

Table of Contents

SUMMARY		PAGE
S.1	Introduction	S-1
S.2	Project Description	S-1
S.3	Project Background, Purpose, and Need	S-8
S.4	Purpose of the EIR	S-12
S.5	Project Impacts	S-13
S.6	Description of Project Alternatives	S-17
S.7	Next Steps	S-20
S.8	Summary of Proposed Project Impacts	S-22

1	INTRODUCTION	
----------	---------------------	--

1.1	Project Overview	1-1
1.2	Overview of the Study Area	1-7
1.3	Project Objectives	1-10
1.4	Transit System Extensions in the Bay Area	1-12
1.5	Purpose of the EIR	1-16
1.6	EIR Process	1-17
1.7	Organization of the EIR	1-23
1.8	Related Studies and Projects	1-24
1.9	Use of this Report	1-27

2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
----------	----------------------------	--

2.1	Introduction	2-1
2.2	Technology	2-2
2.3	Route/Alignment	2-4
2.4	Stations	2-8
2.5	Projected Ridership	2-34
2.6	Operational Characteristics	2-34
2.7	Project Costs and Funding	2-36
2.8	Construction Scenario	2-41

3	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	
----------	-------------------------------	--

3.1	Introduction	3.1-1
3.2	Transportation	3.2-1
3.3	Land Use	3.3-1
3.4	Population and Housing	3.4-1
3.5	Visual Quality	3.5-1
3.6	Cultural Resources	3.6-1
3.7	Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	3.7-1
3.8	Hydrology and Water Quality	3.8-1

3.9	Biological Resources	3.9-1
3.10	Noise and Vibration	3.10-1
3.11	Air Quality	3.11-1
3.12	Public Health and Safety.....	3.12-1
3.13	Community Services	3.13-1
3.14	Utilities	3.14-1
3.15	Energy	3.15-1

4 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-1
4.3	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	4-2
4.4	Summary of Significant Cumulative Impacts	4-3
4.5	Benefits of the Proposed Project	4-4
4.6	Growth-Inducing Impacts.....	4-4

5 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Description of Alternatives.....	5-1
5.3	Environmental Analysis of Project Alternatives	5-38
	No Project Alternative Analysis.....	5-41
	Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative.....	5-46
	Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Alternative Analysis	5-95
	BART Extension Alternative Analysis	5-118
5.4	Cumulative Impacts of Alternatives	5-166
5.5	Attainment of Project Objectives and Key Policy Goals	5-167
5.6	Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	5-174
5.7	Alternatives Considered But Withdrawn.....	5-176

6 LIST OF PREPARERS

6.1	Lead Agency.....	6-1
6.2	Consultants.....	6-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A	2005 and Revised 2008 Notices of Preparation
Appendix B	BART System Expansion Policy
Appendix C	Parking Management Toolkit

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure S-1	Proposed DMU Alignment.....	S-2
Figure S-2	Proposed Project Funding Plan — \$502 Million	S-7
Figure 1-1	Regional Location and Existing BART System.....	1-2
Figure 1-2	Full eBART Project Corridor and Phase 1 Extension	1-5
Figure 2-1	Proposed DMU Alignment.....	2-5
Figure 2-2	Typical DMU Section.....	2-6
Figure 2-3	Existing Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station and Proposed Transfer Platform	2-10
Figure 2-4	Transfer Platform Section.....	2-11
Figure 2-5	Railroad Avenue Station Area and Conceptual Station Plan	2-13
Figure 2-6	Railroad Avenue Station Section.....	2-14
Figure 2-7	Railroad Avenue Station Elevation	2-15
Figure 2-8	Hillcrest Avenue Median Station Area and Conceptual Station Plan	2-18
Figure 2-9	Hillcrest Avenue Median Station Elevation and Plan.....	2-21
Figure 2-10	Proposed Project and Hillcrest Avenue Station Options	2-24
Figure 2-11	Northside West Station Option Area and Conceptual Station Plan	2-25
Figure 2-12	Northside West Station Option Elevation and Section.....	2-27
Figure 2-13	Northside East Station Area and Conceptual Station Plan	2-29
Figure 2-14	Median Station East Option Area and Conceptual Station Plan.....	2-31
Figure 2-15	Proposed Project Funding Plan — \$502 Million	2-39
Figure 3.1-1	Project Corridor	3.1-2
Figure 3.2-1	Transportation Study Area	3.2-2
Figure 3.2-2	Railroad Avenue Station Area Study Intersections.....	3.2-3
Figure 3.2-3	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area Study Intersections.....	3.2-4
Figure 3.2-4	SR 4 Freeway Segments in the Project Corridor.....	3.2-7
Figure 3.2-5	Railroad Avenue Station Area – Existing Intersection Geometrics	3.2-21
Figure 3.2-6	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area – Existing Intersections Geometrics	3.2-23
Figure 3.2-7	Tri Delta Transit Routes.....	3.2-29
Figure 3.2-8	Existing Bicycle Facilities in the Study Area	3.2-35
Figure 3.2-9	Railroad Avenue Station Area – Future Intersection Geometrics (By Year 2015).....	3.2-44
Figure 3.2-10	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area – Future Intersection Geometrics (By Year 2030).....	3.2-45
Figure 3.2-11	Railroad Avenue Station Area Intersections – 2015 No Project Conditions	3.2-47
Figure 3.2-12	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area Intersections – 2015 No Project Conditions	3.2-49
Figure 3.2-13	Railroad Avenue Station Area Intersections – 2030 No Project Conditions	3.2-53
Figure 3.2-14	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area Intersections - 2030 No Project Conditions	3.2-55
Figure 3.2-15	Railroad Avenue Station Area Intersections – 2015 Proposed Project Conditions.....	3.2-61
Figure 3.2-16	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area Intersections – 2015 Proposed Project Conditions.....	3.2-63
Figure 3.2-17	Railroad Avenue Station Area Intersections - 2030 Proposed Project Conditions.....	3.2-73
Figure 3.2-18	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area Intersections - 2030 Proposed Project Conditions.....	3.2-75

Figure 3.3-1	Existing Land Uses within the Project Corridor	3.3-5
Figure 3.3-2	General Plan Land Use Designations within Project Corridor.....	3.3-11
Figure 3.3-3	Important Farmlands within Project Corridor	3.3-20
Figure 3.5-1	Contra Costa County Scenic Highways and Routes	3.5-4
Figure 3.5-2	Landscape Segments of the Project Corridor and Photograph Location Index	3.5-6
Figure 3.5-3 A&B	Project Area Photographs (Landscape Segment 1).....	3.5-8
Figure 3.5-4 A&B	Project Area Photographs (Landscape Segment 2).....	3.5-9
Figure 3.5-4 C&D	Project Area Photographs (Landscape Segment 2).....	3.5-10
Figure 3.5-5 A&B	Project Area Photographs (Landscape Segment 3).....	3.5-12
Figure 3.5-5 C&D	Project Area Photographs (Landscape Segment 3).....	3.5-13
Figure 3.5-6 A&B	Westward View of DMU-BART Transfer Platform from SR 4	3.5-20
Figure 3.5-7 A&B	Westward View of Railroad Avenue DMU Station from SR 4	3.5-24
Figure 3.5-8 A&B	Westward View of Hillcrest Avenue DMU Median Station Pedestrian Overcrossing	3.5-26
Figure 3.5-9 A&B	Westward View of Hillcrest Avenue DMU Median Station Maintenance Facilities and Tailtracks	3.5-28
Figure 3.5-10 A&B	Northwest View of Northside West DMU Station Option from SR 4	3.5-35
Figure 3.6-1	Proposed Project and Historic Contra Costa Canal	3.6-10
Figure 3.7-1	Regional Faults near the Project Corridor.....	3.7-3
Figure 3.7-2	Quaternary Geology along the Project Corridor	3.7-5
Figure 3.7-3	Soils Types along the Project Corridor	3.7-8
Figure 3.7-3L	Soils Map Legend	3.7-9
Figure 3.7-4	Soil Expansion Potential along the Project Corridor	3.7-11
Figure 3.7-5	Liquefaction Hazards along the Project Corridor	3.7-16
Figure 3.7-6	Landslide Hazards along the Project Corridor.....	3.7-17
Figure 3.8 1	Watersheds in the Project Corridor Vicinity	3.8-3
Figure 3.8-2	Flood Hazards along the Project Corridor	3.8-5
Figure 3.8-3	Flood Hazards in the Hillcrest Avenue Station Area	3.8-9
Figure 3.9-1A	Affected Habitat along the Project Corridor	3.9-5
Figure 3.9-1B	Affected Habitat along the Project Corridor	3.9-7
Figure 3.9-1C	Affected Habitat along the Project Corridor	3.9-9
Figure 3.9-1D	Affected Habitat along the Project Corridor	3.9-11
Figure 3.9-2 A&B	Plant Communities along the Project Corridor	3.9-15
Figure 3.9-2 C&D	Plant Communities along the Project Corridor	3.9-16
Figure 3.9-2 E	Plant Communities along the Project Corridor	3.9-17
Figure 3.9-3	Sensitive Species Occurrences in the Project Vicinity.....	3.9-21
Figure 3.9-4	Sensitive Habitat in the Vicinity of the Median Station	3.9-40
Figure 3.9-5	Sensitive Habitat in the Vicinity of the Northside West Station Option	3.9-55
Figure 3.9-6	Sensitive Habitat in the Vicinity of the Northside East Station Option	3.9-57
Figure 3.9-7	Sensitive Habitat in the Vicinity of the Median Station East Option.....	3.9-59
Figure 3.10-1	Examples of Typical Noise Levels for Various Sources	3.10-3
Figure 3.10-2	Examples of Typical Vibration Levels for Various Sources	3.10-4
Figure 3.10-3	Locations of Noise Monitors and Receptors Modeled along Project Corridor	3.10-9
Figure 3.10-4	FTA Noise Impact Criteria for Transit Projects.....	3.10-11
Figure 3.10-5	Increase in Cumulative Noise Levels Allowed by Noise Impact Criteria for Transit Projects	3.10-12
Figure 3.12-1	Hazardous Materials Sites Potentially Affecting Project Corridor	3.12-4
Figure 3.12-2	Schools within One-Quarter Mile of the Project Corridor.....	3.12-11
Figure 3.13-1	Fire Districts in Contra Costa County	3.13-5

Figure 5-1	Typical BRT Guideway Section.....	5-8
Figure 5-2	BRT Route Map	5-10
Figure 5-3	Hillcrest Avenue BRT Station — Conceptual Site Plan/Option A.....	5-12
Figure 5-4	BRT Transfer Station — Conceptual Site Plan/Option A	5-14
Figure 5-5	BRT Transfer Station Plan — Option B	5-15
Figure 5-6	BRT Transfer Station Elevation and Section — Option B	5-16
Figure 5-7	Hillcrest Avenue BRT Station — Conceptual Site Plan/Option B	5-18
Figure 5-8	Typical LRV Section.....	5-27
Figure 5-9	Typical BART Extension Section	5-31
Figure 5-10	Hillcrest Avenue BART Station Area and Conceptual Station Plan.....	5-32
Figure 5-11	Railroad Avenue Area Intersections – Year 2030 with BRT Alternative	5-47
Figure 5-12	Hillcrest Avenue Area Intersections – Year 2030 with BRT Alternative	5-49
Figure 5-13	Westward View Toward Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station and BRT Station (Option B)	5-66
Figure 5-14	Hillcrest Avenue Station Area Intersections - Year 2030 with BART Alternative	5-119
Figure 5-15	Northwest View towards Hillcrest Avenue BART Station from SR 4 – BART Extension Alternative	5-134
Figure 5-16	Sensitive Habitat in the Vicinity of the Hillcrest Avenue BART Station.....	5-141

LIST OF TABLES

Table S-1	Projected Daily DMU Ridership, 2015 and 2030.....	S-5
Table S-2	Features of the Hillcrest Avenue Station Options	S-8
Table S-3	Summary of Significant and Potentially Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	S-24
Table S-4	Comparative Impacts of the Hillcrest Avenue Station Options	S-16
Table 1-1	Comparison of MTC Resolution #3434 Targets with Proposed Project Station Area Development	1-13
Table 1-2	Comparison of BART System Expansion Policy Ridership Target with Proposed Project Ridership Forecasts (weekday entries and exits in 2030)	1-15
Table 1-3	Agencies with Permit and/or Approval Authority over Proposed Project	1-28
Table 2-1	Projected Daily DMU Ridership, 2015 and 2030.....	2-34
Table 2-2	Proposed Project Operating Schedule for DMU Service	2-35
Table 2-3	Proposed Project – Estimated Capital Costs (2009 Dollars)	2-37
Table 2-4	Hillcrest Avenue Station Options – Estimated Capital Costs.....	2-38
Table 2-5	Proposed Project Funding Plan (2009 Dollars).....	2-39
Table 2-6	Proposed Project Construction Phasing and Schedule.....	2-42
Table 2-7	Overpasses Required for the Proposed Project	2-44
Table 2-8	Estimated Amount of Construction Materials.....	2-47
Table 3.1-1	Growth Projections for Project Corridor Communities, 2010, 2015, and 2030.....	3.1-7
Table 3.1-2	Projected New Development in the Railroad Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue Station Ridership Development Plan Areas.....	3.1-8
Table 3.2-1	Level of Service Criteria – Signalized Intersections	3.2-8
Table 3.2-2	Level of Service Criteria – Unsignalized Intersections.....	3.2-8
Table 3.2-3	Level of Service Criteria – Basic Freeway Segments	3.2-9
Table 3.2-4	SR 4 Operations within the Proposed Project Study Area – Existing Conditions, 2007.....	3.2-11
Table 3.2-5	Key Features of Roadways in Project Study Area	3.2-13

Table 3.2-6	Study Intersection Operations – Existing Conditions	3.2-18
Table 3.2-7	Existing Weekday BART Frequency of Service	3.2-25
Table 3.2-8	BART Train Seated Capacity	3.2-26
Table 3.2-9	Existing Average BART Load Factor on the Concord Line	3.2-27
Table 3.2-10	Tri Delta Transit Bus Lines Near or Serving the Project Corridor	3.2-28
Table 3.2-11	Existing Bicycle Facilities Near or Serving the Project Corridor	3.2-34
Table 3.2-12	Level of Service Standards for Signalized Intersections on Non-Regional Routes	3.2-37
Table 3.2-13	Proposed Project Daily Ridership, 2015 and 2030.....	3.2-57
Table 3.2-14	BART System Peak Period Ridership with and without the Proposed Project, 2030	3.2-58
Table 3.2-15	Access Mode Split by Station, 2015 and 2030.....	3.2-58
Table 3.2-16	2015 AM Peak Hour Intersection Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-65
Table 3.2-17	2015 PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-67
Table 3.2-18	2030 AM Peak Hour Intersection Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-77
Table 3.2-19	2030 PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-79
Table 3.2-20	2015 AM Peak Freeway Segment Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-81
Table 3.2-21	2015 PM Peak Freeway Segment Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-82
Table 3.2-22	2030 AM Peak Freeway Segment Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-83
Table 3.2-23	2030 PM Peak Freeway Segment Operations with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-84
Table 3.2-24	2030 Westbound AM Peak BART Line Load with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-86
Table 3.2-25	2030 Eastbound PM Peak BART Line Load with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-87
Table 3.2-26	2030 Average Load Factor on BART with and without the Proposed Project	3.2-91
Table 3.2-27	Proposed Project Station Parking Demand, 2015 and 2030.....	3.2-94
Table 3.2-28	Estimated 2030 New Development for Hillcrest Avenue Station Options ..	3.2-100
Table 3.2-29	2030 AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations Comparison under the Hillcrest Station Avenue Options.....	3.2-101
Table 3.2-30	Comparison of 2015 AM/PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations – With and Without Slatten Ranch Road.....	3.2-102
Table 3.3-1	Existing Land Uses in Project Corridor Study Area (in acres)	3.3-7
Table 3.3-2	Existing Land Uses within one-half Mile of the Proposed Railroad Avenue Station (in acres)	3.3-8
Table 3.3-3	Existing Land Uses within one-half Mile of the Proposed Hillcrest Avenue Station Options (in acres).....	3.3-10
Table 3.3-4	FMMP Farmland Classifications.....	3.3-19
Table 3.3-5	Comparison of MTC Resolution #3434 Targets with Proposed Project Station Area Development	3.3-34
Table 3.3-6	Comparison of BART System Expansion Policy Ridership Target with Proposed Project Ridership Forecasts (weekday entries and exits in 2030).....	3.3-36

Table 3.4-1	Demographic Data for Contra Costa County and Project Corridor Cities	3.4-2
Table 3.4-2	Demographic Data within One-Half Mile of the Station Sites	3.4-3
Table 3.4-3	Demographic Projections for Contra Costa County and Project Corridor Cities, 2005–2030	3.4-5
Table 3.4-4	Projected Station Area Households and Employment under Proposed Ridership Development Plans, 2030	3.4-7
Table 3.4-5	Land Acquisition for the Proposed Project and Hillcrest Avenue Station Options	3.4-12
Table 3.6-1	Structures Built In or Before 1957 Over or Under SR 4 from Bay Point to Loveridge Road.....	3.6-11
Table 3.6-2	Structures Built In or Before 1957 Over, Under, or Immediately Adjacent to SR 4 from Loveridge to SR 160	3.6-12
Table 3.7-1	Soil Types Underlying Project Corridor	3.7-7
Table 3.7-2	Active Faults in the Vicinity of the Project Corridor	3.7-13
Table 3.7-3	Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale.....	3.7-14
Table 3.7-4	Classification of USGS Hazard Mapping	3.7-18
Table 3.8-1	Floodplain Hydraulic Data in the Project Corridor	3.8-7
Table 3.8-2	Impervious Surface Area for Hillcrest Avenue Station Options	3.8-32
Table 3.9-1	Plant Communities and Plant and Wildlife Species Observed in the Project Corridor	3.9-13
Table 3.9-2	Species and Habitats Covered Under ECCC HCP/NCCP	3.9-31
Table 3.9-3	ECCC HCP/NCCP Wetland Fee and Acreage Determination Methods.....	3.9-34
Table 3.9-4	Indigenous Trees in the City of Antioch.....	3.9-36
Table 3.9-5	Acreage of Wetlands at the Hillcrest Northside West Station, Northside East Station and Median Station East Options	3.9-56
Table 3.9-6	Potential Swainson’s Hawk Foraging Habitat Loss per Station Option	3.9-63
Table 3.10-1	Summary of Existing Noise Measurements along the Project Corridor, 2006–2008	3.10-6
Table 3.10-2	FTA Land Use Categories	3.10-11
Table 3.10-3	FTA Vibration Impact Criteria for Transit Projects	3.10-12
Table 3.10-4	City of Pittsburg General Plan Land Use/Noise Environment Compatibility Guidelines	3.10-13
Table 3.10-5	City of Antioch General Plan Maximum Noise by Land Use.....	3.10-15
Table 3.10-6	Oakley General Plan Noise Level Standards for Exposure to Transportation Noise Sources.....	3.10-15
Table 3.10-7	Contra Costa County General Plan Noise Standards	3.10-16
Table 3.10-8	Noise Impact Criteria during Operations	3.10-17
Table 3.10-9	Noise Impact Criteria during Construction.....	3.10-18
Table 3.10-10	Groundborne Vibration (GBV) Impact Criteria during Operations	3.10-19
Table 3.10-11	Vibration Damage Impact Criteria during Construction	3.10-19
Table 3.10-12	Summary of Key Parameters for Operational Noise Analysis	3.10-21
Table 3.10-13	Predicted Day-Night (L_{dn}) Noise Level from DMU Operations (in at-grade segments with no railroad switches), 2030.....	3.10-24
Table 3.10-14	Predicted Peak Hourly ($L_{eq}(hr)$) Noise Level at Two Closest Schools from DMU Operations, 2030 (in at-grade segments with no railroad switches).....	3.10-25
Table 3.10-15	Predicted Day-Night (L_{dn}) Noise Level from DMU Operations at Railroad Switches (Crossovers)	3.10-27
Table 3.10-16	Predicted Day-Night (L_{dn}) Noise Level from Project-Related Traffic (Years 2015 & 2030)	3.10-30

Table 3.10-17	Predicted Vibration Levels from DMU Operations.....	3.10-31
Table 3.10-18	Distance of Significant Noise Impact during Proposed Project Construction for Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Receptors	3.10-32
Table 3.10-19	Distance of Significant Vibration Impact during Proposed Project Construction (feet)	3.10-35
Table 3.11-1	State and National Criteria Air Pollutant Standards, Effects, and Sources.....	3.11-3
Table 3.11-2	Ambient Air Quality in the Vicinity of the Project Corridor (from the Pittsburg and Bethel Island Air Quality Monitorings)	3.11-6
Table 3.11-3	Ambient Concentrations of Carcinogenic TACs Measured in the Project Vicinity by the BAAQMD and CARB in 2002	3.11-10
Table 3.11-4	Predicted CO Concentrations at Intersections Affected by the Proposed Project	3.11-22
Table 3.11-5	Greenhouse Gas (CO ₂) and Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions (lb/day) with the Proposed Project	3.11-24
Table 3.11-6	Air Quality Construction Control Measures	3.11-30
Table 3.11-7	Greenhouse Gas (CO ₂) and Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions (lb/day) Under Cumulative Conditions without and with the Proposed Project.....	3.11-35
Table 3.12-1	Hazardous Materials Sites Listed in Federal, State, and Local Agency Databases with Potential to Affect the Project Corridor	3.12-3
Table 3.12-2	Schools within One-Quarter Mile of the Project Corridor.....	3.12-10
Table 3.12-3	System Safety Performance Data for Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year 2006	3.12-12
Table 3.13-1	BART Police Department Quarterly Data – Third Quarter Fiscal Year 2008.....	3.13-3
Table 3.14-1	Major Utility Locations along the Project Corridor	3.14-21
Table 3.15-1	Energy Consumption in California by Sector, 2000 and 2004.....	3.15-2
Table 3.15-2	Source of California Energy (in percent)	3.15-2
Table 3.15-3	Natural Gas Usage in California by Sector, 2004.....	3.15-3
Table 3.15-4	Sources for Generating Electricity in California, 2006	3.15-4
Table 3.15-5	BART System Electricity and Energy Consumption at Facilities, 2006.....	3.15-6
Table 3.15-6	Energy Intensity for Maintenance of Vehicles/Cars	3.15-10
Table 3.15-7	Energy Consumption of the Proposed Project	3.15-12
Table 5-1	Ridership Summary – BRT Alternative vs. Proposed Project	5-19
Table 5-2	BRT Alternative – Station Access Mode Split	5-19
Table 5-3	BRT Alternative Option A - Route Features and Proposed Service Headways	5-20
Table 5-4	Phase 1A BRT Alternative - Staging Locations, Equipment, and Material.....	5-24
Table 5-5	Phase 1B BRT Alternative - Staging Locations and Material	5-25
Table 5-6	Ridership Summary – BART Extension Alternative vs. Proposed Project.....	5-33
Table 5-7	BART Extension Alternative – Station Access Mode Split.....	5-33
Table 5-8	Phase 1A BART Extension Alternative - Staging Locations, Equipment, and Material	5-37
Table 5-9	Phase 1B BART Extension Alternative - Staging Locations and Material	5-38

Table 5-10	Summary Comparison of eBART Project Alternatives	5-39
Table 5-11	BRT Alternative – 2030 AM Peak Hour Intersection Operation	5-51
Table 5-12	BRT Alternative – 2030 PM Peak Hour Intersection Operation.....	5-53
Table 5-13	BRT Alternative – 2030 Mitigated Intersection Operations	5-55
Table 5-14	BRT Alternative – 2030 AM Freeway Segment Operation.....	5-57
Table 5-15	BRT Alternative – 2030 PM Freeway Segment Operation	5-58
Table 5-16	BRT Alternative – Station Parking Demand, Year 2030	5-59
Table 5-17	BRT Alternative – Average Load Factor, Year 2030	5-60
Table 5-18	BRT Routes and Bus Volumes	5-77
Table 5-19	Predicted Day-Night (L_{dn}) Noise Level from BRT (assuming diesel engines)	5-79
Table 5-20	Predicted Hourly ($L_{eq}(hr)$) Noise Level from BRT (assuming diesel engines)	5-80
Table 5-21	Noise Levels (L_{dn}) From a Bus Maintenance Facility (dBA).....	5-81
Table 5-22	BRT Ridership Increase and Associated CO Concentrations (ppm)	5-84
Table 5-23	Energy Consumption of the BRT Alternative (Option A), 2030	5-93
Table 5-24	Potential Land Acquisition for LRV Traction Power Substations	5-98
Table 5-25	BART Alternative – 2030 AM Peak Hour Intersection Operation	5-121
Table 5-26	BART Alternative – 2030 PM Peak Hour Intersection Operation	5-122
Table 5-27	2030 Mitigated Intersection Operations – BART Extension Alternative	5-124
Table 5-28	2030 AM Freeway Segment Operation – BART Extension Alternative	5-126
Table 5-29	2030 PM Freeway Segment Operation – BART Extension Alternative.....	5-127
Table 5-30	2030 Station Parking Demand – BART Extension Alternative – Year 2030	5-128
Table 5-31	BART Extension Alternative – Average Load Factor, Year 2030.....	5-129
Table 5-32	BART Extension Alternative – Predicted Day-Night (L_{dn}) Noise Level (at-grade and away from switches)	5-144
Table 5-33	BART Extension Alternative – Predicted Peak Hourly ($L_{eq}(hr)$) Noise Level (at-grade and away from switches)	5-145
Table 5-34	BART Extension Alternative – Predicted Day-Night (L_{dn}) Noise Level (at switches)	5-147
Table 5-35	Predicted Day-Night (L_{dn}) Noise Level from BART Maintenance Facility	5-149
Table 5-36	Vibration Levels from the BART Extension Alternative	5-150
Table 5-37	BART Extension Alternative Ridership Increase and Associated CO Concentrations (ppm)	5-151
Table 5-38	Energy Consumption of the BART Extension Alternative.....	5-159
Table 5-39	Summary of Key Impacts: Proposed Project and Alternatives.....	5-161
Table 5-40	Project Alternative Attainment of Project Objectives	5-168