART for 50 years and
4 get the absolute shortest minimum possible length of
5 BART, plus the biggest impact which is the service yard,
6 I think is going to be is a hard pill for Livermore to
7 swallow, and I think for good reason.

3 cont.

8 So, I think that if we're gonna put some
9 additional resources, you know, all the money that you'll
10 save by not putting the yard up there in the pink fist at
11 the top but keeping it on the freeway, can be put into
12 some research to look at building conventional BART at
13 lower costs.

14 Thank you.

15 (End of Jeff Kaskey.)

16 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

17 The next speaker is Vamsee Lakamsani.

18 VAMSEE LAKAMSANI

S24
V. Lakamsani

19 MR. LAKAMSANI: Thank you.

20 I'd like to thank the BART people for doing the
21 great work on putting all the information together.
22 Really appreciate it. I learned a lot more than I knew
23 before this one.

1

24 First of all I'd like to support the full BART
25 extension to Livermore, like many of the other citizens

PH1
S24 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 have said. And I'd like to spend some time on the cost
2 aspect of it. Right?

3 So, when we hear this cost of 1.6 billion
4 dollars... and I'm getting a little bit tired of
5 politicians that don't observe our vision... they call
6 T.V. and say, you know, "This thing costs too much."

7 And I believe that, you know, aside from all the
8 reasons the other people have said about the yard, the
9 yard has added significantly to the cost of the station.

10 Right?

11 So, I would like BART to kind of break down the
12 costs in a little, a lot, more detail. The storage-shed
13 cost and the maintenance-shop cost, you know, you could
14 separately break it out.

15 Because I think these are actually benefiting
16 the tax system, not just Livermore Station. And so, you
17 know, I think it would be good for everybody outside the
18 area to know, you know, how much of it is going to be
19 these maintenance fees and how much is going to the
20 station itself.

21 And then going a little bit further, we all know
22 that the 3.5 billion-dollar maintenance bond that's been
23 approved in the last election, you know, to maintain the
24 system.

25 Right?

1 cont.

PH1
S24 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 So, if you're able to break down the costs of
2 this service shed, you know, maybe there's a way to find
3 some money from that bond to build a storage shed.

4 Because these are, as they are, benefiting the
5 whole system, not just Livermore.

6 And lastly I'd like to, you know, see the BART
7 extended to Greenville. But I understand that, you know,
8 there's not enough money to build Isabel Station, so, we
9 need a lot more money to extend it to Greenville.

10 But hopefully we can do that in the long run.

11 Thank you.

12 (End of Vamsee Lakamsani.)

13 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

14 The next speaker is Ronald Acciaioli.

15 RONALD ACCIAIOLI

16 MR. ACCIAIOLI: Yeah. Hi. I think I can do
17 this without a mic. Just....

18 Just a quick note here. It seems like this is
19 five miles here, and all of a sudden we're going all the
20 way up to Hartman Road here.

21 Well, it seems to me that if you just straighten
22 that out, you're almost halfway to Greenville
23 (indicating).

24 (End of Ronald Acciaioli.)

25 (Applause.)

1 cont.

S25
R. Acciaioli

1

PH1
S17 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments. Thank
2 you for that comment.

3 All right, that's the last Speaker Card that we
4 have. Are there any others who have not submitted a
5 Speaker Card but want to speak tonight?

6 MS. RATTO: I left out two and I still had a
7 couple more minutes. May I?

8 THE REPORTER: Is your name Miss Ratto?

9 MS. RATTO: Yes.

10 THE REPORTER: Okay.

11 MS. RATTO: Thank you.

12 THE REPORTER: If you can do maybe a minute?

13 MS. RATTO: Sure.

14 THE REPORTER: I want to make sure I put your
15 name.

16 MS. RATTO: Thank you.

17 Patricia Ratto. The gases from the diesel and
18 the air quality and the safety, I also didn't mention
19 that. And that, that in itself, isn't good to live in
20 your front door.

21 So, I'd like to add that and get an answer on
22 that, please.

23 MR. FUNG: Okay.

24 MS. RATTO: Then if you can just add my value on
25 to your guys' thing there.

S17
P. Ratto

2

PH1
S14 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 MR. FUNG: Okay, thank you for the comment.

2 MS. RATTO: Thank you.

3 MR. FUNG: So, if there are no other speakers,
4 then I think we're going to bring this meeting, tonight's
5 meeting, to a close.

6 We do want to thank everyone for coming out and
7 taking time from your schedules and participating in the
8 planning process.

9 Oh, I'm sorry, was there somebody else who
10 wanted to speak?

11 MR. MARA: Yeah, I just want to ask a question.

12 THE REPORTER: Tell me your name again.

13 MR. MARO: Leo Mara.

14 You heard people speak here. Is anybody here
15 from BART? Do they --

16 Do they have any feelings in themselves? Or is
17 there any light that was shown on how these people feel?

18 Did that change some of the ways these things
19 are being done?

20 Or is it just going to be compiled and "We'll
21 let you know some day down the road."

22 Has anybody been impacted by some of the things
23 that have been said here?

24 MR. TANG: Just I'll say I clearly heard some
25 issues that people have raised.

S14
L. Mara

5

PH1
S1 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 And these are things that we're gonna have to go
2 back and roll up our sleeves and deal with. I heard
3 quite clearly. Yes. So, we will.

4 MR. FUNG: Okay. I think with that we will wrap
5 up tonight. As a reminder, the next step is Public
6 Comment period.

7 MR. MC PARTLAND: Hang on. Before everybody
8 leaves, I've got a couple.

9 MR. FUNG: Okay, Director McPartland.

10 DIRECTOR JOHN MC PARTLAND

11 MR. MC PARTLAND: Okay, again, I'm
12 John Mc Partland, BART Director, and I work for you.

13 I had a couple things I would like to end up
14 pointing out to everybody here. And number one is
15 that... and I asked Andrew to address this, but I'm going
16 to try to address it; and if I screw it up, he'll correct
17 me... and that is, the reason for the location.

18 By the way, I agree with everybody. And this
19 makes perfectly good sense. To end up taking this
20 doggone thing and just laying it out there and going
21 right through (indicating).

22 But we can't do it. Because this is on grade,
23 and you have to end up parking your cars on flat ground.

24 MS. BANKHEAD: That's right. And that's why,
25 so, the alternative is to not do it at all.

S1
N. Bankhead

7

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

PH1

1 AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Speaking simultaneously.)

2 THE REPORTER: I can't do all the voices.

3 MR. MC PARTLAND: The issues we're going to
4 have, I've asked and I am asking him, directing Andrew,
5 to give a thorough vetting and explanation on what's
6 going on and what the considerations are in relationship
7 to where we're going to end up having that yard.

8 Maybe we can't have it out there.

9 I was really surprised with the amount of
10 folks here that are really upset, and especially you,
11 Patricia, because my heart weeps for you; from the
12 standpoint of your whole life is put into that property,
13 and now you feel like you're getting it ripped out from
14 underneath you.

15 And my heart weeps for you.

16 And we're going to end up seeing how we can
17 address these things. That's what these meetings are
18 for.

19 I've got to tell you one thing, though, is, and
20 that is, that everything is not, you know, roses in
21 relationship to the BART Board of Directors.

22 There's a whole bunch of those guys that don't
23 want to spend another dime for anything for any extension
24 anywhere because they want to spend all the money to
25 rebuild the core system that's been falling apart.

PH1
S1 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 And they are in the process of trying to rewrite
2 the policies in relationship to dealing with extensions
3 for anybody in this suburban area.

4 And if they can get the votes, they're gonna
5 make it happen.

6 So, whatever we come up with, we're going to
7 have to come up with as far as the design, where we're
8 gonna put yards, and how we're gonna end up doing this.

9 We're going to have to, as a community... since
10 I work for you... come up with a unified voice from the
11 standpoint of what we can end up with, what you want to
12 do in relationship to not going out into the boondocks.
13 Because I like the wetland areas myself.

14 But I've got to tell you that it's going to be
15 expensive.

16 And I can --

17 We sure would like to have somebody come up with
18 a strategy on how I can convince the rest of those
19 Directors to be able to put out the additional monies so
20 that we can end up doing something different.

21 Keeping it on the freeway, it just irks me that
22 we can't do that. That's not doable. As far as
23 extending --

24 MS. BANKHEAD: Well, killing the endangered
25 animals --

S1
N. Bankhead

8

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

PH1

1 MR. MC PARTLAND: If we want to wait until the
2 end.

3 I'm getting into a dialogue, and I've found out
4 in BART Board Meetings that when you end up with three
5 minutes that you allow somebody, and then we get into a
6 back-and-forth dialogue, it goes for 20 minutes per
7 person.

8 So, I'm going to go ahead and have to cut it
9 off.

10 But I really want to end up working for you and
11 representing you the best way I possibly can and give you
12 BART to Livermore.

13 I'm working on my third term, trying to fulfill
14 a promise that I had to end up making to my constituents
15 in Livermore to stick around until I get you BART to
16 Livermore.

17 I'd like to get it done before I have to take my
18 grandchildren down the aisle, and they're 6 and 13.

19 So, let's go ahead; I'm going to work for you,
20 Andrew's gonna work for you; we're gonna try to come up
21 with the best solution that we possibly can as far as
22 recommendations are concerned.

23 I think it's pretty clear that everybody here
24 wants to have full BART.

25 (Applause.)

PH1
S17 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

1 MR. MC PARTLAND: That's one. I've got an
2 uphill. I'm a salmon swimming upstream in relationship
3 to the other Directors in that regard.

4 And so, the stronger we get, the better solution
5 that we can come up with, that everyone buys into, that
6 isn't too much more expensive.

7 If we can end up doing it without getting any
8 more expensive at all, it's going to be my strongest
9 selling point to those other 8 Directors so we can get
10 this darn thing done. Okay?

11 So, let's work together to get this thing done.

12 MS. RATTO: Would it be a possibility to bring
13 it more west where there's no homes?

14 MR. MC PARTLAND: I'm not a planner. I'm going
15 to leave that to this guy right here, from the standpoint
16 that if we go further west, then we're expecting this to
17 get further away from our goal.

18 We only have two or three other options. And we
19 find ourselves in a position where we have to look at the
20 problems that we're going to create when we go there.

21 So, with that, ladies and gentlemen, I want
22 to -- I'm going to turn it back to the Moderator because
23 we're paying this guy money to do a job that he's not
24 doing right now.

25 Here you go (handing microphone).

S17
P. Ratto

3

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-22-17

PH1

1 MR. FUNG: Thank you.

2 And so, I think with that we'll close the
3 meeting.

4 Thank you very much for coming out, taking your
5 time. The BART Staff will be here, the Project Team will
6 be here.

7 If you have further questions, we'd be happy to
8 have another conversation with you after the meeting.

9 Thank you very much.

10 (Public Speaker Comments adjourned at 8:54 p.m.)

11 *****

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESPONSE PH1-S1 Nancy Bankhead

- PH1-S1-1 The comment opposing the storage and maintenance facility is noted. See Master Response 5 regarding the need for the storage and maintenance facility and Master Response 6 regarding why the location in the Draft EIR is the only feasible location.
- PH1-S1-2 The comment describes the potential presence of California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog in a managed pond on a Hartman Road property to the west of the storage and maintenance facility. Impact BIO-3 of the Draft EIR discusses all potential impacts to both species. A similar pond within the Proposed Project footprint is discussed in the Draft EIR as “Pond-1” and is displayed on Figure 3.I-2b (Waters of the U.S. and State in the Study Area – Eastern Project Corridor) on page 831. Although the California Natural Diversity Database does not report these species in Pond-1, the Draft EIR presumes the presence of aquatic breeding habitat for both these species at this location. In the case that California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog are observed, Mitigation Measures BIO-3.A, BIO-3.B, and BIO-3.C would apply where applicable. The Draft EIR adequately described biological resource impacts and no revisions are needed.
- PH1-S1-3 Please see Response for Comment PH1-S2-2.
- PH1-S1-4 The scope and objectives of this EIR are focused on extending transit service to Isabel Avenue. As described on pages 89 and 123 of the Draft EIR, the design of the Proposed Project and DMU Alternative/EMU Option does not preclude a future extension of the rail alignment to the east to Greenville Road, either in the Interstate (I-)580 median or to Downtown Livermore, although the DMU Alternative would prevent the use of technology other than diesel multiple unit (DMU). Please see Master Response 4 regarding a future extension to Greenville.
- PH1-S1-5 The commenter's concern regarding noise associated with the storage and maintenance facility is noted. Noise and vibration impacts related to train operations, including those between the proposed Isabel Station and the storage facility, are described in Impacts NOI-3 and NOI-4 (Expose persons to or generate noise levels from transit facilities in excess of standards established by the FTA in 2025 and 2040), starting on page 1007 of the Draft EIR. These impacts were found to be less than significant, as follows: (1) the Proposed Project would have less-than-significant impacts; and (2)

the DMU Alternative would have less-than-significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures. Please see Master Response 7 for a comprehensive discussion of impacts associated with construction and operation of the storage and maintenance facility.

PH1-S1-6 In compliance with CEQA's notice requirements, as described on page 24 of the Draft EIR, a Notice of the Availability of the Draft EIR was provided to the public in the following ways:

- Published in The Independent, Pleasanton Weekly, Pleasanton Express, Danville Express, East Bay Times, Tri Valley Times, and San Ramon Valley Times
- Mailed to addresses within 0.5 mile of the collective footprint of the Proposed Project, DMU Alternative, and Express Bus/BRT Alternative
- Emailed to addresses on BART's email notification list and to individuals and organizations who submitted a written request for notification concerning the Proposed Project

The commenter was among the recipients on BART's 0.5-mile-radius mailing list and the email notification list.

BART's public outreach program to notify the community about the release of the Draft EIR and the public comment period included mailers sent to approximately 14,900 households in the project area; an email alert sent to more than 1,850 email addresses; flyers distributed at Tri-Valley BART stations; and attendance by BART staff at several Livermore community meetings or City Council meetings.

RESPONSE PH1-S2 Anne Homan

PH1-S2-1 The commenter's opposition to the development of the storage and maintenance facility at the location proposed is noted. Measure D, referenced by the commenter, redrew the East County Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to remove North Livermore from urban development. As discussed on page 490 of the Draft EIR (Section 3.C, Land Use and Agricultural Resources), included in Measure D were amendments to portions of the East County Area Plan.

Please see Master Response 6 regarding alternative locations for the storage and maintenance facility, why they are infeasible, and why the proposed location is the best available site. Please also see Master Response 7 for a comprehensive discussion of impacts associated with

construction and operation of the storage and maintenance facility, including compatibility with Measure D and land use and agricultural impacts.

- PH1-S2-2 The 875-acre parcel mentioned in the comment (located at 2284 North Livermore Avenue) which historically was owned by Valentin Alviso, the son-in-law of Robert Livermore, is beyond the study area identified for cultural resources in the Draft EIR based on the area of potential effects on such resources. The tail tracks for the Proposed Project and DMU Alternative/EMU Option are beyond the parcel boundaries and over 0.5 mile from the residence. Alviso and his wife Josefa Livermore, along with their children, lived on the property from 1870 until Josefa's death in 1893. In 1899, Alviso remarried and moved to the San Luis Obispo area. The John Meyn family leased the house until 1911, when F.S. Gomes purchased the property. The construction date of the existing house is uncertain; one source states 1891,¹ while another states 1905.² The house is a Craftsman-style bungalow with a barn and other outbuildings. Furthermore, the storage and maintenance facility would be several parcels to the north and approximately 1 mile from the residence. No direct or indirect impacts to the house or the property are anticipated from the Proposed Project or the Build Alternatives. The Draft EIR analysis of impacts to cultural resources is adequate and no revisions are necessary.
- PH1-S2-3 Please see Master Response 7 regarding visual impacts described in the Draft EIR related to the storage and maintenance facility.
- PH1-S2-4 The comment that there is an abundance of wildlife associated with creeks is noted, and is consistent with the Draft EIR analysis. Impacts BIO-2 (Adversely Affect Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp and Longhorn Fairy Shrimp during Construction), BIO-3 (Adversely Affect California Tiger Salamander and California Red-Legged Frog during Construction), BIO-4 (Adversely Affect Western Spadefoot during Construction), and BIO-5 (Adversely Affect Western Pond Turtle during Construction) are related to the wildlife associated with creeks. Impacts BIO-11 (Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on State or Federally Protected Wetlands or Waters during Construction) and BIO-12 (Have a Substantial Adverse Effect on Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Communities during Construction) are related to wetlands

¹ The Independent, 2011. Concern Expressed Over Fate of Valentin Alviso Home. September 15.

² Alameda County Community Development Agency, 2005. Historical and Cultural Resource Survey, East Alameda County. June 17.

and habitat. The discussion of these impacts starts on page 882 of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE PH1-S3 Karen Jefferson

PH1-S3-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an extension to Greenville is noted. Please see Master Response 1 for information related to Livermore and taxes paid into the BART system.

PH1-S3-2 The comment opposing the storage and maintenance facility is noted. A maintenance facility cannot be built within a freeway median due to space constraints and access issues. For example, large trucks would need to access the facility and load and unload equipment.

Please see Master Response 4 regarding the potential future extension of BART to Greenville, Master Response 5 regarding why a storage and maintenance facility is needed for the Livermore extension, and Master Response 6 regarding other locations considered but found to be infeasible for the storage and maintenance facility

PH1-S3-3 The increase in public transportation capacity, whether through expanded rail or bus service, is projected to displace private vehicles traveling on the road. As shown in Table S-4 (Summary of Quantitative Beneficial Effects in 2040) on page 20 of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project and all Build Alternatives would result in a reduction of vehicle miles traveled, which has a corresponding benefit on emissions and air quality.

The details of the air quality analysis are covered in Section 3.K, Air Quality, on pages 1071 through 1107. As outlined in Table 3.K-16 (Net New Annual Operational Emissions in 2025) and Table 3.K-17 (Net New Annual Operational Emissions in 2040), emissions are reduced due to operations for many of the alternatives. Furthermore, the Draft EIR analysis of bus emissions is conservative, as it does not take into account that certain bus fleets will incorporate fully electric vehicles and emissions will improve over time. As bus fleets modernize, emissions will be further reduced.

RESPONSE PH1-S4 Thomas Jefferson

PH1-S4-1 The comment supporting a conventional BART extension to Greenville is noted. The scope and objectives of this EIR are focused on extending transit service to Isabel Avenue and do not include a BART to Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) rail connection. However, the project does not

preclude a future connection between BART and ACE undertaken by BART or by another agency. Please see Master Response 4 for more information regarding extending service to Greenville.

- PH1-S4-2 Please see Master Response 1 regarding funding for the BART to Livermore Extension Project and Livermore's contribution.
- PH1-S4-3 Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Draft EIR, which describes the BART and Metropolitan Transportation Commission policies related to system expansions. Please also see Master Response 2 regarding the applicability of BART's System Expansion Policy to the Livermore extension and Master Response 3 for more information regarding the INP.
- PH1-S4-4 Please see Master Response 5 regarding the need for a storage and maintenance facility for the Livermore extension, and Master Response 6 regarding other locations considered but found to be infeasible, why the proposed location is the best available site, and why the same freeway median storage used at the Dublin/Pleasanton Station is not feasible for a future extension.
- PH1-S4-5 Emissions from diesel engines include reactive organic gases (ROGs), nitrogen dioxide (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM). Although a DMU engine generates diesel particulate emissions, the reduction in automobile particulate emissions when drivers switch from private vehicles to DMU would more than offset emissions from the DMU itself. As discussed under Impact AQ-9 (Result in Increased Emissions of ROGs, NO_x, and PM above BAAQMD Significance Thresholds under 2025 Project Conditions) on page 1153 of the Draft EIR, under the DMU Alternative there would be a net reduction in passenger vehicles and a corresponding net decrease in total particle emissions as particulate matter with a diameter less than 10 microns (PM₁₀) and particulate matter with a diameter less than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}). An increase in ROG and NO_x emissions would occur; however, when compared to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District thresholds, the impact of these emissions increases would be less than significant. Additionally, cancer risk and PM_{2.5} concentrations under the DMU Alternative would be less than significant. In comparison, under the EMU Option, criteria air pollutant emissions would be even lower compared to the DMU Alternative.

RESPONSE PH1-S5 Robert S. Allen

PH1-S5-1 In 2010, after preparing a Programmatic Final EIR that considered ten different alignment, station, and maintenance facility combinations, the BART Board of Directors (BART Board) adopted an alignment extending from Dublin/Pleasanton Station through Isabel Avenue and then to Downtown Livermore, consistent with the recommendation of the City of Livermore at that time. As the commenter noted, the City of Livermore subsequently revised its General Plan to depict the City's preference for keeping BART in the median of I-580 rather than traveling to Livermore's downtown as was originally planned. While the BART Board has not revisited its determination for the alignment to go to Downtown Livermore, the proposed extension from Dublin/Pleasanton Station to Isabel Avenue that is considered in this EIR is common to both the City's adopted plan and BART's adopted alignment, as described on page 49 of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 4 for information regarding extending the track towards Greenville.

PH1-S5-2 Please see Master Response 5 for information related to the need for a storage and maintenance facility and see Master Response 6 for information regarding the location of the storage and maintenance facility and the feasibility of relying on tail tracks in the I-580 median. An independent line between the Tri-Valley and Oakland, Berkeley, and Richmond is not under consideration in BART's current plans and is also out of scope for the current BART to Livermore project. Those passengers are aptly served by a transfer to the Richmond line at one of several stations. If passenger patterns were to change substantially in the future, BART operations could consider modifying the service plan for a direct line to those East Bay cities.

PH1-S5-3 Comments related to the ACE train are outside the scope of this project and should be directed to the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission. This project does not preclude a future connection between BART and ACE as a separate project. Please see Master Response 11 for an update on ACE.

RESPONSE PH1-S6 Evan Branning

PH1-S6-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with a future extension to Greenville and connection to ACE is noted. No response is necessary.

RESPONSE PH1-S7 Lisa Tromovitch

PH1-S7-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) is noted. Please see Master Response 6 for a discussion of alternative locations considered for the storage and maintenance facility that were deemed to be infeasible by BART.

RESPONSE PH1-S8 Merlin Newton

PH1-S8-1 The concern about the impacts of the proposed storage and maintenance facility are noted. Please see Master Response 6 regarding alternative locations for the storage and maintenance facility, why they are infeasible, and why the proposed location is the best available site.

Noise and vibration impacts related to train operations, including those between the proposed Isabel Station and the storage and maintenance facility, are described in Impacts NOI-3 and NOI-4 (Expose persons to or generate noise levels from transit facilities in excess of standards established by the FTA in 2025 and 2040) starting on page 1007 of the Draft EIR. These impacts were found to be less than significant for the Proposed Project and less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the DMU Alternative. Please also see Master Response 7 for a comprehensive discussion of impacts associated with construction and operation of the storage and maintenance facility.

Regarding visual quality, the commenter also notes that the term “great visual impact” was used to describe locations in Dublin considered for the storage and maintenance facility but withdrawn. The location in Dublin referred to by the commenter was considered for the DMU Alternative, not the Proposed Project. This location was rejected due to both visual impacts and increased cost. In addition, there is a location in Livermore immediately north of I-580 and west of North Livermore Avenue that was considered for the Proposed Project but also rejected due to both visual impacts and increased cost.

The commenter states that the proposed location for the storage and maintenance facility would have a greater visual impact than these two locations considered but withdrawn. The Draft EIR did find that the impacts of the storage and maintenance facility on visual quality would be significant and unavoidable (Section 3.E, Visual Quality) because it would introduce transportation-related elements that would contrast with the rural character of the area (Impact VQ-3) and obstruct views from Hartman Road, a scenic route (Impact VQ-4).

Although two separate impacts may both be significant, their magnitude may differ considerably. Both locations considered but withdrawn, as described above, would be directly and prominently visible to many drivers on I-580, a freeway that carries 149,000 vehicles near the Altamont Pass on an average weekday³ and that is eligible to be designated as a State scenic highway.⁴ By comparison, the proposed storage and maintenance facility would be visible from Hartman Road and North Livermore Avenue, local scenic routes that carry a much lower volume of potential sensitive viewers. The Dublin and Livermore locations are both undeveloped areas of rolling hills zoned for resource management and would require extensive earthworks compared to the proposed location, causing much greater alteration to the topography of the landscape. Therefore, their visual impact would be substantially greater than the proposed location. In addition, as noted above, these locations were rejected not only due to their visual impact but also because of their increased cost.

RESPONSE PH1-S9 Daniel Casner

PH1-S9-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an eventual extension to Greenville and ACE is noted. No response is necessary.

RESPONSE PH1-S10 Patricia Munro

PH1-S10-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an eventual extension to Greenville and ACE connection is noted. Comments opposing the storage and maintenance facility are also noted. Please refer to the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives Evaluation Report, available at <http://www.bart.gov/about/projects/liv>, for additional information pertaining to the costs per rider. The analysis also develops operations and maintenance costs for non-BART service, including DMU/EMU and buses. Please see Master Response 4 regarding future extension to Greenville. No further response is necessary.

³ California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 2015. Traffic Volumes on the California State Highway System.

⁴ California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 2017. List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. Excel Spreadsheet. Accessed February 10. Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/.

RESPONSE PH1-S11 Mike Kujacich

PH1-S11-1 The commenter's preference to extend BART to Downtown San Jose is noted. The BART extension to San Jose is a different project that is separately funded and undertaken by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. No response is necessary.

RESPONSE PH1-S12 Peta Grimes

PH1-S12-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) is noted. Please see Master Response 1 regarding funding for the BART to Livermore Extension Project and Livermore's contribution. Evaluation of alternatives to the Proposed Project is required by CEQA.

As described on page 72 of the Draft EIR, the proposed BART storage yard would provide storage space for approximately 172 BART cars. BART cars typically run as 10-car trains during the peak commute periods and as 5-car trains during other times. All trains would pass through Isabel Station to arrive at the storage yard. Approximately 7 to 8 trains per hour would enter and exit the storage and maintenance facility, and approximately 7 trains per hour would use the storage tracks within the storage yard.

RESPONSE PH1-S13 Lynn Schussel

PH1-S13-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an eventual extension connecting to Greenville is noted. No further response is necessary.

RESPONSE PH1-S14 Leo M. Mara

PH1-S14-1 Please see Master Response 1 regarding funding for the BART to Livermore Extension Project and Livermore's contribution.

PH1-S14-2 The I-580 express lanes were constructed by the Alameda County Transportation Commission and Caltrans and were open to the public in early 2016. The express lanes were seen as a way to address chronic traffic congestion, freight needs, and air pollution in the Tri-Valley at a time when a BART extension was still being evaluated environmentally. The express lanes will have been in operation for 10 years by the expected completion of construction for the Proposed Project or one of the Build Alternatives (2026). Both the express lanes and a BART extension are parts of a multi-modal solution to transportation issues in the Tri-Valley.

PH1-S14-3 The proposed Isabel Station site is within the city of Livermore. Consistent with BART's System Expansion Policy, one of the project objectives is to support transit-oriented development (TOD) in priority development areas, which includes development in the Isabel Avenue BART Station area. Please see Master Response 3 for more information regarding the INP, which is the Ridership Development Plan proposed to promote TOD around the Isabel Station.

The comments supporting an extension to Greenville and opposing the location of the storage and maintenance facility are noted. Please see Master Response 4 regarding extending the track toward Greenville.

PH1-S14-4 The commenter's concern regarding noise associated with the storage and maintenance facility is noted. Noise and vibration impacts related to train operations, including that between the proposed Isabel Station and the storage and maintenance facility, are described in Impacts NOI-3 and NOI-4 (Expose persons to or generate noise levels from transit facilities in excess of standards established by the FTA in 2025 and 2040), starting on page 1007 of the Draft EIR. These impacts were found to be less than significant for the Proposed Project, and less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the DMU Alternative. Please see Master Response 7 for a comprehensive discussion of impacts associated with construction and operation of the storage and maintenance facility.

RESPONSE PH1-S15 Greg Thompson

PH1-S15-1 The comments supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an eventual extension to Greenville and connection to ACE, and supporting the INP, are noted. Furthermore, the comment opposing the storage and maintenance facility is noted.

Please see Master Response 5 regarding the need for a storage and maintenance facility for the Livermore extension, as well as Master Response 6 regarding the other locations considered but found to be infeasible and why the proposed location is the best available site.

RESPONSE PH1-S16 Daniel Tet

PH1-S16-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an eventual extension to Greenville is noted. As noted by the commenter, BART studied an extension to Livermore and published a programmatic-level environmental review of 10 different alignment

alternatives in 2010 (see page 48 of the Draft EIR). The Program EIR identified an appropriate route and alignment for a future BART system extension, but did not identify a preferred technology that would be used (conventional BART, DMU, bus, etc.), leaving the question of technology to a future project-level evaluation. This Draft EIR serves as the second tier, project-level evaluation and is limited to the Proposed Project (and alternatives to the Proposed Project) extending in the I-580 median to the proposed station east of the Isabel Avenue/I-580 interchange, together with tail track, storage and maintenance facility, and other facilities such as wayside facilities and the Isabel Station parking structure. This analysis provides a more detailed review of environmental issues as preliminary engineering has been completed. Upon completion of this project-level environmental review and certification of the EIR, the BART Board can move forward to adopt a project, complete its design, and undertake construction for the selected project.

RESPONSE PH1-S17 Patricia Ratto

PH1-S17-1 Please see Response to Comment PH1-S1-6 regarding compliance with CEQA's notice requirements. The commenter was among the recipients on BART's mailing list that included properties within 0.5 mile of the project footprint and the email notification list.

As detailed in Section 3.D, Population and Housing, of the Draft EIR (starting on page 536), a number of properties would be affected by the Proposed Project or one of the alternatives. Acquisition of the commenter's property would not be necessary for constructing any of the alternatives. For those properties to be acquired (or a portion thereof), BART would follow all applicable policies related to acquisition of properties and relocation of residents, identified in Mitigation Measure PH-2 (Acquisition of Property and Relocation Assistance), which would require BART to implement an acquisition and relocation program. This program would provide compensation at fair market value as well as relocation assistance. However, compensation is not provided for a change in private views.

Please see Master Response 4 for more information regarding an extension to Greenville; Master Response 5 for more information regarding the need, size, and cost of the storage and maintenance facility; and Master Response 6 for more information regarding alternative locations considered for the storage and maintenance facility.

Please also see Master Response 7 for a detailed discussion of the impacts, including visual impacts, resulting from the storage and maintenance facility. BART elected to prepare additional photo-simulations in response to concerns. These simulations further clarify but do not change the findings or magnitude of the impacts disclosed in the Draft EIR and are also described in Master Response 7.

RESPONSE PH1-S18 Corrie Karlsen

PH1-S18-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an extension to Greenville is noted. Please see Master Response 4 for more information regarding a previously considered downtown Livermore alignment and an extension toward Greenville. Please also refer to Master Response 6 for an explanation as to why the storage and maintenance facility could not be placed in the I-580 median east of Isabel Station.

Contrary to the commenter's suggestion, if the DMU (or EMU) were constructed, it is very unlikely that it would later be converted to conventional BART due to the associated cost. The standard gauge tracks used by the DMU would need to be converted to the wider BART gauge. A third rail and new power system would need to be added. Station platforms would need to be lengthened to accommodate the longer BART trains. The DMU storage and maintenance area would need to be expanded to accommodate BART vehicles. For these and additional reasons, the cost of conversion would most likely deter any future conversion to conventional BART.

RESPONSE PH1-S19 Maria DeLuz

PH1-S19-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an extension to Greenville is noted. Furthermore, the comment opposing the storage and maintenance facility in North Livermore is noted.

The commenter's concern regarding noise associated with the storage and maintenance facility is noted. Please also refer to the Draft EIR Section 3.J, Noise and Vibration, for a full analysis of noise and vibration generated by the Proposed Project and Alternatives.

Please see Master Response 7 regarding noise, biological resources, and agricultural impacts associated with the storage and maintenance facility.

RESPONSE PH1-S20 Gary Marx

PH1-S20-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) is noted. Please see Master Response 1 for a discussion of project funding, Master Response 5 regarding the need for a storage and maintenance facility for the Livermore extension; and Master Response 6 regarding alternative locations for the storage and maintenance facility (including using existing storage and maintenance facilities) and why those locations are infeasible.

RESPONSE PH1-S21 Larry Vardanega

PH1-S21-1 As shown in Table 2-2 (Conventional BART Project – Alignment, Facilities, and Structures) on page 96 of the Draft EIR (Chapter 2, Project Description), the tail tracks leading from the Isabel Station to the storage and maintenance facility would head east and cross under I-580 in a subway west of Portola Avenue. The tail tracks would then proceed north where they would cross Cayetano Creek on a bridge and go through a tunnel to reach the storage and maintenance facility. The track alignment was designed to maintain a grade (vertical rise) acceptable for BART cars.

Please see Master Response 4 regarding extending the track toward Greenville; Master Response 5 regarding cost and allocation for the storage and maintenance facility and the need for a storage and maintenance facility for the Livermore extension; and Master Response 6 regarding other locations considered for the storage and maintenance facility but found to be infeasible and why the proposed location is the best available site.

RESPONSE PH1-S22 Marianne Bidwell

PH1-S22-1 Impacts to police services are discussed in the Draft EIR starting on page 1420 (Section 3.O, Community Services). Under CEQA, analysis of impacts related to police services focuses on the need for additional police infrastructure to maintain service objectives (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section XIV). The Proposed Project and Alternatives would not result in significant impacts as stated under Impact CS-5 (Need for New or Physically Altered Governmental Facilities to Maintain Acceptable Service Ratios, Response Times, or Other Performance Objectives for Police Services). With respect to crime at the proposed Isabel station, as well as the general effects of a BART extension on crime in the surrounding area, please see Response to Comment D15-1.

Regarding property impacts, as detailed starting on page 536 of the Draft EIR (Section 3.D, Population and Housing), a number of properties would be affected by the Proposed Project or Build Alternatives. If the Proposed Project were adopted, two residences on Hartman Road would be acquired. BART would follow all applicable policies related to acquisition of properties and relocation of residents, identified in Mitigation Measure PH-2 (Acquisition of Property and Relocation Assistance), which would require BART to implement an acquisition and relocation program. This program would provide compensation at fair market value as well as relocation assistance.

Regarding extending the track toward Greenville, please see Master Response 4. Please also see Response to Comment PH1-S14-2 regarding I-580 express lanes.

RESPONSE PH1-S23 Jeff Kaskey

PH1-S23-1 Regarding why the BART car storage cannot be maintained at the existing location with the Proposed Project and why a storage and maintenance facility is needed for the Livermore extension, please see Master Response 5. While the commenter appears to suggest that BART cars could be stored on a single track to the north of the existing tracks where the DMU track is proposed, it is not possible to store 172 cars on one track as it would be operationally infeasible. Construction of a north-side storage track also would result in additional right-of-way (ROW) impacts in Dublin. Furthermore, BART trains would need to “deadhead”⁵ from the Dublin/Pleasanton Station to Isabel Station in order to begin their runs there. These extra runs of empty trains would precede the start of daily operations or during midday make-break operations,⁶ resulting in inefficiencies and potentially interfering with revenue service and/or with maintenance in non-operating hours. For all of the above reasons, this alternative is infeasible.

Please see Master Response 4 regarding extending the track toward Greenville.

PH1-S23-2 See Response to Comment PH1-S2-2.

⁵ Deadheading refers to non-passenger service train travel.

⁶ Make-break operations refer to dividing a 10-car train into smaller trains (usually 5-car trains) or reestablishing 10-car trains from smaller trains. These operations usually occur after the morning peak period (break) or before the afternoon peak period (make). This allows BART to reduce car mileage by running smaller trains during periods of lower passenger demand.

PH1-S23-3 Please see Master Response 1 regarding funding for the BART to Livermore Extension Project and Livermore’s contribution.

RESPONSE PH1-S24 Vamsee Lakamsani

PH1-S24-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) with an eventual extension to Greenville is noted. Please see Master Response 4 regarding extending the track toward Greenville, as well as Master Response 5 regarding the reason for the size of the storage and maintenance facility, and the cost allocation for the storage and maintenance facility.

RESPONSE PH1-S25 Ronald Acciaioli

PH1-S25-1 Please see Master Response 4 regarding extending the track toward Greenville and Master Response 6 regarding the location of the storage and maintenance facility.

RESPONSE PH1-S17 Patricia Ratto

PH1-S17-2 A principal use of diesel fuel would be to power the DMU (Diesel Multiple Unit) vehicles used in the DMU Alternative. Diesel fuel is also used for buses, though bus operators are transitioning their fleets to other sources of power. Diesel emissions are also produced by BART maintenance vehicles, emergency generators, and most heavy construction vehicles. The potential emissions and public health issues related to diesel use have been captured in the air quality analysis for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Regarding air quality, as summarized in Table 3.K-7 (Summary of Air Quality Impacts) on page 1129 of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives were determined to have either no impact or a less-than-significant impact for all criteria (i.e., emissions, health risk, odor) during project operations.

Regarding safety during project operations, as summarized in Table 3.N-9 (Summary of Public Health and Safety Impacts) starting on page 1360 of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives were determined to have either no impact or less-than-significant impacts related to public health and safety.

RESPONSE PH1-S14 Leo M. Mara

PH1-S14-5 The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The purpose of the public hearing was to solicit public comments, to which BART is responding in this Final EIR as required by CEQA.

RESPONSE PH1-S1 Nancy Bankhead

PH1-S1-7 The comment opposing the storage and maintenance facility is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. BART may consider this comment/concern as part of the project merits when considering approval of the Proposed Project or alternatives.

PH1-S1-8 The comment pertains to endangered species at the location of the storage and maintenance facility. Please see Section 3.1, Biological Resources, on page 883 through 939, which describe potential impacts to special-status species and other biological resources. The potential impacts of the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives were found to be less-than-significant with implementation of specified mitigation measures.

RESPONSE PH1-S17 Patricia Ratto

PH1-S17-3 As discussed in Master Response 6, BART considered alternative locations for the storage and maintenance facility and the site proposed in the Draft EIR was the best available site. The storage and maintenance facility could not be moved west of its proposed location due to the steeper topography in that area, which would entail substantial earthworks and an associated increase in costs and visual impacts.

This page intentionally blank

2. Dublin Public Hearing

This page intentionally blank

In The Matter Of:
BART TO LIVERMORE EXTENSION

PUBLIC SPEAKER COMMENTS
August 29, 2017
BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

Bay Area Court Reporters
22320 Foothill Boulevard, Suite 210
Hayward, California 94541
800-339-DEPO

Original File BAYAREA.BARTHEARING.txt
Min-U-Script® with Word Index

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

---oOo---

BART TO LIVERMORE EXTENSION PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
PUBLIC REVIEW MEETING

Reporter's Transcript of Public Speaker Comments

Tuesday, August 29, 2017

Shannon Community Center

Ambrose Hall - 11600 Shannon Avenue

Dublin, California 94568

Reported By KATHRYN LLOYD, C.S.R.
Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 5955

AY AREA COURT REPORTERS
22320 Foothill, Hayward, California 94541

89-9400

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

INDEX OF PUBLIC SPEAKERS

SPEAKER	PAGE
Robert S. Allen	4
Vaughn Wolffe	6
Cathy Gabor	9
John Phillips	10
Inder Dosanjh	12
Evan Branning	14
Chuck Weir	16
Nancy Bankhead	18
Doug Mann	20
Stephanie Ericson	24
Gregg McKerroll	26

---oOo---

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

VERBAL COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

BE IT REMEMBERED that pursuant to Public Notice and on Tuesday, August 29, 2017, commencing at the hour of 6:00 p.m., with public comment commencing at 7:49 p.m., at Shannon Community Center, Ambrose Hall - 11600 Shannon Avenue, Dublin, California, the following Draft Environmental Impact Report Public Meeting was stenographically reported by KATHRYN LLOYD, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, and thereafter transcribed as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT

ANDREW TANG, Project Manager, Presenter

JOHN MC PARTLAND, Director District 5

(Other Members of BART were also present)

ARUP NORTH AMERICA

CHESTER FUNG, Moderator

(Other Members of ARUP were also present)

URBAN PLANNING PARTNERS

LYNETTE DIAS, Timekeeper

PH2
S1

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKER COMMENTS

ROBERT ALLEN

MR. MCPARTLAND: Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to introduce Bob Allen.

He was the first director for District 5 when BART first went into operation back in 1972.

MR. ALLEN: Bart's first -- and for years its only Tri-Valley station -- was Dublin-Pleasanton.

That station site was chosen for its intermodal potential: Directly over the soon-to-be abandoned Southern Pacific railroad's San Ramon branch.

The San Ramon branch ran from Radum on the UP/ACE rail line, just west of Shadow Cliffs Park to Martinez.

Shortly before the rail service ended, SP planted a major pipeline, now operated by Kinder-Morgan, parallel to its track to carry oil products to much of the South Bay and Silicon Valley.

Reviving rail on about three miles of that branch -- running from Radum to Bart's Dublin-Pleasanton station -- would provide the connectivity between ACE and BART that ACE is now seeking.

S1
R. Allen

1

PH2
S1 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 Route 2-B of Bart's Program, BART to
2 Livermore D.E.I.R. called for the first station to be
3 by Junction Avenue School, close to downtown Livermore.

4 Alarmed volunteers circulated an initiative
5 petition to amend the Livermore General Plan and
6 clarify the city's preference for orientation of BART
7 along the freeway.

8 It sought a first-stage station to be at
9 Isabel and I-580 where BART had owned a 53-acre
10 parcel for about 25 years after a previous City
11 Council had asked for BART oriented to the freeway.

12 It also sought an eventual BART extension in
13 the then-vacant freeway median to a station at
14 Greenville and I-580.

15 Once the petition qualified for the 2011
16 Municipal Ballot with the signatures a some 8400
17 Livermore voters, the City Council adopted its
18 wording in their General Plan rather than place it on
19 the ballot.

20 Since then, planning has shifted from the
21 Program D.E.I.R. Route 2-B to this Project D.E.I.R.

22 I urge these changes to the D.E.I.R.

23 1) Defer the shop and yard, and include them
24 with a future BART extension project along I-580 to
25 Greenville.

2

3

PH2
S1 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 2) Locate the tail tracks and car storage
2 eastward from the station in a widened I-580 median.

3 3) Provide enough car storage on these tail
4 tracks for trains to serve an additional new route to
5 downtown Oakland, Berkeley and Richmond when BART has
6 enough cars in its new fleet.

7 4) Enlarge the Airway Park/Ride and run what
8 I call iiBART (Interim Isabel freeway bus) on
9 weekdays, as a forerunner -- not an alternative -- to
10 BART rail.

11 (End of Robert Allen.)

12 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

13 Our next speaker will be Vaughn Wolffe.

14

15

VAUGHN WOLFFE

16 MR. WOLFFE: The first thing I can see is
17 the cost of the I-580 widening of the easement or
18 whatever it is, that should be an itemized cost in
19 the D.E.I.R.

20 We're just going to spend several million
21 dollars building it, and then we will have to spend
22 several hundred million tearing it apart and putting
23 back together again.

24 I'd like to see a ridership mode share of
25 BART, all the easement to the BART alternatives

3 cont.

4

S2
V. Wolffe

1

2

PH2
S2 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 versus road, the highways, through the I-580
2 corridor, including the side streets and all of that
3 kind of stuff, because by my calculation, the 13,000
4 riders plus the 5 percent in 2040, it's kind of silly
5 to spend 1.6 billion dollars and still have the roads
6 just as heavily congested as we have now.

2 cont.

7 And most of the people that will be riding
8 those trains don't even live here yet.

9 I'd like to see the tax funds that are
10 available per year that are coming up -- you
11 projected the year of the implementation, the tax
12 money, the 500 million that you say we have, it's not
13 in the bank, it's coming in over a period of time,
14 there should be a breakdown how much revenue is
15 coming in and some way to track that in the future.

3

16 The I-580 study that was done back in 2000
17 indicated that the overwhelming majority of the
18 people that are coming over in trips through the
19 I-580 corridor are not coming to the BART service
20 area. It's about 10 percent maximum.

21 What are we doing about the other 90 percent
22 just to leave a representative of the area?

4

23 I would like to see, if we didn't build
24 BART, what the 1.6 billion dollar that would be spent
25 for BART would do if we put it toward ACE, or another

PH2
S2 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 thing that would be able to carry that many people.

2 We should have a choice.

3 If we get a hundred thousand riders on ACE
4 and only 13,000 riders on BART for the same cost, I
5 would suspect that maybe we should spend it on ACE
6 instead.

7 ACE could be incrementally increased over a
8 period of time.

9 CalTrain, in the last three years, went from
10 18,000 riders to 60,000 riders without any
11 extensions, without any modernization.

12 BART has spent billions of dollars expanding
13 the railroad, and it hasn't gone anywhere near two or
14 three times as much in ridership.

15 With respect to connecting to ACE and BART,
16 if you look at Shinn Road in Fremont, you can do an
17 aerial view in Google maps, the Fremont Bart is
18 directly over the top of the ACE line.

19 Most of the people in Pleasanton and the
20 Tri-Valley would be served better by connecting
21 there, along with taking the traffic from the
22 San Joaquin Valley and transferring there.

23 And if you go south on the BART to San Jose.

24 Also, you should confirm that for the
25 Tri-Valley people that want to take BART to San Jose,

4 cont.

PH2
S2 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 they are going to have to travel to Bay Fair,
2 transfer, go to Fremont.

3 That's 35 minutes. An extended trip.

4 If you want to get to Fremont, you can take
5 ACE and get there faster.

6 (End of Vaughn Wolffe.)

7 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

8 The next speaker is Cathy Gabor.

9 After Cathy Gabor is John Phillips, Inder
10 Dosanjh, and Evan Branning.

11

12 CATHY GABOR

13 MS. GABOR: Thank you for letting me make a
14 comment.

15 Two questions:

16 One question that I'm confused about is with
17 this report that you presented tonight.

18 You are trying to find ways to make it more
19 clear to average citizens like me.

20 I was confused by the 2 to 6 percent
21 increase in traffic on I-580 east of Isabel.

22 So what that means to me is that there will
23 be cars that are not currently using I-580 to commute
24 or to drive to Pleasanton Dublin Bart.

25 These people in Tracy who are now

4 cont.

S3
C. Gabor

1

PH2
S3 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 telecommuting will begin driving to BART and Isabel?

2 I guess I don't understand where that
3 increase comes from.

1 cont.

4 So that would be something to clarify in the
5 future iteration of this report.

6 And then my second question is: Do we know,
7 Alameda County has BART tax, which cities other than
8 Livermore in the county do not have a BART station?

2

9 Those are my questions. Thank you.

10 (End of Cathy Gabor.)

11 MR. FUNG: Thank you very much for the
12 comment.

13 The next speaker is John Phillips.

S4
J. Phillips

14
15 JOHN PHILLIPS

16 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, my concerns on the
17 traffic in the area is that we are not going far
18 enough with the project, which is what we are hoping
19 is out to the east side of the valley, which would
20 cut down on the traffic coming into our valley,
21 relieving traffic where they are running across, all
22 the way across to Dublin and then from East Dublin,
23 they are trying to get in, and there's no parking
24 there, and they are just continuing trying to find a
25 way to get to work.

1

PH2
S4 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 We don't have enough parking at BART at any
2 of the stations out here.

3 You are talking about now building another
4 station there or another parking lot.

5 I say you shouldn't do that.

6 If you can get BART out to the east side of
7 the valley, it will be the best thing for us in the
8 valley.

9 Diesel is just more smoke in the valley, for
10 us, just the same as the trucks are burning.

11 We don't need that here.

12 We need to get the pollution down from the
13 cars and the emissions and the truck emissions.

14 And you are talking about the commute time
15 to BART currently.

16 I-580 is blocked all morning long.

17 It's one of the worst commutes in the bay.

18 There's no highways being built.

19 There's no roads being accessed in different
20 areas where we can eliminate traffic.

21 The only thing that we have here is BART.

22 And until BART is built, the traffic is just
23 going to continue to get worse for us in the valley.

24 Thank you.

25 (End of John Phillips.)

1 cont.

2

3

PH2
S5

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 MR. FUNG: Thank you very much.
2 The next speaker is Inder Dosanjh.

S5
I. Dosanjh

3
4 INDER DOSANJH

5 MR. DOSANJH: Good Evening.

6 My name is Inder Dosanjh.

7 I'm one of the dealers in Dublin.

8 I was looking at the plans.

9 The impact I'm seeing extends over on our
10 parking.

11 You have to realize, you are only storing
12 probably 40 cars of ridership. Others are being
13 stored in different places.

14 And it's actually impacting the Chevy store,
15 the Nissan store and the Hyundai, Acura and Lexus and
16 Nissan.

17 Just my store sales are over \$250 million a
18 year.

19 And if you take the other guys, you are
20 probably looking at a billion dollars in sales.

21 I had similar to this in Oakland in 2004.

22 Auto Mall.

23 They listen to us.

24 Oakland lost all the car dealerships.

25 That's what happened in the City of Oakland.

1

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 The fire department, police department, all
2 the money to the city of Dublin and Pleasanton. You
3 have to reconsider and look at who you are impacting.

4 My dealership has the big impact.

5 At the worst, I would probably lose 5 to
6 10 percent.

7 And there's certain dealerships losing up to
8 25 percent.

9 It just cannot happen.

10 And if you do this, I can assure you we will
11 relocate before that.

12 We have options.

13 We really will probably consider building
14 Auto Mall, all of us getting together.

15 It's going to be a devastating impact on all
16 of the auto dealers.

17 So I spoke to some of the dealers and said,
18 you guys really need to look at some of this stuff.
19 Look at what will happen to that.

20 And if I lose 10 percent of my frontage, we
21 are done.

22 You guys are almost in my showroom, so we
23 will have to close up.

24 And we will move before this happens.

25 And there's no place in Dublin.

1 cont.

PH2
S5 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 There's no place in Pleasanton to move.
2 Auto malls are easier to function in, auto
3 malls.

4 The Fremont Auto Mall has stores there.
5 Much easier.

6 So please don't force us to move.
7 And then City of Dublin needs us.

8 City of Pleasanton needs us.

9 We produce a lot of tax revenue to our
10 cities.

11 Thank you.

12 (End of Inder Dosanjh.)

13 MR. FUNG: Thank you for your comments.

14 The next speaker is Evan Branning.

15 Then after Evan Branning, it will be Chuck
16 Weir, Nancy Bankhead, and Doug Mann.

1 cont.

S6
E. Branning

18 EVAN BRANNING

19 MR. BRANNING: My name is Evan Branning.

20 I represent the BART to Livermore Coalition.

21 I believe we spoke at the last meeting to
22 figure out and understand the concerns of the
23 Livermore citizens.

24 I would like to ask a couple of
25 clarifications from the D.E.I.R. that my coalition

1

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 is looking for.

2 First of all, I would like to ask that the
3 cost of the maintenance yard be itemized so that we
4 can see how much of the cost of this project is
5 benefiting the entirety of BART versus just the
6 Isabel extension.

7 The second thing we would like to ask for is
8 if an alternative of tail tracks were to be
9 implemented at Isabel, easing the transition to the
10 Greenville station, what would be the cost and
11 drawbacks and benefits of such an extension of tail
12 tracks instead.

13 And the last thing I believe we addressed
14 already is that we want to see if conventional BART
15 is built, how much of the upkeep costs would be
16 offset by ridership. But I believe that is already
17 in the future EIR.

18 So this is my main concern going forward.

19 And I thank you very much for the Draft EIR.

20 It is an excellent product.

21 And we really are hoping for a conventional
22 BART to Livermore.

23 Thank you.

24 (End of Evan Branning.)

25 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

1 cont.

PH2
S7

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 The next speaker is Chuck Weir.

2

3

 CHUCK WEIR

4

 MR. WEIR: My name is Chuck Weir.

5

 I'm a resident of Pleasanton and I ride BART
6 frequently.

7

 I do strongly support extending BART out to
8 Livermore.

9

 I would like to see it go farther.

10

 I'm very pleased to see that the 6 billion
11 dollar project has come along, and downtown Livermore
12 has gone into the vapors. That's great.

13

 It's a little misleading.

14

 The speaker said that all these projects are
15 being evaluated equally.

16

 So that's generally true in the EIR, but in
17 fact, your own handout says that the proposed project
18 is conventional BART.

19

 So that's a little misleading.

20

 I'm a little concerned also that everything
21 you talked about was in terms of the D.E.I.R., rather
22 than E.I.R.- E.I.S., which implies that you are not
23 getting any federal funding.

24

 Is that a question that you can answer while
25 I'm here?

S7
C. Weir

1

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 MR. FUNG: We can answer that afterwards.

2 MR. WEIR: I'm sure others would like to
3 hear it.

4 If you actually do the E.I.R.- E.I.S., E.I.S.
5 is federal under EPA, and you can get federal funding.

6 So to not do that seems like it is
7 incorrect.

8 Seems like you can do both.

9 MR. TANG: If the director can answer that
10 question, he probably will.

11 We did approach the Federal Transit
12 Administration about doing a joint E.I.R.- E.I.S.

13 And the BART alternative, the D.M.U.
14 alternative, and Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit
15 alternative would likely require E.I.S.

16 The Federal Transit Administration says to
17 us, would you please first pick among the four and
18 then come see us.

19 So that is what we are going to do.

20 In fact, I just met with the FTA today and
21 they are still on board with that idea.

22 So after the BART Board decides, we will be
23 going to the federal government to start E.I.S.

24 MR. WEIR: Okay. Thank you.

25 And lastly, I support the other comments

1 cont.

PH2
S7 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 about making sure that the shop and the yard will be
2 suitable for extending BART all the way out to
3 Greenville.

1 cont.

4 Thank you.

5 (End of Evan Branning.)

6 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

7 The next speaker is Nancy Bankhead.

S8
N. Bankhead

8

9 NANCY BANKHEAD

10 MS. BANKHEAD: I live on Hartman Road.

11 I live there because it is quiet and
12 peaceful.

1

13 But if BART comes there, there would be
14 light 24 hours a day, five days a week.

15 I looked at Vasco in the schematics, it is
16 six to seven days a week they work on there.

17 Last spring, we had five Kites flying in the
18 area.

19 And they are wonderful. They fly in the
20 area. Then they flap like this (indicating) and then
21 they dive back down, and they get the mice and
22 whatever in the field.

2

23 A man came along the road, and he had a
24 permit from Fish and Wildlife, and put a trap there
25 alongside the road.

PH2
S8 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 It's legal because he got a permit from Fish
2 and Game.

3 Those five Kites did not come back down.

4 They come every once in a while, but what is
5 BART going to do for the Raptors out there?

6 They are wonderful to watch.

7 You can drive down Hartman and stop your car
8 and look at the Raptors.

9 Anyway, two years ago, I had my pond
10 rebuilt, it was in ill condition.

11 The biologist came from the government and
12 they helped me dig it out and make a plan.

13 They found a red legged frogs, they found
14 tiger salamanders.

15 They were supposed to come out in August,
16 but they didn't get out of the water in time.

17 So we had to make a special thing for them
18 to get them.

19 We got in there and saved the tiger
20 salamanders so they wouldn't get run over before they
21 dug out the pond.

22 BART doesn't know they are out there.

23 Go to Greenville.

24 You said in the beginning that BART would go
25 to Greenville.

2 cont.

3

4

PH2
S8 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 They bought the land, the beautiful land you
2 own.

3 I raise sheep. Pretty good sheep.

4 One got one of the top prices at the Alameda
5 County fair.

6 I sell them to the 4-H kids. They take them
7 to the fair. And when they are judged, my sheep come
8 out on top.

9 So my sheep don't want BART out there. They
10 want to sleep at night.

11 And does BART know that there is a gas line
12 out there that they have to go out there and dig it
13 up and check it every so often?

14 Thank you.

15 (End of Nancy Bankhead.)

16 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comment.

17 The next speaker is Doug Mann.

18 And then after Doug Mann will be Stephanie
19 Ericson and Gregg McKerroll.

20 Doug Mann.

21

22

DOUG MANN

23 MR.MANN: I live in Livermore.

24 My wife works in Oakland.

25 She takes BART every day, and will take BART

4 cont.

5

S9
D. Mann

1

PH2
S9 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 out of the Livermore station if it comes in. So it
2 will convenience us.

3 But first of all, Andrew, you have been very
4 helpful over the years, and especially tonight
5 helping us find information. And I hope the audience
6 can appreciate, the way I have, being at several
7 meetings, about how much good information you do
8 have, and that you are making an honest effort to
9 cover the things that people want covered.

1 cont.

10 Regarding the EIR, one of the things you
11 helped define tonight is something that I expected,
12 but I didn't expect it to be spelled out quite so
13 clearly in the EIR.

14 But on page 326 and 398, it shows that the
15 freeway traffic, the commute traffic on I-580 is
16 essentially not affected by the addition of BART.

17 I think that's important in the D.E.I.R. to
18 have that clarity for the public, because our vision
19 has been, bring BART in, the cars would come off of
20 the freeway or traffic will get better on the freeway.

2

21 And the D.E.I.R. is showing that that's not
22 going to happen.

23 And I suspected that might be going on, but
24 I didn't expect the report to actually say it, at
25 least not so soon.

PH2
S9 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 And I think that needs to be --

2 I had trouble finding that, and that is why
3 I came here tonight.

2 cont.

4 So I would like those points a little more
5 clear.

6 In a way --

7 The report being as long as it is, it could
8 really stand to have an executive summary, like most
9 long reports would have.

3

10 And I think the public would benefit from
11 having these important features put out in a way
12 where they can really drill into the important
13 information to them.

14 Page 298: One of the things that is not
15 addressed, yet, is how full the trains will be once
16 they get to, especially the East Dublin station.

17 I think Dubliners and people who live in
18 Pleasanton would be a little disappointed with the
19 BART -- at this point, a BART extension that meant
20 that when the trains get to Pleasanton-Dublin, they
21 are full and they can't get on them anymore.

4

22 I don't think that's the case, but I think
23 you need to spell that out a little more
24 deliberately somewhere where we can --

25 Well, it's not spelled out yet, but it needs

PH2
S9 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 to be spelled out.

2 What is their experience going to be after

3 the Livermore extension goes in?

4 Is it going to be better?

5 Is it going to be worse?

6 I think that needs to be clarified.

7 I'm almost done.

8 The maintenance yard, I think blows the

9 whole thing up.

10 You can't put the maintenance yard there.

11 That's really a policy thing.

12 We are not really addressing the location of

13 the maintenance yard in this discussion tonight, but

14 I think the E.I.R. has to study a maintenance yard

15 which is not there and maybe on the freeway.

16 Something has got to happen.

17 And finally, I would just like to see a

18 version of this that does not include the

19 alternatives because again, I think people are

20 looking for real BART, they are not looking for the

21 alternatives.

22 When we have to weed through thousands of

23 pages, it would be better if that were maybe under a

24 thousand without the alternatives, if there's a way

25 to do a parallel report and a legal way to do that, I

4 cont.

5

6

PH2
S9 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 think that would be awesome.

6 cont.

2 (End of Doug Mann.)

3 MR. FUNG: Thank you for the comments.

4 The next speaker is Stephanie Ericson.

5

S10
S. Ericson

6 STEPHANIE ERICSON

7 MS. ERICSON: I live in Dublin.

8 I have clarifying questions.

9 I do want to second the suggestion of the
10 previous speaker for an executive summary.

1

11 I'm not prepared to read a thousand pages.

12 And these, while useful, are just a little
13 sparse, I guess, to really understand what's going
14 on.

15 My two questions basically have to do
16 with -- one has to do with understanding the
17 operating costs better, and the second has to do with
18 the traffic as was somewhat mentioned by other
19 people.

20 In terms of the diagram here and operating
21 costs, I was kind of surprised to see -- I was
22 wondering what the reasons for those higher operating
23 costs were for the conventional BART versus the
24 D.M.U. and E.M.U.

2

25 And I suspect now that it probably related

PH2
S10 cont.

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 to higher ridership.

2 But if there are other reasons for that, I
3 am just curious to know what those are.

4 And maybe if you looked at the net cost, it
5 would be a more useful comparison for people to make.

6 And then in terms of traffic congestion, I'm
7 puzzled.

8 It seems like --

9 I understand that the specific intersections
10 will be impacted negatively at times, but I just
11 wondered if the decrease in traffic overall might be
12 undercounted because of the additional ridership.

13 And I didn't understand the area in
14 San Ramon and so forth, if they are coming to Dublin
15 BART, well that means they are not riding somewhere
16 else, so there is some lesser impact in some other
17 parts that would be useful to note.

18 Along with that, I'm assuming that the
19 comparison is with no alternative in the future
20 versus not your current traffic.

21 Is that the case?

22 MR. MCPARTLAND: Yes.

23 MS. ERICSON: Okay. Thank you.

24 (End of Stephanie Ericson.)

25 MR. FUNG: Thanks for your comment.

2 cont.

3



BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 The next speaker is Gregg McKerroll.

2

S11
G. McKerroll

3

GREGG MCKERROLL

4

MS. MCKERROLL: I'm Chief Financial Officer
5 for Dublin Toyota.

6

And I just learned about this project
7 yesterday.

8

And when I looked at the Appendix D, Volume
9 3, I saw that with respect to Dublin Toyota, there is
10 5 percent land requirement that was to be
11 considered -- I assume it's running along I-580.

12

So we would be losing -- I think Mr. Dosanjh
13 addressed this from his perspective -- lots of
14 parking spaces.

15

One to 5 percent, that doesn't sound like a
16 great deal, and it may be something we could talk
17 more about.

18

I turned the page, and I saw what the D.M.U.,
19 that was for the conventional BART project, I didn't
20 see any impact to the other three dealerships.

21

I am also CMO for Dublin Nissan, Dublin
22 Hyundai and Dublin Volkswagen.

23

And when I turned the page to the D.M.U.
24 project, and I saw that Toyota had 1 to 5 percent, I
25 was stunned to see what it says for our Volkswagen

1

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 dealership. It is up to 81 percent.

2 So 75 percent -- more than 75 percent -- and
3 then another 1 to 5 percent for those two APNs.

4 And similarly -- it's one big property.
5 Volkswagen is at the west end of Scarlett Drive.

6 And Hyundai is on the same property.

7 So you are basically putting two car
8 dealerships out of business entirely.

9 So clearly, that is not something that we
10 are terribly pleased to see.

11 And I am just basically speaking tonight for
12 the record, and we will be addressing this in writing
13 too.

14 That's all.

15 Thank you.

16 (End of Gregg McKerroll.)

17 MR. FUNG: That's the last speaker that has
18 submitted a card.

19 Are there any other speakers who want to
20 speak tonight?

21 Seeing none, I think we will close this
22 public verbal comment period of the meeting.

23 And I think I'll give an option for --

24 Well, first, I'll give an opportunity for
25 those who asked questions who wanted them answered,

1 cont.



BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 like I said before, we will stay after and we are
2 happy to talk.

3 For those who don't want to stay after, I
4 just want to thank you for your time, and I
5 appreciate your time and your effort in coming out
6 here tonight.

7 And I'll say a few words about the next
8 steps.

9 And then I'll close the meeting, and then
10 folks who want to talk more can talk more with the
11 staff.

12 So from here forward, we are still in the
13 public comment period, so anybody can submit a public
14 comment until, as Andrew said, October 16.

15 At that point, we will compile all the
16 public comments that we have received, and the
17 project team will provide written responses to all
18 those comments.

19 Those comments and the responses to those
20 comments will become part of the final Environmental
21 Impact Report, which is a document that we will
22 publish after we finish responding to those comments.

23 And at that point is when the BART staff
24 will take this document and the project to the BART
25 board for certification and consideration of adopting

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 an alternative.

2 And that is expected to happen in the spring
3 of 2018.

4 Okay.

5 So that will be the next time the public
6 will hear from this project, is when the final
7 Environmental Impact Report is ready to be
8 distributed publicly.

9 And separately from the environmental
10 process, the project team will come out to have
11 additional meetings with the public and consider and
12 discuss further the comments that we are receiving
13 during this period.

14 Okay.

15 Before I adjourn, I will give the director a
16 chance to say a few words.

17 MR. MCPARTLAND: Thank you for coming out.

18 I ended up working for you.

19 I said that before and I will say that
20 again.

21 I will have to correct -- as much as I
22 admire Andrew Tang, I will have to correct him on
23 something he said earlier when someone asked him a
24 question.

25 And he said, "Now, that's a complex

BART TO LIVERMORE Public Comments 8-29-17

1 question. I'm going to have to deal with that a
2 little bit later."

3 There was nothing complex about the
4 question. It was rather straightforward.

5 The answer, on the other hand, kind of
6 reminds me of when I had a foreign exchange student
7 from Finland.

8 And she said, "I just have really one
9 question, coming from Finland, that I would like you
10 to be explain to me in simple terms. Would you
11 please explain baseball?"

12 "It's going to take a while."

13 We are at your disposal right now.

14 The formal portion of this meeting is over.

15 Now let's get in those conversations and
16 talk about baseball.

17

18 (Public Speaker comments adjourned at 8:22 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESPONSE PH2-S1 Robert Allen

- PH2-S1-1 The comments regarding the history of BART service at Dublin/Pleasanton Station are noted. The comment refers to an extension of ACE from its alignment in Pleasanton to the Dublin/Pleasanton Station. Comments related to ACE service are outside the scope of this project and should be directed to the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission. This project does not preclude a future connection between BART and ACE as a separate project. Please see Master Response 11 for an update on ACE.
- PH2-S1-2 This comment refers to Alternative 2-B of the BART to Livermore Program EIR, which was adopted by the BART Board in 2010. Please see Response to Comment PH1-S5-1.
- PH2-S1-3 Please see Master Response 5 related to the need for and location of the storage and maintenance facility and Response to Comment PH1-S5-2 relating to a new BART line to Oakland, Berkeley, and Richmond.
- PH2-S1-4 Please see Response to Comment D1j-3 regarding iiBART, as well as other Responses to Comment letter D1.

RESPONSE PH2-S2 Vaughn Wolffe

- PH2-S2-1 The cost of relocating I-580 is included in the total capital cost estimate. See Table 2-18 (Estimated Capital Costs) for the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives, on page 191 of the Draft EIR; the item “site work” total of \$89 million for the Proposed Project includes the cost of relocating I-580. Table 2-18 also includes the ROW cost for the freeway relocation, which is \$101 million for the entire ROW, including the alignment north of I-580. For details on the land needs for each project alternative, refer to the EIR Appendix B Footprint Map Books.
- PH2-S2-2 Under No Project Conditions in 2040, the number of people riding BART would constitute 8% of the total daily person-trips using I-580 and BART. The Proposed Project is predicted to remove 8,800 daily vehicle trips from the roadways, including I-580 and parallel routes such as Dublin Boulevard, and increase BART ridership by 11,900 boardings. Thereafter, under the Proposed Project in 2040, the number of people riding BART would constitute 13% of the total daily person-trips using I-580 and BART. In addition, under Cumulative Conditions, the amount of daily vehicle trips removed would increase to 11,000 and the amount of new BART boardings

would increase to 13,400. The amount of new BART boardings are reported in Table 3.B-21 -BART Systemwide Daily Ridership (Weekday), Existing and 2025/2040 (page 291 of the Draft EIR).

While the analysis showed that some local intersections would be impacted with higher delays, including near Isabel Station (see pages 343 to 379), the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives would reduce overall VMT, as shown in Table 3.B-30 [Surrounding Transit Services Ridership (Weekday Boardings), Existing and 2025/2040 No Project Conditions] on page 302.

PH2-S2-3 Please see pages 192 through 194 of the Draft EIR for a full list of funding sources. Please also see Master Response 1 regarding funding for the BART to Livermore Extension Project and Livermore's contribution.

PH2-S2-4 The BART Board will evaluate the cost and ridership for the Proposed Project and Alternatives before determining whether any of the alternatives will go forward. Funding for regional transit projects is provided through a competitive selection process. Funders, such as Alameda County Transportation Commission and Metropolitan Transportation Commission, evaluate transit projects based on a variety of criteria, including but not limited to capital cost, operating cost, new ridership, congestion reduction, air quality improvement, and transit connectivity. Therefore, a combination of regional agencies will be balancing the costs and benefits of any major project and comparing each against a set of criteria to try to make the best use of public funds.

Regarding the commenter's contention that most travelers coming east over the Altamont Pass are heading to places not served by BART, it is true that given the destinations of many of those travelers, it would not benefit them to ride BART. However, the travel demand modeling indicated that the Proposed Project would increase overall daily BART ridership by 11,900 compared with the No Project Conditions, and that the Proposed Project would remove 8,800 vehicles per day from the roadway network. The analysis showed that Proposed Project would provide traffic reduction benefits.

See Responses to Comments C12-6, D19-1, and D43-4 for a discussion of a transfer between ACE and BART at Shinn Street, as well as Master Response 11 regarding ACE.

RESPONSE PH2-S3 Cathy Gabor

- PH2-S3-1 New automobile trips would appear on I-580 east of Isabel as a result of existing demand for BART by potential riders living east of Isabel, in response to newly available parking at the Isabel Station. These new trips are mode-shifting to driving to the Isabel Station from other modes, including carpooling, ACE, and San Joaquin Regional Transit District to BART. The increase in parking availability and decreased travel time would shift about 1,500 riders from ACE and San Joaquin Regional Transit District buses to driving and parking at the Isabel Station. This mode shift increases I-580 traffic volumes from the Altamont Pass to Isabel Avenue.
- PH2-S3-2 Six cities in Alameda County (including Livermore) do not have a BART station; the other cities are Alameda, Albany, Emeryville, Piedmont, and Newark.

RESPONSE PH2-S4 John Phillips

- PH2-S4-1 Please see Master Response 4 regarding extending the track toward Greenville.
- PH2-S4-2 In 2025, the DMU Alternative would result in a net reduction in emissions of ROG_s, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from passenger vehicles when compared to the 2025 No Project Conditions. In addition, under the DMU Alternative, the operational emissions resulting from diesel combustion by the DMU vehicles would be less than 2 tons per year for each criteria pollutant and would be below the respective significance thresholds. With the EMU Option, emissions would decrease further because the EMU would be electric-powered. A full discussion of ROG_s, NO_x, PM₁₀ for the DMU Alternative/EMU Option can be found beginning on page 1153 of the Draft EIR.
- PH2-S4-3 The commenter's support of BART as a means of addressing traffic congestion is noted. This comment does not specifically address the adequacy of the EIR; no response is necessary.

RESPONSE PH2-S5 Inder Dosanjh

- PH2-S5-1 Thank you for providing comments. Please see Response to Comment B3-4 and B3-5 for a discussion of economic effects to businesses.

RESPONSE PH2-S6 Evan Branning

PH2-S6-1 The comment supporting the Proposed Project (Conventional BART Project) is noted. Please see Response to Comment A5-3 and Master Response 5 regarding the cost of the storage and maintenance facility and the amount of the cost allocated to the Proposed Project.

Please see Master Response 5 regarding the need for the storage and maintenance facility. Please also see Master Response 6 regarding alternative locations considered for the storage and maintenance facility but found to be infeasible, which include: 1) constructing tail tracks in I-580 median east of Isabel Station, and 2) a storage and maintenance facility at or near Greenville.

Please see Response to Comment B5-2 regarding the three metrics that have been calculated to measure cost effectiveness for the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives, as follows: (1) rail farebox recovery ratio; (2) annualized lifecycle costs per net new BART boarding; and (3) annual operational and maintenance cost (O&M) per net new BART boarding. The farebox recovery ratio represents the percentage of O&M cost paid by fare revenue, which is less than 100 percent, Transit projects rarely cover all O&M costs from fares, and the 88 percent farebox ratio for the Proposed Project is higher than the 74 percent system-wide average for BART (based on 2017 data).

RESPONSE PH2-S7 Chuck Weir

PH2-S7-1 The commenter's preference for conventional BART to Livermore with a desire to see it extend further is noted.

CEQA requires that an EIR identify the proposed project. In addition, an EIR must also evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15124 and 15126.6. The Draft EIR consistently identifies the Conventional BART Project as the Proposed Project and distinguishes the Proposed Project from the three Build Alternatives, which are the DMU Alternative/EMU Option, Express Bus/BRT Alternative, and Enhanced Bus Alternative. Page 3 of the Draft EIR states that the Proposed Project involves extending the BART system, using conventional BART technology, from the existing terminus of the Daly City-Dublin/Pleasanton Line at the Dublin/Pleasanton Station to a new station located east of Isabel Avenue (State Route 84) in the city of Livermore. In addition to the Proposed Project, three Build Alternatives, as well as the No Project Alternative (or No Build Alternative), are evaluated in this EIR. This is consistent with *Washoe*

Meadows Community v. Department of Parks and Recreation (2017) 17 Cal. App. 5th 277, which clarifies that an EIR must clearly identify the project being proposed, as distinct from the range of alternatives considered. The BART Board will adopt a project for implementation based on their review of the Proposed Project and Alternatives.

As described on pages 69 and 70 of Chapter 1, Introduction, the Draft EIR evaluated the Proposed Project and Alternatives under CEQA; if the Proposed Project, DMU Alternative/EMU Option, or the Express Bus/BRT Alternative were to move forward as the adopted project, it would also require evaluation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). An Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to NEPA would be prepared subsequent to completion of the CEQA process. However, it is anticipated that the Enhanced Bus Alternative would not be subject to NEPA.

As described on pages 89 and 123, the design of the Proposed Project and DMU Alternative/EMU Option (including the location and design of the storage and maintenance facility) does not preclude a future extension of the rail alignment to the east to Greenville in a separate project.

RESPONSE PH2-S8 Nancy Bankhead

- PH2-S8-1 Please see Master Response 7 for a discussion of light associated with the storage and maintenance facility.
- PH2-S8-2 The Draft EIR recognizes the presence of suitable habitat for white-tailed kites in the project area (see pages 840, 859, and 910 of the Draft EIR). The federal and State of California protection requirements for the project are described in Section 3.1, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. As this section describes, disturbance of raptors (including kites) that causes nest abandonment and/or reproductive failure is considered take by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; however, habitat modification to accommodate an approved project would not be considered take, unless it resulted in the direct loss of birds, eggs, or nests. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-7 (Avoid Nesting Birds), the unauthorized loss of birds, their nests, or eggs, would not occur. Following construction, raptor foraging habitat would still be available outside of the Proposed Project footprint in the Hartman Road/Cayetano Creek Area.
- PH2-S8-3 Please see Response to Comment PH1-S1-2.

PH2-S8-4 Please see Master Response 4 regarding extending the track toward Greenville.

Operational noise and light from the storage and maintenance facility is discussed in Section 3.J, Noise and Vibration. Light and visual impacts are discussed in Section 3.E, Visual Quality. Noise and light from the operation of the facility would not affect agricultural operations, which are not considered sensitive uses or receptors. Please see Master Response 7 regarding noise and light associated with the storage and maintenance facility.

PH2-S8-5 Thank you for your comment. As shown on Figure 3.P-1 (Major Utility Lines in the Collective Footprint) on page 1437 of the Draft EIR in Chapter 3.P, Utilities, an underground natural gas line has been identified near the location proposed for the storage and maintenance facility.

RESPONSE PH2-S9 Doug Mann

PH2-S9-1 Thank you for your comment. Comment noted.

PH2-S9-2 As correctly noted by the commenter and as described on page 325 of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would not create a significant reduction in overall traffic volumes on I-580.

The Proposed Project would reduce the number of vehicle trips using I-580 as a route from points east to the Dublin/Pleasanton Station, as such vehicles would instead be drawn to the proposed Isabel Avenue Station in both 2025 and 2040. The shifting of vehicles from the Dublin/Pleasanton Station to the Isabel Station would cause small volume reductions on I-580 and parallel roadways to the west of the new Isabel Station, between Isabel Avenue and Hacienda Drive. However, east of Isabel Avenue, compared with the No Project Conditions, a small increase of vehicles on I-580 and local Livermore roadways would result from additional travelers driving to the Isabel Station from points east. The new Isabel Station would attract new trips that previously would not have been made to BART due to the closer proximity of the station to the travelers and parking supply at the station. Figure 3.B-9 on page 321 of the Draft EIR shows these effects, which are further described on page 322. Please also see Response to Comments A2-19, B7-12, and D4a-2 for more information regarding traffic as result of the Proposed Project and Alternatives.

Please refer to page 44 of the Draft EIR for a listing of the project objectives (second page of Chapter 1, Introduction). Reducing congestion on I-580 is not one of the project objectives, however, the project does aim to “provide an effective *commute alternative* to traffic congestion on I-580” (emphasis added). The Proposed Project’s ability to meet this goal is measured through its travel time from Downtown Livermore to Downtown San Francisco, as well as the overall reduction in vehicle miles travelled. For additional information pertaining to this objective, please refer to the Proposed Project and Build Alternatives Evaluation Report, which is available as a link on the project website at: <https://www.bart.gov/about/projects/liv>.

The commenter notes that they had trouble finding the I-580 traffic information in the Draft EIR. The above information is provided under *Impact TRAN-4: General-purpose lane freeway segments operating at unacceptable LOS, under 2040 Project Conditions*. An EIR considers a wide range of environmental resources and a project’s impacts upon them; LOS within freeway segments is just one of the many environmental topics analyzed.

- PH2-S9-3 Basic project information, including a summary of the impacts and benefits of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, can be found in the Summary chapter of the Draft EIR.
- PH2-S9-4 Please see Responses to Comments C4-3 and C11-7 and Master Response 8 regarding anticipated passenger conditions with an extension to Isabel Avenue.
- PH2-S9-5 Please see Master Response 5 regarding the need for a storage and maintenance facility for the Livermore extension, and Master Response 6 regarding other locations considered but found to be infeasible and why the proposed location is the best available site.
- PH2-S9-6 CEQA requires an EIR to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives as well as the proposed project. As described on page 77 of the Draft EIR in Chapter 2, Project Description, three Build Alternatives were identified in initial screening as alternatives with the potential to meet most of the project objectives and be completed within a reasonable timeframe. The Draft EIR provides a full evaluation of those alternatives, while other alternatives found not to be feasible at the screening stage were excluded from evaluation, consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Although the desire for a shorter report, or a report focused on the Proposed Project is

understandable, such a report would not comply with CEQA. Moreover, BART believes that the side-by-side comparison of the alternatives provides a fuller understanding of the environmental impacts and benefits.

RESPONSE PH2-S10 Stephanie Ericson

PH2-S10-1 The Draft EIR contains a Summary chapter, which contains basic project information, including the impacts and benefits of the Proposed Project and Alternatives.

PH2-S10-2 Under the Proposed Project, the project would operate 10-car BART trains for the entire line from Isabel Station to Daly City Station. Those trains would not be filled with passengers upon leaving Isabel Station. Boardings at the Isabel Station would only require a few cars to provide sufficient passenger capacity. But the trains that start from the Isabel Station still must be 10-car trains, because ten cars are required for capacity needs when the trains reach stations closer to San Francisco.

Under the DMU Alternative, a four-car DMU train would operate on the Dublin/Pleasanton Station to Isabel Station segment, sized to meet the passenger demand between the two stations. Those passengers would then transfer to conventional 10-car BART trains at Dublin/Pleasanton Station. Therefore, between Isabel Station and Dublin/Pleasanton Station, the operating cost for the Proposed Project (entailing operation of 10-car trains) is higher than that of the DMU Alternative (which entails operation of 4-car trains).

PH2-S10-3 The traffic analysis focused on the Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore area, and the comment is correct that the project would result in reductions of traffic congestion elsewhere in the region that are not reflected in the Draft EIR. However, the analysis of vehicle miles traveled does account for traffic reductions around the Bay Area as a whole.

RESPONSE PH2-S11 Gregg McKerroll

PH2-S11-1 The commenter is referring to Appendix C (not Appendix D) of the Draft EIR, which displays percentages of property loss to individual parcels. It does not account or represent the total loss to the properties (which can be located on multiple parcels). While the commenter does not name which “two APNs” they are referring to, it can be inferred these are APN 941 055002400 and APN 941 055003000, which are listed as parcel address “6085 Scarlett” and “6015 Scarlett”, respectively (see Appendix C, DMU

Alternative, page 3 of 5). The commenter correctly states that more than 75% of these parcels would be needed for the permanent project footprint. Appendix B, Footprint Mapbooks, of the Draft EIR, provides a more accurate picture of the actual extent of right-of-way acquisition. As seen in the mapbook for the DMU Alternative, page 1 of 11, only a small portion of Dublin Volkswagen and Dublin Hyundai property would potentially be acquired. The image below further clarifies that the APNs in question are very small and most of the dealerships' property is located in the two adjacent parcels, APN 941 055002502 and 941 055003202 (the blue hatch is BART's potential ROW need).



In addition, please see Response to Comment B3-5, regarding the parcels that may be required for the ROW and the mitigation measure identified in the Draft EIR to address potential business displacement impacts, i.e., Mitigation Measure PH-2 (Acquisition of Property and Relocation Assistance). Other than physical displacement impacts addressed by Mitigation Measure PH-2, impacts to businesses are not considered to be significant environmental impacts under CEQA and are not required to be analyzed in an EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(e) states that economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. Please also see Response to Comment C7-1 for more information regarding property acquisition.

This page intentionally blank