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Introduction:

The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART or District), as a recipient of federal funds, is required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its amendments (Act). Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that no person in the United States, on the grounds of race, color or national original be excluded from, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination, under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. Presidential Executive Order 12898 “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” addresses environmental justice in minority and low income populations. Presidential Executive Order 13166 “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency” addresses services to those individuals with Limited English Proficiency (LEP).

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1B, dated October 1, 2012, entitled Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients (Circular), requires that federal funding recipients, such as BART, complete a Title VI equity analysis on the determination of the site or location of facilities. Per 49 CFR Part 21.5(b)(3): “In determining the site or location of facilities, a recipient or applicant may not make selections with the purpose or effect of excluding persons from, denying them the benefits of, or subjecting them to discrimination under any program to which this regulation applies, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin; or with the purpose or effect of defeating or substantially impairing the accomplishment of the objectives of the Act or this part.” In accordance with the Circular, the equity analysis ensures that site or location or facilities is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin.

49 CFR Part 21, Appendix C, section (a)(3)(iv) provides that “[t]he location of projects requiring land acquisition and the displacement of persons from their residences and businesses may not be determined on the basis of race, color, or national origin.” It is noted here that only property currently owned by BART or that would be leased by BART are considered in this study; in no case would residences or businesses be displaced as a result of this project.

This report, the Transit Operations Facility Title VI Siting Analysis (Siting Analysis), ensures that the proposed site location options for BART’s new Transit Operations Facility (TOF) were selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. In January 2015 BART conducted a preliminary Site Alternatives Evaluation which evaluated five alternate locations to the Lake Merritt Complex (where the current facilities are located) with respect to criteria developed by BART staff. This Siting Analysis summarizes the findings from that earlier report and adds a Title VI assessment to that 2015 evaluation.
Section 1: Background and Project Description

1.1 Background:

Much of BART's current transit system management facilities are located in the Lake Merritt Complex, underneath the Lake Merritt Plaza. The existing facilities require increased physical space and state of good repair improvements to achieve state-of-the-art functionality, support improved BART operations, and accommodate operation of planned BART extension projects over the next 40 years, including the extension to Silicon Valley. Therefore, BART is currently proposing to design and construct a new Transit Operations Facility (TOF) to modernize current operations control infrastructure and technology to support system expansion.

Phase 1 of the Silicon Valley extension, which will extend the system to Milpitas and Berryessa stations, is forecast to be open by the end of 2017. Current estimates put a new facility operational in 2021, leaving a 3- to 4-year gap. For the interim years BART will need to make some minor improvements to the existing facilities to make it operable, but these improvements will not be sufficient for long-term operation.

1.2 Project Description:

For the new Transit Operations Facility (TOF), BART is exploring potential site locations, including a TOF rebuilt at the Lake Merritt Complex (at grade on the Lake Merritt Plaza), or a TOF constructed elsewhere in the BART system. The TOF would consist of new and enlarged facilities required to support improved & expanded BART operations. It is worth noting that the new facility would not replace all operations currently located at the Lake Merritt Complex and several related systems, such as communications hubs, would continue to be located at the Lake Merritt Complex regardless of the location of the new TOF. For the purposes of this study it is assumed that the TOF will be a secure 3-story facility (57 feet tall plus roof equipment), with opportunities for retail and/or community uses at the ground floor. The facility will also require a back-up generator. For the Lake Merritt Complex site alternative, it is assumed that the TOF would be constructed where the BART Administration building was previously located, making use of the foundations that supported that building. This report will describe the alternative potential site locations and evaluate each site location's impact on Title VI communities.
Section 2: Study Purpose

2.0 Study Purpose:

BART objectives for this study are to:

1. Identify the most appropriate locations for construction of a resilient, high-functioning TOF.
2. Undertake a review of potential site locations for the TOF, comparing the existing Lake Merritt Complex location to other potential sites.
3. Review demographic data of each proposed site location to determine if any protected populations (minority and low-income) would be disproportionately impacted by the location of the new TOF building.¹
4. Analysis of potential adverse impacts and benefits on each proposed site and compare impacts among the sites and also analysis of equity impacts of alternative sites.
5. Conduct community outreach on proposed site locations.

¹ A subsequent Environmental Justice/Impacts Analysis will be conducted for the TOF project which will evaluate construction and operational impacts of building and operating a TOF in the chosen site location.
Section 3: Title VI Compliance

3.0 Transit Operations Facility Title VI Compliance:

Per FTA Circular 4702.1B, BART as a recipient of federal funds is required to complete a Title VI equity analysis during the planning stage with regard to where a project is located or sited to ensure the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. While the siting analysis section of the Circular does not specifically mention low-income populations, it does require that BART “engage in outreach to persons potentially impacted by the siting of facilities.” Following this language and the principles outlined in FTA Circular 4703.1 (EJ Circular) and BART’s current practice and policies, this report will also conduct an analysis on low-income populations. The Title VI equity analysis must compare the equity impacts of various siting alternatives, and the analysis must occur before the selection of the preferred site.

This report determines if the site selection for the new TOF would have a disparate impact on minority populations or place a disproportionate burden on low-income populations. To determine if a disproportionate impact is born by protected populations, BART will refer to the threshold in its Board adopted Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy (DI/DB Policy). BART uses the DI/DB Policy as a measure to determine if fare changes or major service changes result in disproportionate impacts on protected populations. For new service and new fares, a disparate impact to minority riders or a disproportionate burden on low-income riders will be found if the applicable difference between the proportion of Project riders that are protected and the proportion of protected system-wide riders is equal to or greater than 10%. For the TOF, BART will use this 10% DI/DB threshold to evaluate potential impacts of various siting alternatives on minority and low-income populations. BART’s DI/DB Policy does not specify a threshold for siting analysis, but given a 10% threshold is used for new fares and new service, BART shall apply a 10% threshold for a new site location.

---

2 Per 49 CFR Part 21.5(b)(3): "In determining the site or location of facilities, a recipient or applicant may not make selections with the purpose or effect of excluding persons from, denying them the benefits of, or subjecting them to discrimination under any program to which this regulation applies, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin; or with the purpose or effect of defeating or substantially impairing the accomplishment of the objectives of the Act or this part."

3 BART’s DI/DB Policy was developed pursuant to the Circular, following an extensive public participation process, and adopted by the BART Board of Directors on July 11, 2013.
Section 4: Alternative Locations

4.0 Selection of Alternative Locations for Transit Operations Facility:
This section describes how five alternative locations to the Lake Merritt Complex were identified (see Figure 1). Access to the Lake Merritt Complex is important to the function of the TOF because it is at the center of the system which is host to important equipment and facilities. Given BART's preference for TOF proximity to these features, only locations within a 10-minute response time by BART or car to the Lake Merritt Complex were reviewed. A central location also provides ready access to all parts of the system and proximity to both the BART Headquarters and the existing facilities at Lake Merritt. Further, only locations near BART tracks and close to BART stations were considered. An edge-of-system location was added for comparison to the central-system TOF site locations.

Figure 1: Alternative TOF locations in relation to the BART System Map
4.2 Locations Selected for Review:

Five alternatives were selected for review against the current Lake Merritt Complex location.

The five alternative locations are:

1. **Downtown Oakland** – near either the 12th St/Oakland City Center or 19th St/Oakland Station in a basement location of a building adjacent to the station. Assumed to be the basement of the Central Building, 436 14th Street, at the corner of 14th and Broadway for illustrative purposes. While this specific location was analyzed in this report, other similar locations not currently owned by BART, but close to existing stations, would be expected to have similar results in the evaluation.
2. **Fruitvale** – at the parking lot pictured and located between 36th and 37th Avenues.

3. **Lake Merritt (Proximate to Station)** – BART-owned surface parking lot currently used for BART maintenance vehicles, adjacent to the freeway off-ramp, and two blocks from the station entrance.
4. **Jack London Square Portal** – where the BART tracks emerge from below ground as they leave Downtown Oakland, using the BART-owned parcel currently used for support equipment.

5. **Dublin/Pleasanton** – one location in the outer part of the BART system was selected for comparison to the locations selected in the system’s core. The location is the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station, on a portion of the existing surface parking lot south of the BART station, in the city of Pleasanton.
4.3 Eliminated Locations:

Along list of possible alternative TOF locations was created based on the initial criteria described above. Sites on the long list were then screened to eliminate those with limited space for TOF construction, either with transit-oriented development (TOD) under construction or with an RFQ released for development, with extended access time compared to others on the list, with very similar characteristics to another site being evaluated (assuming a similar rating outcome), and with elevated risk of sea level rise.

The following locations were reviewed and eliminated for the following reasons:

1. Coliseum Station – eliminated due to exceptional sea level rise risks as well as planned TOD.
2. MacArthur Station – eliminated because any plausible locations for construction of a TOF would interfere with TOD currently under construction.
3. West Oakland Station – eliminated because the immediate station area and vicinity are occupied with station-serving uses and BART is currently seeking development partners to implement TOD. The uncertain timing and complexity of TOD in this location would likely result in schedule delays and increase the complexity of the TOF project (due to many unknowns in the site and context), ultimately negatively impacting the overall schedule for new TOF operability.
4. Oakland Shops – eliminated for several reasons: a. the location is currently overcapacity with little employee parking; b. it has no access to a BART station; c. there would be a delayed response to emergencies should dispatch of TOF employees be required; and d. location could be better used for on-rail vehicle storage if land were acquired from the railroad.
5. West Oakland Proximate – eliminated because it has similar characteristics to the near-station Lake Merritt location (selected for review) and is currently being leased.
Section 5: Methodology

5.0 Title VI Populations and Methodology:

This section identifies the Title VI communities in the project area and the methodology used to assess potential impacts of the TOF site selection on Title VI populations. Title VI populations analyzed in this report include minority and low-income populations. A ½ mile radius around each proposed site location was drawn – this area is the site study area and used to determine the demographics of each site location. US Census 2010 data was used to identify minority populations and data from the American Community Survey (ACS 2010 - 2014) was used to identify low-income populations.

5.1 Title VI Populations:

For this analysis, BART’s four-county service area definitions and thresholds for minority and low-income populations are used. The definitions and thresholds are described as follows:

- **Minority Definition:** Pursuant to the Circular and Federal guidelines, minority populations are defined as individuals who have identified themselves to be American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.

- **Low-Income Definition:** BART defines the low-income populations as those who are at or below 200 percent of the poverty level established for households by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines. This assumption is more inclusive of low-income populations, accounting for higher incomes in the Bay Area as compared to the rest of the United States. The 200% threshold is also consistent with the assumptions employed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in its February 2009 Equity Analysis Report. This definition takes into account both the household size and household income, the combinations of household size and income that are defined as “low-income” are as follows. For reference, this threshold defines a four-person household with an annual income under $48,600 as low income in 2016.

### Table 1: 2016 Poverty Guidelines: Federal* and the BART Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in family/household</th>
<th>Poverty guideline (federal)</th>
<th>200% (BART Service Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,880</td>
<td>$23,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16,020</td>
<td>$32,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,160</td>
<td>$40,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>$48,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28,440</td>
<td>$56,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32,580</td>
<td>$65,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36,730</td>
<td>$73,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40,890</td>
<td>$81,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the 48 Contiguous States and the District of Columbia

BART’s four-county service area populations include:

- Minority population: 59.4% (US Census 2010)
- Low-income population: 26% (ACS 2010-2014)

5.2 METHODOLOGY:
To evaluate impacts on minority and low-income populations, a demographic assessment was conducted. The assessment evaluates whether populations living within the project study area of each proposed site location may be adversely affected by a TOF complex are disproportionately minority or low-income.

Description: The Demographic Assessment compares the proportion of minority and low-income populations in each site location’s project study area (½ mile radius from each proposed TOF site location) to BART’s four-county minority and low-income populations.


Step 1: Identify the Data Source
US Census 2010 was used to identify minority populations and ACS 2010-2014 data was used to identify low-income populations in each TOF site alternative’s project study area. The US Census 2010 and ACS 2010-2014 provides population and demographic data at the census tract level.

Step 2: Determine Project Catchment Area
The project study area for each of the five proposed site locations are shown in Appendix A (minority) and Appendix B (low-income). Consistent FTA Circular guidance and previous BART equity analysis under the guidance of FTA Circular 4702.1B, a ½ mile radius was drawn around each proposed site alternative location. This ½ mile radius is the project catchment area for each site alternative. The Lake Merritt Complex and Lake Merritt Proximate sites use the same ½ mile radius, and therefore are shown on a single map.
Step 3: Determine the share of protected riders for the Project Catchment Area

For this analysis, BART's four-county service area definitions and thresholds for minority and low-income populations are used. Each census tract within the study area was analyzed to determine if the percentage of minority and low-income populations exceeded the four-county service area average based on the minority and low-income population definitions and thresholds defined in Section 5.1. The maps in Appendix A and B display census tracts within each proposed site alternative's project study area where the percentage of minority and low-income populations exceeded the four-county service area average.

Step 4: Determine the share of protected riders for overall BART ridership

For the new site Demographic Assessment, BART will use the minority and low-income population data for the City of Oakland. According to the US Census 2010, the City of Oakland's minority population is 73.5% and according to ACS 2010-2014, the City of Oakland's low-income population is 41.5%. As a comparison group for the proposed site alternative in Dublin/Pleasanton, BART will use the City of Dublin data. According to the US Census 2010, the City of Dublin's minority population is 57% and according to ACS 2010-2014, the City of Dublin's low-income population is 10.6%.

Step 5: Apply BART's Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy

Pursuant to the Circular, BART must evaluate equity impacts for fare and service changes using its DI/DB Policy (See Section 3.0). As mentioned previously, BART will refer to its DI/DB Policy, in determining whether the difference between the affected area's protected population (minority and low-income) share and overall protected population share (City of Oakland or City of Dublin) exceeds a 10% threshold. For new site demographic assessment, a disparate impact to minority populations or a disproportionate burden on low-income populations may be found if the difference is 10% or more.

Step 6: Alternative Measures

If this siting analysis finds that minority populations experience disparate impacts, pursuant to FTA Circular 4702.1B, BART may proceed with the proposed location of the Project only if BART can show:

- A substantial legitimate justification for locating the Project there exists; and
- There are no alternatives serving the same legitimate objectives that would have a less disparate impact on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

While the Circular does not necessarily outline how to proceed if the assessment finds that low-income populations experience a disproportionate burden from the proposed location of a siting, using language from the FTA Circular 4702.1B as it applies to low-income populations for fares and service changes, principles from FTA Circular 4703.1 as it applies to adverse effects on low-income populations, and to ensure consistency with how BART generally analyzes impacts to this protected group, BART should take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate these impacts where practicable. BART shall also describe alternatives available to low-income populations affected by the proposed new site.
Section 6: Alternatives Analysis

6.0 Title VI Alternatives Evaluation:
This section includes the Title VI demographic analysis for the Lake Merritt Complex and each of the alternative locations, to evaluate whether populations living within the project study area of each proposed site location may be adversely affected by an TOF complex are disproportionately minority or low-income.

As mentioned in Section 4 above, the five alternatives selected for review against the current Lake Merritt Complex location include:

- Downtown Oakland
- Fruitvale
- Lake Merritt (Proximate to Station)
- Jack London Square Portal
- Dublin/Pleasanton

49 CFR Part 21, Appendix C, section (a)(3)(iv) provides that “[t]he location of projects requiring land acquisition and the displacement of persons from their residences and businesses may not be determined on the basis of race, color, or national origin.” It is noted here that only property currently owned by BART or that would be leased by BART are considered in this study; in no case would residences or businesses be displaced as a result of this project.

6.1 Study Area Protected Populations: Table 2, shows the demographic breakdown (minority and low-income) for each proposed site location and the current Lake Merritt Complex (also a proposed site location). US Census 2010 and ACS 2010-2014 data was used to identify low-income and minority populations in each TOF site alternative’s project study (determined by a ½ mile radius around each site).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lake Merritt Complex</th>
<th>Downtown Oakland</th>
<th>Fruitvale Station</th>
<th>Lake Merritt Proximate</th>
<th>Jack London Square Portal</th>
<th>Dublin/ Pleasanton Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% minority</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% low-income</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% LEP</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for Dublin/Pleasanton Station includes an average of City of Dublin population data and City of Pleasanton population data as the site is located in both cities.
Source: US Census and ACS data
6.2 Demographic Assessment

Pursuant to the Circular, BART must conduct a demographic assessment to evaluate equity impacts of building a TOF. Using the DI/DB Policy, the demographic assessment demines if minority or low-income populations experience a disproportionate impact from BART building a TOF in each of the site locations. In applying the DI/DB Policy, the determination is made as to whether the difference between the affected area’s protected population (minority and low-income) share and overall system’s protected population (minority or low-income) share exceeds the 10% threshold in the Policy. For new site demographic assessment, a disparate impact to minority populations or a disproportionate burden on low-income populations may be found if the difference is 10% or more.

In the case of this new site assessment, the overall population value is the City of Oakland’s minority and low-income data. Since all proposed site alternatives which are the top contenders for the new TOF site, with the exception of Dublin/Pleasanton Station, are located within the City of Oakland, BART determined this to be the most accurate comparison value as this data is a closest representation of the local community.

Dublin/Pleasanton Station located in the outer part of the BART system was selected for comparison to the locations selected in the system’s core (locations within the City of Oakland). For this location, the City of Dublin, minority and low-income population data will be used as a comparison value as it is the closest representation of the local community.

Table 3, 4, and 5 show the results of the minority and low-income demographic assessment for the 5 proposed site alternatives.

**Table 3: Minority Population Demographic Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lake Merritt Plaza</th>
<th>Downtown Oakland</th>
<th>Fruitvale Station</th>
<th>Lake Merritt Proximate</th>
<th>Jack London Square Portal</th>
<th>Dublin/Pleasanton Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ Mile % Minority</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City % Minority</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>50.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Difference</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Disparate Impact</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for Dublin/Pleasanton Station includes an average of City of Dublin population data and City of Pleasanton population data as the site is located in both cities.

Source: US Census and ACS data
### Table 4: Low-Income Population Demographic Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lake Merritt Plaza</th>
<th>Downtown Oakland</th>
<th>Fruitvale Station</th>
<th>Lake Merritt Proximate</th>
<th>Jack London Square Portal</th>
<th>Dublin/Pleasanton Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>½ Mile % Low-Income</strong></td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City % Low-Income</strong></td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Difference</strong></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Disparate Impact</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for Dublin/Pleasanton Station includes an average of City of Dublin population data and City of Pleasanton population data as the site is located in both cities.*

Source: US Census and ACS data

### 6.2 Location Rankings:

In addition to the Title VI siting analysis, BART staff developed selection criteria related to the resiliency and operational functionality of each site alternative, and a scoring system for those criteria. Criteria address locational features only, and criteria related to building design, which would be incorporated into any building site, are not included. The criteria were reviewed by BART staff representatives from multiple departments, including: transportation and system services, property development, BPD security and emergency management, planning, capital systems, and maintenance and engineering. The scoring criteria and approach, on a scale of 1 to 3, are presented in Table 5. They are grouped into four sets of closely related criteria:

- Fundamentals
- Access & Operations
- Land Use
- Hazards
### TABLE 5: RESILIENCY AND OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score: Scale of 1 (low) to 3 (high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals</td>
<td>1 Availability</td>
<td>Real estate readily available to BART, either through current ownership or</td>
<td>Not BART-owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>purchase.</td>
<td>BART-owned, but has a structure on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Space</td>
<td>Location large enough to allow for security (either through buffer or design),</td>
<td>Not large enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support flexibility of use, facilitate projected view of whole BART system,</td>
<td>Large enough, with design constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>allow replacement of support facilities, and allow related uses, including</td>
<td>Large enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emergency control center and development complex to be integrated into the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>building. Assuming 35,000 sq. ft., with a minimum width of 90 feet based on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preliminary architectural drawings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 General cost</td>
<td>Order of magnitude costs.</td>
<td>Higher cost than those currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>budgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Time to completion</td>
<td>Can facility be constructed in time to support SVRT project, opening by 2021?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but schedule is tight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Operations</td>
<td>5 Centrality</td>
<td>Location within the BART system, particularly proximity to the Oakland Wye/</td>
<td>Further than 2 BART stops from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Track Section A05.</td>
<td>the Oakland Wye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 TOF staff access</td>
<td>Accessible via BART and via major roadways to facilitate 24-hour operations</td>
<td>Access difficult (distant from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>access and emergency access. Also consider safety from parking and/or BART</td>
<td>BART and highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Station to TOF.</td>
<td>Easy access on BART and highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Headquarters access</td>
<td>Reasonable proximity to headquarters, so management and support staff from</td>
<td>More than 20 minutes by any mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>headquarters can access the TOF.</td>
<td>0-20 minute access by any mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Communications</td>
<td>Access to communication networks</td>
<td>Not attached to communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>networks system</td>
<td></td>
<td>networks (not in station)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>connection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attached to communication networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(station)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Center of communication networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(central station)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>1 Constructability</td>
<td>Location allows relative ease of construction to minimize costs, risks, and</td>
<td>Difficult to construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>service disruptions.</td>
<td>Construction has some challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Transit-oriented</td>
<td>Consider opportunity cost with respect to current or future potential for</td>
<td>Limits opportunities for TOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>transit-oriented development (TOD) at BART stations.</td>
<td>Some drawbacks with respect to TOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral with respect to TOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Context and standards</td>
<td>How well can an TOF be woven in with adjacent land uses and local building</td>
<td>Design for compatibility is difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>design standards?</td>
<td>Can be designed to be compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Readily compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Flooding/sea level</td>
<td>Does the location have vulnerability to sea level rise, storm surge, or local</td>
<td>Subject to all three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level rise hazards</td>
<td>flooding, based on Cal-Adapt and ABAG mapping?</td>
<td>Subject to one or two of the three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Seismic hazards</td>
<td>The whole BART system is in seismically active locations; the score is in</td>
<td>Existing structure would be difficult to upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>terms of ability to provide a building that meets the standards for essential</td>
<td>New or existing structure would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structures.</td>
<td>meet standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure would meet standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and is in a lower-risk location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 HazMat and threats</td>
<td>Does the location’s place in the system or location above/below ground or</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>near a highway make it more vulnerable to hazardous materials, terrorism,</td>
<td>Unlikely, but possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group violence, or vandalism?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 An earlier version of this report used 2019 as the baseline year for project completion. More recent estimates indicate that 2021 will be the more likely year of completion.
Further, a weighting system was developed to ensure that the ultimate scores adequately reflect the relative importance of each criterion in selecting a location, and that the locations are sufficiently differentiated. The weighting system reflects the following priorities:

1. Highest Priority (Weight 3): The Fundamentals grouping of criteria, the centrality criterion, and the communications network connection criterion are of particular importance because they support the basic ability of the TOF to function successfully and received the highest weighting of 3.

2. Medium Priority (Weight 2): The TOF staff access, headquarters access, transit-oriented development, and HazMat and threats criteria are similarly important to those described above, but not as crucial to system function. For this reason, they received a weighting of 2.

3. Lowest Priority (Weight 1): The remaining criteria: constructability, context and standards, flooding/sea level rise hazards, and seismic hazards received weightings of 1; these criteria are important, but can generally be addressed through careful planning and design.

The weighted scores for each location are summarized in Table 5. Detailed scores can be found in Appendix C.

**Table 5: Weighted Alternatives Evaluation Summary (Weighted score/Total possible score)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lake Merritt Complex</th>
<th>Downtown Oakland</th>
<th>Fruitvale Station</th>
<th>Lake Merritt Proximate</th>
<th>Jack London Square Portal</th>
<th>Dublin/ Pleasanton Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundamentals</strong></td>
<td>33 / 36</td>
<td>12 / 36</td>
<td>30 / 36</td>
<td>27 / 36</td>
<td>27 / 36</td>
<td>33 / 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access &amp; Operations</strong></td>
<td>30 / 30</td>
<td>25 / 30</td>
<td>22 / 30</td>
<td>24 / 30</td>
<td>20 / 30</td>
<td>17 / 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>8 / 12</td>
<td>10 / 12</td>
<td>9 / 12</td>
<td>9 / 12</td>
<td>11 / 12</td>
<td>9 / 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards</strong></td>
<td>9 / 12</td>
<td>8 / 12</td>
<td>8 / 12</td>
<td>9 / 12</td>
<td>7 / 12</td>
<td>8 / 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80 / 90</td>
<td>55 / 90</td>
<td>69 / 90</td>
<td>69 / 90</td>
<td>65 / 90</td>
<td>67 / 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lake Merritt Complex receives the highest score, with 80 weighted points, followed by the Lake Merritt Proximate Location and Fruitvale Station locations with 69 points. The Dublin/Pleasanton Station location received a score of 67, followed closely by the Jack London Square Portal location with 65 weighted points. Finally, the Downtown Oakland location received the lowest weighted score of 55 points. While the Lake Merritt Complex receives the highest score, the Lake Merritt Proximate and Fruitvale locations scored highly enough in the analysis to further review its viability as a potential TOF site.
6.3 ANALYSIS

Based on the demographic assessment of each TOF site location, we have determined the following:

- Dublin/Pleasanton site’s location, outside the core of the BART system, is not ideal for a TOF. A resilient TOF location requires centrality for staff access, headquarters access, and reliable connection to BART’s communication hub. Furthermore, this location, while not resulting in a disparate impact, is very close to the 10% threshold, impacting a higher % of minority populations compared to other site alternatives.

- Lake Merritt Proximate has the same demographics as Lake Merritt Complex which do not result in a disparate impact on minority populations or a disproportionate burden on low-income populations. This site’s location features are very similar to those of the Lake Merritt Complex because of their close proximity (500 feet) to one another, though the site is not directly connected to the Lake Merritt Complex, so received lower marks for communications network access. The site also faces similar challenges to the Lake Merritt Complex in terms of supporting potential TOD and requiring careful design to fit into the neighborhood (the proximate location is partially located in a historic district as defined by the City of Oakland, and is adjacent to single family homes).

Lake Merritt Complex is the highest scoring site in the resiliency and operational functionality assessment analysis in Table 5. Furthermore, from a Title VI perspective, building a TOF does not result in a disparate impact on minority populations or a disproportionate burden on low-income populations because the percentage of each population group (within the ½ radius studied) is within the 10% threshold for disproportionate impacts minority impacts at 3.2% and low-income impacts at 8.7%). Compared to other site alternatives studied, the Lake Merritt Complex presents the least amount of impacts to the local community and protected populations. This location impacts the least percent of minority population (after Dublin/Pleasanton) at only 3.2% difference from the City of Oakland population.

While the Complex may impact a higher proportion of low-income populations, at 8.7%, this number is within our 10% threshold. Furthermore, another element of the Lake Merritt Plaza site is that it includes sufficient area to incorporate redesign of the remaining plaza area to serve as an enhanced transportation hub and to support the vision of the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan, adopted by the City of Oakland in 2014. The Plan envisions the BART blocks as catalytic sites that establish an active neighborhood hub, provide pedestrian-oriented spines along 8th and 9th, and connect neighborhood assets – including BART, Chinatown, Laney College, the Oakland Museum of California, and the Jack London District, among others. The addition of the TOF to the area has the potential to benefit the community in many ways, including:

- Creating an improved transit plaza.
- Facilitating expanded and improved BART operations, which connect the neighborhood to the region.
- Engagement in the plaza design process so that it meets local objectives of activating the area and improving local transportation connections (for transit, pedestrians, and bicycles in particular).
• Incorporation of local and relevant art and amenities into the project.
• The addition of new retail spaces to activate the area and bring more jobs to the neighborhood.

Based on the results of this siting analysis, the Lake Merritt Complex is the preferred alternative for BART's new TOF for the following reasons:

• Least impacts on Title VI populations.
• Colocation with related systems found in other parts of the Lake Merritt Complex, which supports a high functioning system.
• Central location in the BART system.
• Space and availability to construct the TOF.

6.4 CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

Based on the results of the Title VI Siting Analysis and the resiliency and operational functionality assessment, the Lake Merritt Complex is the preferred site location for BART's new Transit Operations Facility.
Section 7: Public Participation Report

7.0 Purpose:

Pursuant to FTA Circular 4702.1B (October 2012), BART conducted public outreach to provide information to the public about the new TOF to solicit feedback on the preferred alternative location and potential impacts the project could present to the local community. A key component of the Title VI outreach is to seek input from minority, low-income, and limited English proficient (LEP) populations. BART used established information outlets to engage the stakeholders who would be directly affected by the building of a new TOF site in the preferred alternative location, Lake Merritt Complex. By doing so, BART ensures consistency with its Public Participation Plan (2011) as well as ensures efficiency in communication with community members. Below is a brief summary of Title VI outreach and engagement conducted for the Transit Operations Facility Title VI Siting Analysis Report. In addition, BART staff met with City, Mayor’s Office, and Council to inform them of the project. Overall, feedback received did not show any disagreement with the preferred TOF site location at the Lake Merritt Complex.

7.1 ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Staff presented information on the TOF, including potential Title VI impacts to each site alternative location, to BART’s Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and BART’s Limited English Proficient (LEP) Advisory Committee. The meeting details are listed below and agendas for the meetings are included in Appendix D:

- Title VI/EJ Advisory Committee: Monday, February 8, 2016 from 2:00 – 4:30PM at the BART Board Room (Kaiser Center 20th Street Mall – Third Floor, 344 20th Street, Oakland, CA)
- LEP Advisory Committee: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 from 10:30AM – 1:00PM at the BART Board Room
- LEP Advisory Committee: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 from 10:30AM – 1:00PM at the BART Board Room
- Title VI/EJ Advisory Committee: Monday, May 8, 2017 from 2:00 – 4:30PM at the BART Board Room

Both BART’s Title VI/EJ Committee (8 CBOs, 10 members) and LEP Committee (12 CBOs, 14 members) members are active participants of local-community based organizations (CBO) that serve minority, low-income, and LEP populations within the BART service area. The meeting was open to the public and the agenda was noticed at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. At the meeting, staff presented a PowerPoint with an overview of the Project, a list of each potential site location and demographic data on minority and low-income populations, potential impacts to protected populations, and information about the building design in the preferred alternative location, Lake Merritt Complex.

Committee members expressed the following questions and comments:
• 2016 Advisory Committee Meetings
  o Ensure that construction, employment, and operational impacts will be studied in the Environmental Review.
  o When public process starts to communities, provide detail about plans for the old location, what will happen to the old location, and a backup plan for the TOF. Provide more detail on emergency preparedness, upgrade technology, and security.
  o Provide information about what will happen to the current parking situation in the area
  o Provide information about noise impacts and impacts to the elderly population in that area
  o Clarification if the outreach meetings will be about the siting analysis or if it will provide information about environmental and construction impacts.

• 2017 Advisory Committee Meetings
  o It is a very good project. Clarification of construction start date
  o Keep the space available for public use for exercise, as is currently
  o Information about the homeless issue in that area will be addressed
  o Information about the relationship between the area residents and ridership. Wanted information if the passengers using the station live in the Chinatown area or coming of somewhere else.
  o Understand the criteria for choosing language translation for outreach. There is a rising African population. Suggest talking to East Bay Refugee Forum
  o Keep the Committee informed of meeting and outreach dates

Staff responded to the Committee members’ questions and followed up with further information via email and at subsequent Committee meetings and also referred them to attend the community Open House. Committee members did not have any concerns about the preferred site location of the new TOF site at the Lake Merritt complex.

7.2 Community Working Group

BART staff directly contacted local stakeholders representing several neighborhood CBOs and nearby institutions for participation in a community Working Group. Participants of the working group include:

- Asian Health Services
- EBALDC
- APEN
- Chinatown Chamber of Commerce
- Tai Chi users
- Laney College
- Oakland Museum of California
- Bike East Bay
- Chinatown Improvement Initiative
- Transform
- Jack London District Association
- City of Oakland Parks and Recreation, Planning and Building, & Office of the City Administrator

Additional invitations were sent to Family Bridges, Oakland Asian Cultural Center, Oakland Heritage Alliance but these organizations have not participated in Working Group meetings to date.
**Working Group 1:** BART staff and consultant provided an overview of the project and discussed plaza design goals and elements. Key feedback from the group included:

- Create / Enhance visual corridors into plaza, and from plaza to surrounding context/features
- Create / Enhance physical access to the plaza
- Connect all 3 blocks / Laney to Chinatown – visual and physical connections
- Catalyze / Activate the public realm
- Create open space for large group activities and community use
- Include gatherings spaces for users of all ages
- Including benches for sitting and playing games
- Develop consistent streetscape design and wayfinding
- Provide shade / Protection from sun and rain
- Implement crosswalks improvements
- Design Building as activating asset in plaza

Materials are available online at [www.bart.gov/lakemerritt](http://www.bart.gov/lakemerritt).

**Working Group 2:** BART presented the following design objectives based on the feedback from Working Group 1: Catalyze & Activate; Connect & Integrate; and Safe & Welcoming.

Three design concepts for the plaza were presented to the group and the Working Group provided feedback on the design elements. The two options preferred by the group were then refined for feedback at the open house.

Materials are available online at [www.bart.gov/lakemerritt](http://www.bart.gov/lakemerritt).

### 7.3 Stakeholder Meetings

An additional stakeholder meeting was held at Lincoln Recreation Center to meet with current Tai Chi and recreational users to hear suggestions and feedback on the approach to design of the plaza.

### 7.4 Community Open House

Community Open House #1 was held on May 10, 2017 at the Metro Center Auditorium at 101 8th St, in Oakland. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the new Transit Operations Facility and Plaza Redesign project to the public, share alternatives (Concepts 1 and 2) for the Lake Merritt Plaza, and secure their feedback on the project via the use of survey handouts. Several Stations were setup with consultant and BART staff available to discuss and answer questions. Large format boards depicting information on the project and the two plaza design concepts were displayed in English and Chinese, and smaller handouts were available with Vietnamese and Spanish translations. Two stations also included video ‘fly-throughs’ of the site. Light refreshments were provided. Materials are available online at [www.bart.gov/lakemerritt](http://www.bart.gov/lakemerritt). A more detailed report on the Open House feedback is included in Appendix D.

**Publicity**

Publicity for the open house was conducted through print and online media, and outreach to community organizations. The following publicity and outreach methods were used for this project:
• A multilingual mailer in English, Chinese and Spanish, (including reference to the availability of translation services for the meeting) was mailed to all residents and businesses within ½ mile radius of the site.
• A multilingual flyer in English, Chinese, Spanish, and Vietnamese, (including reference to the availability of translation services for the meeting) distributed in station, dropped off at local community gathering places (such as Laney College, Lincoln Recreation Center, Asian Library, Oakland Asian Cultural Center), posted on the website, and emailed to stakeholders, local community-based organizations, and institutions.
• An oversized simplified version of the multilingual flyer was displayed at Lake Merritt station.
• BART website announcement.
• BART social media announcements (Twitter and Facebook).
• Additional email notices were sent to stakeholders, local community-based organizations and institutions.

The mailer and flyer are included in Appendix F.

**Interpretation**

Chinese and Vietnamese interpreters were available on-site, though the Vietnamese interpreter was not needed.

**Survey**

A survey was available for open house attendees to fill out and was available online for one week following the event. The survey was available in English, Chinese, Spanish and Vietnamese. 90 people submitted a hand-written survey form. After the May 10 meeting, BART received an additional 48 survey forms online for a total of 138 completed surveys. Individual surveys were submitted in 3 languages from the community as shown in Table 6. The survey is included in Appendix F (versions in English, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Spanish).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Written Surveys</th>
<th>Online Surveys</th>
<th>Total surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Surveys</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full demographic responses are included in Appendix E. This section summarizes some key demographic responses of interest:

• 56% of survey respondents live within walking distance and 38% work within walking distance of the site
Respondents identified themselves as part of the following racial/ethnic groups:

- 64% Asian or Pacific Islander
- 33% white
- 8% Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin
- 3% Black/African American
- 2% American Indian or Alaska Native
- 3% other

- 43% of respondents indicated that they speak a language other than English at home; of those respondents 30% indicated that they speak English “Not well” or “Not at all.”

- 39% of respondents had an annual household income of less than $50,000.

Feedback

Full survey responses are included in Appendix E. This section summarizes key feedback received. For the purposes of this report, the open-ended feedback is most relevant.

**Questions 1-6 (concept comparison):** The results of the first 6 questions clearly indicated that Concept 1 was preferred for overall design, concept idea, and spatial layout. The single exception was the preference for the larger shade canopy shown in concept 2. The responses were fairly split on how a café on Oak and 9th street might be oriented towards, with a slight edge towards the plaza.

**Question 7 (preferred plaza features):** Results from question 7 reflected a diverse range of preferences. However, a few items stand out above the others. In reviewing the results of each individual question first and comparing the bars for “extremely important”, the following selections stand out in order of results:

1. Improved Streetscape (highest rated as “extremely important”)
2. Large Open Plaza
3. Places to sit / gather / meet
4. Green Landscaping

Looking at the weighted average results which accounts for all grades of importance for the specific plaza feature, the same results are produced although in a slightly different order:

1. Improved Streetscape (highest average weight)
2. Places to sit / gather / meet
3. Green Landscaping
4. Large Open Plaza

**Question 8** invites the community to share additional ideas and suggestions for the project. Four recurring comments resulted from this question:

1. Provide adequate community space including active uses/retail, a restroom and space for tai chi, community events, activities, and performance.
2. Need for safety – including recommendations for a police station, improved lighting, clear visual paths, and addressing concerns related to homelessness.
3. Emphasize and recognize cultural significance of the site, including several recommendations to rename Station to Oakland Chinatown Station.
4. Improving connections and circulation, making better connections to Madison Park and Chinatown, and improving the station drop-off areas.

Specific Comments included:

It is important that whatever wayfinding and signage program is implemented at the plaza identify Oakland Chinatown as a nearby destination. The plaza was originally part of that neighborhood, and the iconography and public art in the plaza should reflect that.

No business displacement, restrooms for public. As much as possible have active storefronts along Madison instead of blank wall space. Lighting very important. Bike parking is important.

The plaza should provide accessible space for people to practice tai chi and provide connections to Madison Park and Chinatown. It should not be a barrier or island that is disconnected from the surrounding neighborhood. It should also recognize the cultural presence of Chinatown by include wayfinding signage directing people towards Chinatown and Include Oakland Chinatown as part of the station name.

Let’s make it well lit at night so it feels safe. Safety is key. Also let’s make sure we budget for lots of trash recycle and compost because we don’t want it to get dirty over time. Will there be art that reflects the heritage of the neighborhood?

Please emphasize pedestrian safety, lighting, clear visual paths, BART police presence at night (now totally absent), longer street light times. Please make improvements conducive for all age groups.

Question 9 asks the community to express their concerns with this site, or if there are potential impacts to them as a result of this project. The following recurring comments resulted from this question.

1. Need a restroom.
2. Issues with building creating visual and physical barrier between the plaza and Madison Park/Chinatown core.
3. Connection to Madison Park and surroundings.
4. Final design/look and feel of the TOF building.
5. Some additional concerns expressed by participants include:
   a. Traffic
   b. Safety
   c. Homelessness
   d. Displacement of long-term residents
   e. Station access during construction

Specific comments included:

To have a big building blocking off the park across Madison street seems to be a big shame. A new BART plaza at this location should really be mindful of connecting the neighboring assets. Ideally, it would open up to the park across the street and provide for a pedestrian thoroughfare toward Chinatown.
It blocks the plaza from Madison Park. It is like a large obstruction that visually blocks people coming up out of the station from the public park and from the neighborhood.

I do not want to see an ugly concrete building in the middle of our neighborhood. Please work with Chinatown to create an artistic historical display honoring Chinatown because it has been displaced from this area by BART, Laney, 880.

This may limit the available public space on the plaza.

The plaza should connect and open up to Madison Park. It should visually invite people towards Chinatown, provide space for recreation programming connecting to Madison.

I want to make sure that the plaza is designed in a way that connects with the surrounding Chinatown neighborhood, with Madison Park, and with community usage needs.

Not welcoming to have a big opaque box in middle of plaza ... Make sure ground floor has plenty of retail. Maximize height and mixed use with housing wherever possible.

Traffic on Oak and Madison. Station closures.

The building can create a significant visual/physical barrier to Madison Park and the rest of Chinatown.

More workers there will create more traffic and demand for parking.

**Other Written Comments:** BART also received a comment letter from the Oakland Chinatown Coalition that outlined several principles for design at Lake Merritt. The principles are summarized/abbreviated below; the full comment letter is included in Appendix E.

1. Reduction of the footprint of the facility as much as possible.
2. Provide as much community serving, small business and nonprofit, and recreational space around the edge of the facility as possible.
4. Design and program the Plaza for people of all generations, and maximize the amount of space available.
5. Visual connection and wayfinding towards core Chinatown.
6. Physical pedestrian and street improvements leading towards core Chinatown, with a prioritization of pedestrian orientation towards 9th Street.
7. More visible representation for neighborhood and location specific public art.
8. Community representation in decision making.
9. Rename the BART Station from “Lake Merritt” to “Oakland Chinatown”.

Appendix E includes a more complete summary of feedback received on the project at the community open house, including the comment letter from the Oakland Chinatown Coalition.
7.5 **Additional Outreach Planned**

Building and plaza design will continue over the next several months, and will take public comments into account during that process. Further, the following additional meetings are planned for the project:

- Working Group #3: Feedback on design development
- Open House #2: Feedback on design development
- Additional stakeholder and Working Group meetings as needed

In addition to outreach related to the project design, the project will undergo environmental review as required by CEQA. The required public review periods will be provided as required for that process.
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Appendix C: Site Alternatives Evaluation Results for Resiliency and Operational Functionality; Scored on a scale of 1 (low) to 3 (high); Weighted on a scale of 1 (low) to 3 (high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Weight (1 to 3 scale)</th>
<th>Lake Merritt Complex</th>
<th>Downtown Oakland</th>
<th>Oakland Station</th>
<th>Lake Merritt/Piedmont</th>
<th>Jack London Square Portal</th>
<th>Stable/Pavilion Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Weighted Score</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Weighted Score</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General access</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to completion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters access</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications system access</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit-oriented</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content and standards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building/sewer level</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seismic hazards</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HazMat and threats</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score/Weighted Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Title VI/Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency Advisory Committee Agendas
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A meeting of the Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee will be held on Monday, February 8, 2016, at 2:00 p.m. The meeting will be held in the Board Room, Kaiser Center 20th Street Mall – Third Floor, Conference Room 303, 344 20th Street, Oakland, California.

AGENDA

1. Review of Proposed Parking Fee for Warm Springs/South Fremont Station. For discussion.

2. Overview of BART’s Transit Career Ladders Training (TCLT) Program. For information.


4. General Discussion and Public Comment.

5. Next Committee Meeting Date.

6. Adjournment.

Please refrain from wearing scented products (perfume, cologne, after-shave, etc.) to this meeting, as there may be people in attendance susceptible to environmental illnesses.

BART provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited English proficient who wish to address BART Board matters. A request must be made five days in advance of a Board or committee meeting. Please contact the District Secretary’s Office at (510) 464-6083 for information.
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
300 Lakeside Drive, P. O. Box 12688, Oakland, CA  94604-2688

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA
OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP) ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 23, 2016
10:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

A meeting of the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Advisory Committee will be held on Tuesday, February 23, 2016, at 10:30 a.m. The meeting will be held in the BART Board Room, Kaiser Center 20th Street Mall – Third Floor, Conference Room 303, 344 20th Street, Oakland, California 94612.

AGENDA

1. Overview of BART’s Transit Career Ladders Training (TCLT) Program. For information.


4. Better BART, Better Bay Area. For information

5. General Discussion and Public Comment.

6. Next Committee Meeting Date.

7. Adjournment.

Please refrain from wearing scented products (perfume, cologne, after-shave, etc.) to this meeting, as there may be people in attendance susceptible to environmental illnesses.

BART provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited English proficient who wish to address BART Board or Committee matters. A request must be made five (5) days in advance of a Board or Committee meeting, depending on the service requested. Please contact the District Secretary’s Office at (510) 464-6083 for information.
A meeting of the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Advisory Committee will be held on Tuesday, February 28, 2017, at 10:30 a.m. The meeting will be held in the BART Board Room, Kaiser Center 20th Street Mall – Third Floor, Conference Room 303, 344 20th Street, Oakland, California 94612.

AGENDA


2. Update of Lake Merritt BART Transit Operations Facility & Plaza Redesign. For discussion.

3. Introduction of BART’s Language Translation/Interpretation Services Contractor: International Contact, Inc. For information.

4. General Discussion and Public Comment.

5. Next Committee Meeting Date.

6. Adjournment.

Please refrain from wearing scented products (perfume, cologne, after-shave, etc.) to this meeting, as there may be people in attendance susceptible to environmental illnesses.

BART provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited English proficient who wish to address BART Board or Committee matters. A request must be made five (5) days in advance of a Board or Committee meeting, depending on the service requested. Please contact the District Secretary’s Office at (510) 464-6083 for information.
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT  
300 Lakeside Drive, P. O. Box 12688, Oakland, CA  94604-2688

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA  
OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS TITLE VI/ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 8, 2017  
2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

A meeting of the Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee will be held on Monday, May 8, 2017, at 2:00 p.m. The meeting will be held in the Board Room, Kaiser Center 20th Street Mall – Third Floor, Conference Room 303, 344 20th Street, Oakland, California.

AGENDA


4. General Discussion and Public Comment.

5. Next Committee Meeting Date.

6. Adjournment.

Please refrain from wearing scented products (perfume, cologne, after-shave, etc.) to this meeting, as there may be people in attendance susceptible to environmental illnesses.

BART provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited English proficient who wish to address BART Board matters. A request must be made five days in advance of a Board or committee meeting. Please contact the District Secretary’s Office at (510) 464-6083 for information.
Appendix E: Community Open House Feedback
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BART LAKE MERRITT PLAZA & TRANSIT OPERATIONS FACILITY

COMMUNITY MEETING 1
SUMMARY
Community Open House #1:

The Community Open House #1 was held on May 10, 2017 at the Metro Center Auditorium at 101 8th St, in Oakland. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the new Transit Operations Facility and Plaza Redesign project to the public, share alternatives (Concepts 1 and 2) for the Lake Merritt Plaza, and secure their feedback on the project via the use of survey handouts. Several Stations were setup with consultant and BART staff available to discuss and answer questions. Light refreshments were provided.

The Stations were set up as follows:

1. Sign in Desk
2. Background Information and context
3. Concept 1 plan
4. Concept 1 fly through
5. Concept 2 plan
6. Concept 2 fly through
7. Summary of Concepts
8. Food and water station

The community was encouraged to move around the stations and then fill out their surveys for submittal. Overall we had 98 people fill out the sign in sheet with 90 people submitting a hand written survey form. Subsequent to the May 10 meeting we received an additional 48 survey forms online for a total of 138 completed surveys. Individual surveys were submitted in 3 languages from the community.

Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total surveys submitted</th>
<th>Written surveys</th>
<th>Online surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total combined surveys</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to manage the written responses (Q8 and Q9), rhaa created broad categories of concerns in order to present a snapshot of where the focus seemed to be concentrated on. This begins on page 9. Detailed responses can be found beginning on page 17.
Overall Feedback:

**Questions 1-6 (Concept comparison):** The results of the first 6 questions clearly indicated that Concept 1 was preferred for overall design, concept idea, and spatial layout. The single exception was the preference for the larger shade canopy shown in concept 2. The responses were fairly split on how a café on Oak and 9th street might be oriented towards, with a slight edge towards the plaza.

**Question 7** which covers preferred plaza features showed a diverse range of preferences. However a few items stand out above the others. In reviewing the results of each individual question first and comparing the bars for “extremely important”, the following selections stand out in order of results:

1. Improved Streetscape (highest rated as “extremely important”)
2. Large Open Plaza
3. Places to sit / gather / meet
4. Green Landscaping

Looking at the weighted average results which accounts for all grades of importance for the specific plaza feature, the same results are produced although in a slightly different order:

1. Improved Streetscape (highest average weight)
2. Places to sit / gather / meet
3. Green Landscaping
4. Large Open Plaza

It is worth noting that the Bike Station and the Bike Lockers were selected as the least important of the features on both the individual charts, and the weighted average chart.

**Question 8** invites the community to share additional ideas and suggestions for the project. Four recurring comments resulted from this question:

1. Provide adequate community space including active uses/retail, a restroom and space for tai chi, community events, activities, and performance (Program & Amenities)
2. Need for safety – including recommendations for a police station, improved lighting, clear visual paths, and addressing concerns related to homelessness (Safety)
3. Emphasize and recognize cultural significance of the site, including several recommendations to rename Station to Oakland Chinatown Station(Identity & Way finding)
4. Improving connections and circulation, making better connections to Madison Park and Chinatown, and improving the station drop-off areas.

**Question 9** asks the community to express their concerns with this site, or if there are potential impacts to them as a result of this project. Three recurring comments resulted from this question.

1. Need a restroom
2. Issues with building creating visual and physical barrier between the plaza and Madison Park/Chinatown core (Circulation & Access)
3. Connection to Madison Park and surroundings (Connectivity)
4. Final design/look and feel of the TOF building
5. Some additional concerns expressed by participants include:
   a. Traffic
   b. Safety
   c. Homelessness
   d. Displacement of long-term residents
   e. Station access during construction

Demographic Overview:

The full demographic information is included below. This section summarizes some key demographic responses of interest:

• 56% of survey respondents live within walking distance and 38% work within walking distance of the site.
• Respondents identified themselves as part of the following racial/ethnic groups:
  □ 64% Asian or Pacific Islander
  □ 33% white
  □ 8% Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin
  □ 3% Black/African American
  □ 2% American Indian or Alaska Native
  □ 3% other
• 43% of respondents indicated that they speak a language other than English at home; of those respondents 30% indicated that they speak English “Not well” or “Not at all.”
• 39% of respondents had an annual household income of less than $50,000.
Q1 Compare the two concepts and let us know which you prefer:

Answered: 117 Skipped: 21

Concept 1: Emphasize diagonal pedestrian connection through transit plaza, reflecting BART tracks
Concept 2: Emphasize pedestrian connection along 9th Street

Answer Choices Responses
Concept 1: Emphasize diagonal pedestrian connection through transit plaza, reflecting BART tracks 60.68% 71
Concept 2: Emphasize pedestrian connection along 9th Street 39.32% 46
Total 117

Q2 Compare the two concepts and let us know which you prefer:

Answered: 126 Skipped: 12

Concept 1: Fully cover the sunken courtyard to create a larger plaza, using glass paving to allow natural light into station
Concept 2: Keep the sunken courtyard partially open to add access from plaza to BART Station concourse and allow light below

Answer Choices Responses
Concept 1: Fully cover the sunken courtyard to create a larger plaza, using glass paving to allow natural light into station 64.29% 81
Concept 2: Keep the sunken courtyard partially open to add access from plaza to BART Station concourse and allow light below 35.71% 45
Total 126

Q3 Compare the two concepts and let us know which you prefer:

Answered: 108 Skipped: 30

Concept 1: Kiosk or cafe seating at 9th & Oak oriented toward plaza
Concept 2: Kiosk or cafe seating at 8th & Oak oriented toward street

Answer Choices Responses
Concept 1: Kiosk or cafe seating at 9th & Oak oriented toward plaza 66.67% 72
Concept 2: Kiosk or cafe seating at 8th & Oak oriented toward street 33.33% 36
Total 108
Q4 Compare the two concepts and let us know which you prefer:

Answered: 112  Skipped: 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept 1: Smaller shade...</td>
<td>31.25% 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept 2: Larger shade...</td>
<td>68.75% 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5 Compare the two concepts and let us know which you prefer:

Answered: 126  Skipped: 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept 1: Seating with...</td>
<td>52.38% 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept 2: Seating with...</td>
<td>47.62% 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6 Overall, which plan option do you prefer (check one)?

Answered: 127  Skipped: 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept 1</td>
<td>62.20% 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept 2</td>
<td>32.28% 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>5.51% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 Which of the following plaza features are most important to you? On a scale of 1 - 5 where 1 is “not important” and 5 is “extremely important”, please rate how important each of the following is to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>1 (not important)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (extremely important)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large open plaza areas</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>14.84%</td>
<td>24.22%</td>
<td>45.31%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places to sit / gather / meet</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>36.43%</td>
<td>41.86%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Canopy</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>10.77%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>22.31%</td>
<td>33.08%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces for retail, cafes or kiosks</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
<td>13.28%</td>
<td>21.09%</td>
<td>27.34%</td>
<td>29.69%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved streetscape - wider sidewalks, lighting, trees, wayfinding</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>56.82%</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green landscaping (plantings, trees)</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>16.54%</td>
<td>33.86%</td>
<td>41.73%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Station</td>
<td>14.50%</td>
<td>13.74%</td>
<td>23.66%</td>
<td>27.48%</td>
<td>20.61%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lockers</td>
<td>24.62%</td>
<td>14.62%</td>
<td>22.31%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total votes: 137, Skipped votes: 1.
Q7 - average weighted chart, all features

Q8 Please share any other ideas or suggestions for this project:

Answered: 89 Skipped: 49
Q9 The Lake Merritt plaza is BART’s preferred site alternative for the Transit Operations Facility. What impacts might this project have on you? What concerns, if any, do you have with this site?

Answered: 72 Skipped: 66

Q10 Would you like to receive email updates about this project?

Answered: 102 Skipped: 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11 Do you live or work within walking distance of Lake Merritt BART Station?

Answered: 128  Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I live within walking distance of Lake Merritt BART Station</td>
<td>56.25%  72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I work within walking distance of Lake Merritt BART Station</td>
<td>38.28%  49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.06%  18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 128

Q12 How often do you use the Lake Merritt BART Station?

Answered: 128  Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7 days a week</td>
<td>12.50%  16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 days a week</td>
<td>16.41%  21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 days a week</td>
<td>18.75%  24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>5.41%  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few days a month</td>
<td>22.66%  29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few days a year</td>
<td>21.09%  27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year or less</td>
<td>3.13%  4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 128
Q13 What is your gender?

Answered: 125 Skipped: 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another gender:</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14 How old are you?

Answered: 127 Skipped: 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 or younger</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>16.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>15.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>19.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>29.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?

Answered: 117  Skipped: 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16 What is your race or ethnic identification? Select all that apply.
(Categories based on US Census.)

Answered: 123  Skipped: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>64.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents: 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17 Do you speak a language other than English at home?

Answered: 123  Skipped: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18 If “Yes” to Question 17, how well do you speak English?

Answered: 80  Skipped: 58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not well</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19 What is your total annual household income before taxes?

Answered: 118  Skipped: 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td>25.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>11.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and over</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20 Including yourself, how many people live in your household?

Answered: 125  Skipped: 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21 Do you own a smart phone?

Answered: 125  Skipped: 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Please share any other ideas or suggestions for this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Rename the station to Chinatown BART Station</td>
<td>5/18/2017 7:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Rename the station to OAKLAND CHINATOWN BART STATION</td>
<td>5/18/2017 6:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Rename the station to Chinatown BART Station</td>
<td>5/18/2017 6:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Rename the station to Oakland Chinatown BART Station</td>
<td>5/18/2017 6:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Rename to Chinatown BART Station</td>
<td>5/18/2017 1:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities Restroom There got to be a public bathroom. A open-space round-theatre for small-scale performances and public events will be great.</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lighting Safety More street lamps and a police office</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lighting Safety More street lamps and a police office</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lighting Safety More street lamps and policemen</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Safety Need a police office</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Safety Need a police officer</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:18 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Safety Need a police office</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Safety Need a police officer</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Safety Need a police office</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Safety Need a police officer</td>
<td>5/17/2017 8:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Safety Need a police officer</td>
<td>5/17/2017 7:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Safety Please help keep the space safe and accessible to people, especially students!</td>
<td>5/17/2017 7:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities Restroom Hope there would be a designated area for practicing Tai Chi, and public restroom.</td>
<td>5/17/2017 5:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/17/2017 5:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities Hope there would be a senior center.</td>
<td>5/17/2017 5:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Please consider renaming the BART station to 'Oakland Chinatown', as it rightfully should be.</td>
<td>5/17/2017 4:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Years ago, there was a promise from BART that this station be re-named Oakland Chinatown. I would like to see the promise be fulfilled. The land that BART is currently operating on in those few blocks has historically been Chinatown. BART needs to do the right thing here. I would like to see the Chinese language be displayed more prominently in all signage at the station (and beyond - ideally, all BART signage and announcements should be available in at least Spanish and Chinese).</td>
<td>5/17/2017 2:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding It is important that whatever wayfinding and signage program is implemented at the plaza identify Oakland Chinatown as a nearby destination. the plaza was originally part of that neighborhood, and the iconography and public art in the plaza should reflect that. Additionally, it's important that the station be renamed &quot;Oakland Chinatown&quot;, just as rockridge bart station is named for that neighborhood, this station should be named for the neighborhood in which it exists as well.</td>
<td>5/16/2017 3:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Rename station to acknowledge Oakland Chinatown's 140 year history.</td>
<td>5/16/2017 9:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Circulation &amp; Access Connectivity Chinatown is the main retail/business hub for this area. The plaza should have better harmony and connection with Madison Park and the Chinatown corridor. The operations center blocks the flow from the neighborhood and park to the plaza. A feng shui consultation may be helpful.</td>
<td>5/16/2017 3:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Program &amp; Amenities Rename station to &quot;Oakland Chinatown&quot; to honor historical neighborhood and its cultural significance. Allow room for community events and community use of the plaza, including storage for items needed to make this happen.</td>
<td>5/16/2017 2:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Renaming the Station to &quot;Oakland Chinatown&quot;</td>
<td>5/16/2017 2:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Circulation &amp; Access Program &amp; Amenities More bus stops/transbay access, strong lighting, ample trashcans, places to sit and eat (especially if retail like cafes are there), patches of grass for prunics.</td>
<td>5/16/2017 12:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Keep the current name of the Station as Lake Merritt.</td>
<td>5/16/2017 12:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Program &amp; Amenities Rename the station to &quot;Oakland Chinatown&quot; Community storage and space</td>
<td>5/15/2017 2:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Chinese or Asian Station</td>
<td>5/15/2017 11:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Rename&quot; Oakland Chinatown&quot;</td>
<td>5/15/2017 11:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Identity &amp; Wayfinding Program &amp; Amenities community space and storage, public art and placemaking that opens the plaza up to Chinatown. The station should be renamed to &quot;Oakland Chinatown&quot; station given the history of displacement of Chinatown families and institutions through eminent domain</td>
<td>5/15/2017 9:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Circulation &amp; Access Connectivity Identity &amp; Wayfinding Program &amp; Amenities The plaza should provide accessible space for people to practice tai chi and provide connections to Madison Park and Chinatown. It should not be a barrier or island that is disconnected from the surrounding neighborhood. It should also recognize the cultural presence of Chinatown by include wayfinding signage directing people towards Chinatown and Include Oakland Chinatown as part of the station name.</td>
<td>5/15/2017 9:13 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let's make it walkable at night so it feels safe. Safety is key. Also let's make sure we budget for lots of trash recycle and compost because we don't want it to get dirty over time. Will there be art that reflects the heritage of the neighborhood?

Maintain daylight to station (skylights along path of tracks?) Mix of uses/retail to catalyze a 'place' at the station.

Prevent skateboards, round sharp corners (decrease injury, increase flow)

Traffic light and crosswalk at 8th and Fallon St. 2) Good lighting 3) Police presence 4) Make it such that homeless people cannot camp out 5) Relocate the addict recovery facility at 7th & Oak St. 6) Lock up after 10 pm

I love the game tables. Hosting events or beginning them there would be great - raffles, bike party, movies. I think grassy patches are nice but wonder about dogs.

Make sure the Madison St edge is open/welcoming to china town foot traffic.

Bring true world class design. Think Big and Global. Don't think it's just an operational headquarters. Make it Classy. Lighted pavement is fun. Concept 2 divides open space that doesn't make sense. Add additional escalator/exit

I prefer chairs toward middle instead of street with lots of shops & cafes.

Also let's make sure we budget for lots of trash recycle and compost because we don't want it to get dirty over time.

There needs to be an ewph (?) 5/11/2017 9:51 AM

Look at the museum quarter in Vienna, Austria and borrow from that. It's perfect. 5/12/2017 1:03 AM

Include self-cleaning features, personnel safety, and limit abuse, built-in safety (sight lines), additional escalator/exit 5/11/2017 9:38 AM

Check the feng shui 5/12/2017 1:08 AM

As this project is in chinatown, more emphasis to include some Chinese design aspects 5/12/2017 1:10 AM

Please add more cafes - students at Laney have no outlet to go get food other than cafeteria. 5/12/2017 1:16 AM

Keep the current name of the Station as Lake Merritt. 5/16/2017 12:48 AM

Mixed use above and street level 5/12/2017 5:26 AM

More greenscape? Urban lawns can be successful like at Jack London, Potrero 1010, Yerba Buena, etc. Also more bike lockers! Thanksl

Please emphasize pedestrian safety, lighting, clear visual paths, BART police presence at night (not totally absent), longer street light times. Please make improvements conducive for all age groups.

Must keep homeless away

More greenscape? Urban lawns can be successful like at Jack London, Potrero 1010, Yerba Buena, etc. Also more bike lockers! Thanksl

Mixed use above and street level

Cultivate community partnerships with Laney College, OMCA, Chinese preschools and program the site for activation. Creating official drop-off zones to avoid conflicts with cars and bikes; make BART track on paving more explicit (make it fun! striping so kids can play on path).

Pickup/shutoff area for cars

Please don't spend too much on this project. I would prioritize repairs to keep trains running properly over an extravagant BART plaza. I support cafes to generate revenue for BART.

More kids' playing facilities

Public restrooms are better than having the community space becoming a toilet.

Community garden in community space. Partnership with Oakland Museum.

mixed use - condos, stores

(Additional feedback on Concept 1 - flows better.) (Additional feedback on Question 4 - solar panel generating) Public art and artists should have already been chosen, not a later add-on.

Like the diagonal path, but it seems like a path to nowhere if it doesn't connect to a crosswalk across the street.

In Concept 1, add lights above tracks that illuminate when there is a train. AC Transit coordination. Consolidate bus stops. Game tables for chess players who currently use space. Road diet 2 way streets. Huge bike/auto conflict area at Oak and 9th- cars in bike lane. Add bus stops to other side of Oak Street and make 2 way.

Narrow roads around site, parklets near retail, bike parking with racks, signage that easy to read.

Make sure the plaza is structured appropriately and safe for seniors.

Nice lawns. Make sure the Madison St edge is open/welcoming to chinatown foot traffic.

Please add more cafes - students at Laney have no outlet to go get food other than cafeteria.

Make sure the Madison St edge is open/welcoming to chinatown foot traffic.

Include self-cleaning features, personnel safety, and limit abuse, built-in safety (sight lines), easy to clean and maintain, built-in security cameras, wifi

Identity & Wayfinding  as this project is in chinatown, more emphasis to include some Chinese design aspects

Check the feng shui

Create destinations within the plaza and enhance pedestrian experience (Yerba buena connection to market)

Look at the museum quarter in Vienna, Austria and borrow from that. It's perfect.

Oakland is no longer the city behind SF. It is the city globally attracting attention. Bring true world class design. Think Big an Global. Don't think it's just an operational headquarters. Make it Classy. Lighted pavement is fun. Concept 2 divides open space that doesn't make sense. Add water feature that 'wows' people. Seating should be economical (space wise) yet beautiful. Both concepts are too rectilinear. Having a beautiful water feature draws people, soothes the nerves, and attracts people to it. Why not make it the most prominent feature w/ sculptures/ art elements.

There were no options for prioritizing community space and engagement on the other side
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Maintenance Restroom: Public restrooms are better than having the community space become a toilet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Maintenance Restroom: There needs to be an exit (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Circulation &amp; Access: Having it well lit at night is important, have enough space for community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Program &amp; Amenities: Will access, water fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Circulation &amp; Access: Notice emergency exit, parking for BART maintenance, no parking drop off site, Uber pick up site, solar panels on head houses and TOF, public restrooms especially late at night. Better wayfinding on street and inside station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Program &amp; Amenities: Circulation &amp; Access: Trying to restore the drop off zone, right now you are liable to be ticketed for stopping there even though it was the original intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Circulation &amp; Access: Additional escalator/exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Circulation &amp; Access: Add more escalator at the 8th st and oak entrance. The escalators should go both up and down at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Solar, more lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Design: Other ideas from landscapers, other cities/states with unique contemporary functional designs, opportunities to hire/retain local area residents for the TOF (including seniors/veterans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Safety: Not too many trees; prefer more open space; easy access for day and night security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>5/11/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Restroom: 1) Rainproof canopy to allow for Tai Chi etc. on rainy days. 2) Public restrooms. These were previously available on the first floor of the MetroCenter but the public is now denied access. There is no other place within 3 blocks. BART restrooms downstairs have been closed since 9/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Circulation &amp; Access: Safety: 1) As few places as possible where homeless and transient populations can gather, toilet, or use the open/green spaces as toilets and lounging/living spaces. 2) It would be lovely if the city/BART could provide one of its free, electric shuttle buses to make trips from the Lake Merritt BART Station to popular stops along Oak Street and/or up 8th/9th Streets to nearby downtown/neighborhood locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Misc: Leave the glass enclosure open. No glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Misc: I don't do tai chi, but leave space for the neighbors that do! Only sign of life around the plaza for many years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Misc: Add as much retail as possible. Another shop near 9th/Madison would be good. Try to find businesses that will be open late and on weekends. A lack of open shops in this area makes the station area feel even more deserted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Restroom: Public bathrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Program &amp; Amenities: Misc: Most of BART's plazas are pretty terrible. Anything to minimize open space would be preferable. Building a building in place of the plaza with a ground level entrance into the station would be the best option if it was feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Misc: Thanks for your work on this! Much appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Maintenance: Keep it simple. Keep it easy to clean. Plan on cleaning with high pressure water hose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>Connectivity: Program &amp; Amenities: How does this relate to the parking lot on the other side of Oak? That has to be the worst use of space for that location. How does this relate to the park on the other side of Madison, the park could use investment, and get input of community groups that use it for morning meditation/exercise, school PE throughout the day, and homeless support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 The Lake Merritt plaza is BART’s preferred site alternative for the Transit Operations Facility. What impacts might this project have on you? What concerns, if any, do you have with this site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t displace long time residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open up to Madison Park.. need to connect the Chinatown community. must have open space for recreation, for gathering, a space encompassing the Chinatown area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the other site alternatives for the TOF? To have a big building blocking off the park across Madison street seems to be a big shame. Might the TOF be placed underground? A new BART plaza at this location should really be mindful of connecting the neighboring assets. Ideally, it would open up to the park across the street and provide for a pedestrian thoroughfare toward Chinatown. A large open plaza area for recreation and programming would be a great addition to the area - something like Union Square in San Francisco. In terms of the proposed cafe, I would like to see preference given to a local, small, and independent owner. Is there a way to make the decision as a community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open up to Madison Park it blocks the plaza from Madison park. It is like a large obstruction that visually blocks people coming up out of the station from the public park and from the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want to see an ugly concrete building in the middle of our neighborhood. Please work with Chinatown to create an artistic historical display honoring Chinatown because it has been displaced from this area by BART, Laney, 880.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It appears that the plan is progressing without complementary plans for the surrounding areas: parking lot, Madison Park, Metro Center. These should integrate well together and provide space for recreation, campus activism and community programming along the Chinatown-Laney corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This may limit the available public space on the plaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should invite people to Chinatown and connect to Madison Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more bus stops here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plaza should connect and open up to Madison Park. It should visually invite people towards Chinatown, provide space for recreation programming connecting to Madison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan should facilitate visitors to visit nearby area, including Madison Park &amp; beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the plan should connect and open up to Madison park and also visually invite people towards Chinatown, provide space for recreation programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to make sure that the plaza is designed in a way that connects with the surrounding Chinatown neighborhood, with Madison Park, and with community usage needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height and bulk relative to public space and other uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it iconic &amp; beautiful so people like to take photos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and open up to Madison Park and also visually invite people towards Chinatown, provide space for recreation beyond ground floor uses as possible and minimize blank walls. And please get started on redeveloping the parking lot and old to allow vision through park to plaza.

Patronage, etc. Biggest concern is solicitors, homeless, garbage-litter, graffiti, assaults, robberies, gangs, vandalism of the day, I think this is attractive. The more the space can be seen as a legitimate transit space, space for too many ugly buildings, hodge podge, pedestrian safety.

I'd like to see the park adjacent activated in a responsible way. How can this investment translate to hang out/gather and be inspirational with artistic design at building and landscaping.

Program & Amenities

I'm concerned that it won't get used enough and therefore, won't be maintained as well. That's why I think programming and activity most days will encourage foot traffic and visibility in plaza. People are worried about homeless encampments, but I think allowing for a variety and diversity of users and uses will prevent one group from taking over the public space.

Program & Amenities

I am concerned the site will not have people in it. Keeping the community/kiosk spaces within the community, no chain retail! Not to overshadow community use

Safety

I hope this development can assist in rehabilitating the park.

Program & Amenities

I'm concerned that it won't get used enough and therefore, won't be maintained as well. That's why I think programming and activity most days will encourage foot traffic and visibility in plaza. People are worried about homeless encampments, but I think allowing for a variety and diversity of users and uses will prevent one group from taking over the public space.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td><strong>Connectivity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/10/2017 6:26 AM
Dear Ms. Lindelof,

The Oakland Chinatown Coalition (OCC) is made up of 21 signatory organizations and individuals. We support new development that brings tangible community benefits to the current residents, small businesses, service agencies, and cultural/social institutions that make Oakland Chinatown a vibrant, economically diverse neighborhood, and which will help to preserve its cultural and economic legacy within the City of Oakland. Our Coalition’s involvement with Lake Merritt BART Station specifically as a place and redevelopment opportunity formally date back to 2008 when BART, the City of Oakland, and MTC began to consider work on the Station Area Plan that encompassed a one half mile radius around the station, an area which is generally most recognized for its connection to the historic Chinatown neighborhood. In fact, individuals within the Oakland Chinatown Coalition still have first-hand memories and experiences of the blocks that were taken under threat of eminent domain from local Chinatown property owners, community churches, the orphanage, etc. in order to create the current BART Station. The images of the land, the scars of the pits and tunnels, still resonate with us nearly 50 years later (see attached photo). If this land was taken from private individuals for public purpose, then we believe that the obligations of any future programming on this site continue to fulfill a public purpose for the neighborhood around the Station. The design and execution of the new BART Station Plaza in Chinatown is an opportunity to create public benefits to help to heal those scars.

The OCC has consensus on key overarching design and programmatic principles for the Plaza, and this letter outlines those consensus items which have been discussed over time and in more detail at a full meeting of the Coalition in May 2017. Individual people and organizations within the OCC will have a diverse range of opinions on specific design elements of the Plaza, and those interested individual members will continue to provide feedback on specifics throughout this process, which may be outside the scope of this letter. Here are the items which OCC has strong consensus on, and we urge BART to incorporate these principles into any design and future RFPs that it may issue in connection with this project.

1. Reduction of the footprint of the BART Operations Control Center (BOCC) as much as possible. While we are pleased that the design of the building has evolved from a monolithic 3 story bunker, the mass of that building still “blocks” the connection of the of the Plaza to Madison Park and the rest of Chinatown. We would like to see the profile of the building slimmed as much as possible, with the priority for opening up the Plaza to Madison Street at the 9th Street corner.

2. Provide as much community serving, small business and nonprofit, and recreational space around the edge of the BOCC as possible. We especially want to prioritize this kind of space
towards Madison Street.

3. Connection to Madison Park. As we have stated in nearly all of our public comments, it is important to link the Plaza to a redesigned and updated Madison Park both in the Plaza’s design and programming. We suggest exploring a partnership with the City to program a small rec center facility here with staffing and programming for Madison Park and the Plaza (including well maintained public restrooms!). This would help relieve some of the usage pressure on Lincoln Park.

4. Design and program the Plaza for people of all generations, and maximize the amount of space available. Seniors and adults who practice Tai Chi and dance should be prioritized, but the space should be attractive to young children as well. Playful and whimsical features attract people of all kinds and all ages, and make the space more interesting to visitors, which in turn deters people from setting up longer term shelter in the Plaza and the surrounding blocks. We suggest removing the bike lockers, and moving the majority of the bike storage down below the street level. We also ask that the Plaza include ample trash receptacles (which are an opportunity for public art) to reduce litter.

5. Visual connection and wayfinding towards core Chinatown. The Plaza should have easily identifiable signage and other wayfinding mechanisms and art that lead people coming out of the BART station towards the commercial core of Chinatown (the blocks surrounding 9th and Webster). Any landscaping (trees, hedges, etc) should be easily maintainable and not be so dense that it blocks visibility or passage through the Plaza towards Chinatown.

6. Physical pedestrian and street improvements leading towards core Chinatown, with a prioritization of pedestrian orientation towards 9th Street. These physical improvements could include pedestrian scale lighting, greenery, modifying 9th street to be less auto-oriented, more street art, bulb-outs, more scramble crosswalks consistent with those in core Chinatown, etc. These improvements to neighborhood walkability would help to improve public safety, both in terms of reducing crime, and reducing auto/pedestrian conflict.

7. More visible representation for neighborhood and location specific public art. There are many opportunities for placemaking and art in the Plaza, and on the streets leading towards core Chinatown.

8. Community representation in decision making. Any decision making body relating to the Plaza should include members of the Chinatown Community.

9. Rename the BART Station from “Lake Merritt” to “Oakland Chinatown”. As mentioned in the paragraphs above, the blocks that were taken and excavated were historically part of the Chinatown neighborhood. Today, the vast majority of the residents of the surrounding blocks are Chinese and Asian. When the Oakland Chinatown Coalition was involved in the Lake Merritt BART Station Area Plan process, we were told that we would have an opportunity to change the name when the Warm Springs Station was opened because all of the maps would have to be changed anyway. That never happened, much to our collective
disappointment.

These are the comments we have at this time, based on the information available to the public in the planning meetings for the Plaza thus far. The Oakland Chinatown Coalition is pleased at the early and proactive outreach that BART staff have engaged in thus far, and we hope to be able to support a great project that connects the Bay Area region to this place, and celebrates the cultural history and future of our neighborhood.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact members of the Oakland Chinatown Steering Committee: Julia Liou (AHS), Mike Lok (AHS), Vivian Huang (APEN), Alvina Wong (APEN), Ener Chiu (EBALDC). We also welcome you to our monthly meetings which are held on the third Mondays of the month, from 4pm to 6pm.

The Oakland Chinatown Coalition is:
Asian Advisory Commission on Crime; Asian Health Services; Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach; Asian Pacific Environmental Network; AYPAL; Buddhist Church of Oakland; Chinese American Citizens Alliance – Oakland Lodge; Chinese Community United Methodist Church; East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation; Family Bridges, Inc.; Filipino Advocates for Justice; Friends of Lincoln Square Park; Lincoln Elementary School; Oakland Asian Cultural Center; Oakland Chinatown Lions Foundation; Wa Sung Community Service Club; Alan Yee; Gilbert Gong; Heidi Kong; Karolyn Wong; Lailan Huen

Sincerely,

Ener Chiu
Associate Director – Real Estate Development
East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
1825 San Pablo Ave., Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94612
DIRECT (510) 287-5353 x338 EMAIL echiu@ebaldc.org WEB www.ebaldc.org

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.
For more information please visit http://www.mimecast.com
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Appendix F: Outreach Materials and Survey
Help Plan the Plaza!

Please join BART for a community open house and give us your input on the future BART Transit Operations Facility and Lake Merritt Plaza redesign.

BART is working together with the community to achieve a shared vision for the site that better serves the neighborhood and create a safe and welcoming place for all ages.

Light refreshments will be served and translation and interpretation will be provided. For more information and to fill out a survey, go to www.bart.gov/lakemerritt.

Wednesday
May 10, 2017
4 pm to 7 pm
MetroCenter
101 8th St., Oakland
(Exit Lake Merritt BART Station)

星期三
2017 年 5 月 10 日
下午 4:00 至晚上 7:00
MetroCenter
101 8th St., Oakland
(出口：美麗湖捷運站)

Únase a BART para una sesión abierta a la comunidad y denos su opinión sobre el rediseño futuro de BART Transit Operations Facility y Lake Merritt Plaza.

BART está trabajando en conjunto con la comunidad para lograr una visión compartida del sitio que brinde un mejor servicio al vecindario y crear un lugar seguro y acogedor para todas las edades.

Se servirán refrigerios ligeros y se proporcionará traducción e interpretación. Para obtener más información y contestar una encuesta, visite www.bart.gov/lakemerritt.

Miércoles
10 de mayo de 2017
4 pm a 7 pm
MetroCenter
101 8th St., Oakland
(Salida de Lake Merritt BART Station)

星期三
2017 年 5 月 10 日
下午 4:00 至晚上 7:00
MetroCenter
101 8th St., Oakland
(出口：美麗湖捷運站)

Únase a BART para una sesión abierta a la comunidad y denos su opinión sobre el rediseño futuro de BART Transit Operations Facility y Lake Merritt Plaza.

BART está trabajando en conjunto con la comunidad para lograr una visión compartida del sitio que brinde un mejor servicio al vecindario y crear un lugar seguro y acogedor para todas las edades.

Se servirán refrigerios ligeros y se proporcionará traducción e interpretación. Para obtener más información y contestar una encuesta, visite www.bart.gov/lakemerritt.

如果需要语言援助服务，请拨打（510）464-6752至少在活动日期之前72小时。• Si necesita servicios para comunicarse en otro idioma, por favor llame al (510) 464-6752 al menos 72 horas antes de la fecha del evento。• Nếu quý vị cần dịch vụ trợ giúp về ngôn ngữ, xin vui lòng gọi số (510) 464-6752 ít nhất là 72 tiếng đồng hồ trước ngày của dịp tổ chức。• Kung kailangan mo ang tulong ng mga serbisyo ng wika, paki tawagan ang (510) 464-6752 hindi lilimit sa 72 na mga oras bukod sa petna ng pagbayad。• 언어 지원 서비스가 필요하시면, 행사 날짜로부터 72시간 전에 (510) 464-6752로 연락해 주십시오。
Help Plan the Plaza!
協助規劃廣場！• ¡Ayude a planificar la Plaza!

Lake Merritt Plaza Open House • Wednesday, May 10, 2017
美麗湖廣場 (Lake Merritt Plaza) 參觀日 • 2017 年 5 月 10 日星期三 • Lake Merritt Plaza Open House • Miércoles, 10 de mayo de 2017
You’re invited to an Open House to help plan the Lake Merritt Plaza.

Please join BART for a community open house and give us your input on the future BART Transit Operations Facility and Lake Merritt Plaza redesign.

BART is working together with the community to achieve a shared vision for the site that better serves the neighborhood and create a safe and welcoming place for all ages.

Light refreshments will be served and translation and interpretation will be provided. For more information and to fill out a survey, go to www.bart.gov/lakemerritt.

WHEN
Wednesday
May 10, 2017 • 4 pm to 7 pm

WHERE
MetroCenter
101 8th St., Oakland
(Exit Lake Merritt BART Station)

If you need language assistance services, please call (510) 464-6752 at least 72 hours prior to the date of the event.
LET US KNOW WHAT YOU THINK!

BART is starting work on a new Transit Operations Facility and redesign of the Lake Merritt Plaza to support improved & expanded BART operations and create an enhanced multimodal transportation hub and transit plaza. We’d like your feedback on the following questions to ensure the plaza better serves the neighborhood.

**CONCEPT 1**

**CONCEPT 2**

Compare the two concepts and let us know which you prefer (check one in each row):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emphasize diagonal pedestrian connection through transit plaza, reflecting BART tracks</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fully cover the sunken courtyard to create a larger plaza, using glass paving to allow natural light into station</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kiosk or cafe seating at 9th &amp; Oak oriented toward plaza</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Smaller shade structure</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seating with larger, low planting areas frame smaller gathering spaces within plaza</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall, which plan option do you prefer (check one)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Concept 1</td>
<td>○ Concept 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Which of the following plaza features are most important to you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale of 1 - 5 where 1 is “not important” and 5 is “extremely important”, please rate how important each of the following is to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large open plaza areas</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places to sit / gather / meet</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Canopy</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces for retail, cafes or kiosks</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved streetscape - wider sidewalks, lighting, trees, wayfinding</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green landscaping (plantings, trees)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Station</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lockers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Please share any other ideas or suggestions for this project:

________________________________________________________________________

9. The Lake Merritt plaza is BART’s preferred site alternative for the Transit Operations Facility. What impacts might this project have on you? What concerns, if any, do you have with this site?:

________________________________________________________________________

10. Would you like to receive email updates about this project?

☐ Yes - Email: __________________________  ☐ No

PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF
(your answers will help us evaluate how well we are reaching all the communities we serve).

11. Do you live or work within walking distance of Lake Merritt BART Station?

☐ Yes, I live within walking distance of Lake Merritt BART Station  ☐ No

☐ Yes, I work within walking distance of Lake Merritt BART Station

12. How often do you use the Lake Merritt BART Station?

☐ 6 to 7 days a week  ☐ 2 to 3 days a week  ☐ A few days a month  ☐ Once a year or less

☐ 4 to 5 days a week  ☐ Once a week  ☐ A few days a year

13. What is your gender?

☐ Male  ☐ Female  ☐ Another gender: __________________________

14. How old are you?

☐ 17 or younger  ☐ 25 - 34  ☐ 45 - 54  ☐ 65 and older

☐ 18 - 24  ☐ 35 - 44  ☐ 55 - 64

15. Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?

☐ No  ☐ Yes

16. What is your race or ethnic identification? Select all that apply. (Categories based on US Census.)

☐ White  ☐ Black/African American  ☐ Other (specify): __________________________

☐ Asian or Pacific Islander  ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native

17. Do you speak a language other than English at home?

☐ No  ☐ Yes - Language: __________________________

18. If “Yes” to Question 17, how well do you speak English?

☐ Very Well  ☐ Well  ☐ Not well  ☐ Not at all

19. What is your total annual household income before taxes?

☐ Under $25,000  ☐ $35,000 - $39,999  ☐ $50,000 - $59,999  ☐ $75,000 - $99,999

☐ $25,000 - $34,999  ☐ $40,000 - $49,999  ☐ $60,000 - $74,999  ☐ $100,000 and over

20. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?

☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5  ☐ 6 or more

21. Do you own a smart phone?

☐ No  ☐ Yes
Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) está trabajando en un nuevo edificio para operaciones de transporte y en el rediseño de Lake Merritt Plaza para respaldar la mejora y expansión de las operaciones de BART, además de crear una terminal y centro de transporte multimodal mejorado. Nos gustaría recibir sus comentarios con las preguntas siguientes para asegurarnos de que la plaza sea más funcional para el vecindario.

1. En general, ¿qué opción prefiere (tilde una)?
   - Concepto 1
   - Concepto 2
   - No tiene preferencia alguna

2. ¿Cuáles de las siguientes características de la plaza son más importante para usted?
   En una escala del 1 al 5, en donde 1 es “nada importante” y 5 es “muy importante”, por favor califique qué tan importante es para usted cada uno de los siguientes asuntos:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asunto</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amplias áreas abiertas de plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugares para sentarse/reunirse/encontrarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toldo para generar sombra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espacios para comercios minoristas, cafés o kioscos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paisaje urbano mejorado: aceras más amplias, iluminación, árboles, señalización</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jardinería ornamental (plantas, árboles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estación para bicicletas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casilleros para bicicletas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Compare los dos conceptos y díganos cuál prefiere (tilde una opción en cada fila):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepto 1</th>
<th>Concepto 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hacer énfasis en la conexión peatonal diagonal a través de la plaza, lo que refleja las vías de BART</td>
<td>o Destacar la conexión peatonal a lo largo de 9th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cubrir por completo el patio en desnivel para crear una plaza más grande, con pavimento de vidrio que permita la entrada de luz natural a la estación</td>
<td>o Mantener el patio en desnivel parcialmente abierto para agregar el acceso desde la plaza a la explanada de la estación de BART y permitir la entrada de luz en el nivel inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kiosco o área para sentarse en el café en 9th y Oak con orientación a la plaza</td>
<td>o Kiosco o área para sentarse en el café en 9th y Oak con orientación a la calle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Estructura para generar sombra más pequeña</td>
<td>o Estructura para generar sombra más grande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Asientos con canteros bajos más grandes que enmarcan espacios de reunión más pequeños dentro de la plaza</td>
<td>o Lugares para sentarse con canteros más pequeños e integrados ubicados en una plaza más abierta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ¿Cuáles son los elementos que más se destacan en el diseño de la plaza?
8. Comparta cualquier otra idea o sugerencia para este proyecto:

9. Lake Merritt Plaza es el sitio preferido de BART como alternativa para el edificio de operaciones de transporte. ¿Cómo podría este proyecto afectarle a usted? ¿Qué inquietudes tiene sobre este sitio, si las tuviera?:

10. ¿Le gustaría recibir información reciente por correo electrónico en relación a este proyecto?
    ○ Si la respuesta es sí, escriba su dirección de correo electrónico:  ____________________________  ○ No

**PROPORCIÓNENOS INFORMACIÓN ACERCA DE USTED**
(sus respuestas nos ayudarán a evaluar qué tan bien nos estamos comunicando con todas las comunidades a las que atendemos).

11. ¿Vive o trabaja a una corta distancia de la estación de BART en Lake Merritt?
    ○ Sí, vivo a una corta distancia de la estación de BART de Lake Merritt.  ○ No
    ○ Sí, trabajo a una corta distancia de la estación de BART de Lake Merritt.

12. ¿Con qué frecuencia usa la estación de BART de Lake Merritt?
    ○ 6 a 7 días por semana  ○ 2 a 3 días por semana  ○ Unos cuantos días al mes  ○ Una vez al año o menos
    ○ 4 a 5 días por semana  ○ Una vez a la semana  ○ Unos cuantos días al año

13. ¿Cuál es su sexo?
    ○ Masculino  ○ Femenino  ○ Otro sexo:  ____________________________

14. ¿Qué edad tiene?
    ○ 17 años o menos  ○ 25 a 34 años  ○ 45 a 54 años  ○ 65 años o más
    ○ 18 a 24 años  ○ 35 a 44 años  ○ 55 a 64 años

15. ¿Es usted de ascendencia hispana, latina o española?
    ○ No  ○ Sí

16. ¿Cuál es tu raza o identificación étnica? Marque todas las opciones que correspondan. (Categorías, según la Oficina del Censo de los EE.UU.)
    ○ Blanco  ○ Negro/afroamericano  ○ Otra (por favor, especifique)  ____________________________
    ○ Asiático o de las Islas del Pacífico  ○ Indígena norteamericano o nativo de Alaska

17. ¿Habla usted un idioma que no sea el inglés en el hogar?
    ○ No  ○ Si la respuesta es sí, indique qué idioma:  ____________________________

18. Si respondió “Sí” a la Pregunta 17, ¿qué tan bien habla inglés?
    ○ Muy bien  ○ Bien  ○ No muy bien  ○ Nada

19. ¿Cuáles son los ingresos totales anuales de su hogar antes de impuestos?
    ○ Menos de $25,000  ○ $35,000 a $39,999  ○ $50,000 a $59,999  ○ $75,000 a $99,999
    ○ $25,000 a $34,999  ○ $40,000 a $49,999  ○ $60,000 a $74,999  ○ $100,000 y más

20. Incluyéndose a sí mismo, ¿cuántas personas viven en su hogar?
    ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5  ○ 6 o más

21. ¿Tiene un teléfono inteligente?
    ○ No  ○ Sí
HÃY CHO CHỨNG TÔI BIẾT CÂM NGHĨ CỦA QUY VỊ!

BART đang bắt đầu thực hiện Cosa Sò Điều Hành Văn Chuyến mới và thiết kế lại Lake Merritt Plaza để hỗ trợ cho các hoạt động BART mở rộng và tăng cường và tạo ra một trung tâm giao thông đa phương thức năng cao và plaza văn chuyền. Chúng tôi mong muốn nhận được phản hồi của quý vị cho các cầu hỏi sau để báo đảm plaza phục vụ khu vực lân cận tốt hơn.

KHÁI NIỆM 1

Quý vị so sánh hai khái niệm và cho chứng tỏ biết quý vị thích khái niệm nào hơn (chọn một trong mỗi hàng):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khái niệm 1</th>
<th>Khái niệm 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nhận mạnh kết nối chuyển cho người di bộ qua plaza và chuyển sử dụng các tuyến BART</td>
<td>Nhận mạnh kết nối chuyển cho người di bộ theo 9th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bao gồm hoàn toàn khoảng sân bị lún để xây một plaza lớn hơn, sử dụng kiến lập ngoài để lấy ánh sáng tự nhiên vào bên trong tram</td>
<td>Giải cho một phần khoảng sân bị lún được mở để thêm lơi vào từ plaza đến phiên vị Tram BART và lấy ánh sáng bên dưới</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quầy hàng hoặc chỗ ngồi ương cả phù hợp 9th &amp; Oak hướng về phía plaza</td>
<td>Quầy hàng hoặc chỗ ngồi ương cả phù hợp theo hướng đường 9th &amp; Oak về phía đường</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cầu trục mái che nhờ hơn</td>
<td>Cầu trục mái che lớn hơn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chỗ ngồi với các khu vực cay thấp lớn hơn tạo ra các không gian tu hợp nhờ hơn bên trong plaza</td>
<td>Chỗ ngồi với các bồn cây được tích hợp nhỏ hơn đạt khó phải trong một plaza không gian mở rộng hơn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Tóm lại, quý vị thích lựa chọn nào hơn (chọn một)?
- Khái niệm 1
- Khái niệm 2
- Không có ý kiến

7. Các tính năng plaza nào sau đây là quan trọng nhất với quý vị?
Trên thang đo từ 1 - 5 với 1 là “không quan trọng” và 5 là “cực kỳ quan trọng”, vui lòng xếp loại mỗi mục để quan trọng ra sao đối với quý vị:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(không quan trọng)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (cực kỳ quan trọng)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Các khu vực plaza không gian mở rộng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nội ngồi / hội họp / gặp gỡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tăng mái Che</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Các không gian dành cho bàn làm, cà phê hoặc quầy hàng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chính trang cảnh quân dụng phổ – lối đường rộng hơn, ánh sáng, cây xanh, hướng dẫn đường đi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cảnh quân xanh (trong cây xanh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trạm xe Dap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Các Chố Đế xe Dap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Vui lòng chia sẻ ý kiến hoặc đề nghị khác dành cho dự án này:


9. Lake Merritt Plaza là địa điểm thay thế được ưu tiên của BART cho Cơ Sở Điều Hành Văn Chuyển. Dự án này có thể có những tác động nào đối với quy vị không? Quy vị có mối quan ngại nào dành cho địa điểm này không?


10. Quy vị có muốn nhận các email cập nhật về dự án này không?
   - Có - Email: ____________________  - Không

**XIN QUY VỊ CHO CHỨNG TƠI BIẾT VỀ BÁN THÂN QUY VỊ**
(các câu trả lời của quy vị giúp đánh giá chúng tôi đang tiếp cận ở mức nào đối với các công động mà chúng tôi phục vụ)

11. Quy vị có sinh sống hoặc làm việc gần Tram BART Lake Merritt không?
   - Có, tôi sinh sống gần Tram BART Lake Merritt  - Không
   - Có, tôi làm việc gần Tram BART Lake Merritt

12. Quy vị sử dụng Tram BART Lake Merritt thường xuyên như thế nào?
   - 6 đến 7 ngày một tuần
   - 2 đến 3 ngày một tuần
   - Vài ngày một tháng
   - Một lần một năm hoặc ít hơn
   - Một lần mỗi tuần
   - Vài ngày mỗi tháng
   - Một lần mỗi năm

13. Giới tính của quy vị?
   - Nam
   - Nữ
   - Giới tính khác: ________________________________

14. Tuổi tác của quy vị?
   - 17 hoặc trước
   - 25 đến 34 tuổi
   - 45 đến 54 tuổi
   - 65 tuổi trở lên
   - 18 đến 24 tuổi
   - 35 đến 44 tuổi
   - 55 đến 64 tuổi

15. Có phải quy vị là người gốc Tây Ban Nha, Bồ Đào Nha hoặc Latinh?
   - Có
   - Không

   - Da Trắng
   - Da Đen/Nguời Mỹ gốc Phi
   - Khác (ghi cụ thể): ________________________________
   - Người Á Châu hoặc người Á Châu Thái Bình Dương
   - Người Đàn Châu Mỹ hoặc Thổ Dân Alaska

17. Quy vị có sử dụng ngôn ngữ nào khác ở nhà ngoại tiếng Anh không?
   - Có
   - Không
   - Có – Ngôn ngữ: ________________________________

18. Nếu quy vị trả lời “Có” cho câu hỏi 17, quy vị nói tiếng Anh như thế nào?
   - Rất tốt
   - Tốt
   - Không tốt
   - Hậu như không nói được

19. Loại tức trước thuế hàng năm của gia đình quy vị?
   - До $25,000
   - $25,000 - $34,999
   - $35,000 - $39,999
   - $50,000 - $59,999
   - $75,000 - $99,999
   - $100,000 trở lên

20. Tính cả bản thân quy vị, có bao nhiêu người sống trong gia đình quy vị?
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6 hoặc hơn

21. Quy vị có điện thoại thông minh không?
   - Có
   - Không
請讓我們知道您的想法！
舊金山灣區捷運(BART) 正開始規劃一項新的交通運輸設施(Transit Operations Facility, TOF)和重新設計美麗湖廣場(Lake Merritt Plaza)，以期能支援BART在營運上的改進和擴展，並且打造一個加強型多模式聯運樞紐和交通運輸廣場。我們想知道您對以下問題的看法，以確保廣場能為鄰里提供更好服務。

概念 1

請讓我們知道您的想法！

請比較兩個概念，告訴我們您比較喜歡哪一個（每一行勾選一個答案）：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>概念 1</th>
<th>概念 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 強調穿越交通運輸廣場的對角線行人通連道，與BART 軌道互相輝映</td>
<td>或 強調 9 街沿路的行人通連道</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 完全覆蓋下凹式中庭廣場，以打造更大的廣場空間，並使用玻璃鋪設地面，讓自然光能照進車站</td>
<td>或 保持一部分的下凹式中庭廣場開放，增加從廣場至BART 車站大廳的出入口，並且讓光線能向下照射</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 販賣機或咖啡店座位設在 9 街或 Oak 街處，面向廣場</td>
<td>或 販賣機或咖啡店座位設在 9 街或 Oak 街處，面向廣場</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 較小的遮蔭設施</td>
<td>或 較大的遮蔭設施</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 座椅擁有面積較小的密集式植栽區，分布於較開闊的廣場空間</td>
<td>或 座椅擁有面積較大的低密度植栽區，框架出廣場內多個較小的聚集空間</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. 總體上，您比較喜歡哪一個計劃選項（勾選一項）？
   - 概念 1
   - 概念 2
   - 沒有偏好

7. 下列哪些廣場特色對您最重要？
   若以 1 - 5 來代表評分標準，1 代表「不重要」，5 代表「極重要」；請就下列每個項目對您有多重要進行評分：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (不重要)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (極重要)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>廣大的開放式廣場空間</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>坐下 / 聚集 / 會面的地方</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>遮蔭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>零售、咖啡或販賣機空間</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>更好的街景 - 更寬的行道、照明、樹木、路標</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>綠色造景 (花壇、樹木)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>單車站</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>單車寄放櫃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. 請分享您對於本項目的其他任何構想或建議:

9. 美麗湖廣場是 BART 較中意的交通營運設施備選場址。本項目可能對您造成哪些影響？您對此場址有什麼顧慮（若有）？

10. 您是否想透過電子郵件收到有關本項目的最新資訊？
    ○ 是 - 電子郵件地址：__________________________ ○ 否

請告訴我們一些有關您的資訊
（您的答案有助於我們評估本公司社區服務的成效。）

11. 您的住家或工作地點與 Lake Merritt BART 捷運站的距離是否在步行範圍內？
    ○ 是，我的住家與 Lake Merritt BART 捷運站的距離在步行範圍內 ○ 否
    ○ 是，我的工作地點與 Lake Merritt BART 捷運站的距離在步行範圍內

12. 您多常去 Lake Merritt BART 捷運站乘車？
    ○ 一週 6 至 7 天 ○ 一週 2 至 3 天 ○ 每個月幾次 ○ 一年一次或更少
    ○ 一週 4 至 5 天 ○ 一週一次 ○ 一年幾次

13. 您的性別？
    ○ 男 ○ 女 ○ 其他性別：__________________________

14. 您今年幾歲？
    ○ 17 歲或以下 ○ 25 - 34 歲 ○ 45 - 54 歲 ○ 65 歲和以上
    ○ 18 - 24 歲 ○ 35 - 44 歲 ○ 55 - 64 歲

15. 您是否為拉美裔或西語裔？
    ○ 否 ○ 是

16. 您的族裔為何？可複選。（根據美國人口普查分類。）
    ○ 白人 ○ 黑人/非裔美國人 ○ 其他（請註明）：__________________________
    ○ 亞裔或太平洋島國人士 ○ 美洲印第安人或阿拉斯加原住民

17. 您在家是否說英語以外的語言？
    ○ 否 ○ 是 - 所說語言：__________________________

18. 如果 17 題回答「是」，您的英文程度有多好？
    ○ 很好 ○ 好 ○ 不好 ○ 完全不會

19. 您的稅前家庭年收入總共多少？
    ○ $25,000 以下 ○ $35,000 - $39,999 ○ $50,000 - $59,999 ○ $75,000 - $99,999
    ○ $25,000 - $34,999 ○ $40,000 - $49,999 ○ $60,000 - $74,999 ○ $100,000 和以上

20. 包括您在內，您家裡共住多少人？
    ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 ○ 6 人或更多

21. 您有智慧型手機嗎？
    ○ 否 ○ 是