

31. Liz Haemmel (web form dated November 1, 2008)

Letter 31

11/1/2008

Liz Haemmel

Subject: Extension of Bart to Hillcrest Avenue Antioch

Dear BART, It is so exciting that you will be extending Bart to Antioch.

31-1

However, it would be so much better for the environment if you would use electricity instead of diesel power. Please consider this in your impact statement.

Thank you.

31. Liz Haemmel (web form comment dated November 1, 2008)

- 31.1 The commentor expresses a preference for the Proposed Project to be powered by electricity rather than diesel. Please refer to Master Response 1 and 2 for a discussion of the process that went into advancing DMU technology as the Proposed Project, and Master Response 3 regarding the viability of an electric propulsion technology extension.

32. D. Hill (web form dated September 22, 2008)

Letter 32

11/1/2008

D. Hill
dvrconsulting@comcast.net

Subject: EBART

32-1

My husband and I have lived in Antioch for 4 years and work in SF. This expansion would be beneficial to us and many other residents in similar situations. I am FOR this proposal and look forward to seeing it pass.

32. D. Hill (web form comment dated September 22, 2008)

- 32.1 The commentor expresses support for the Proposed Project and looks forward to seeing the project advance. This comment concerns the merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

33. Bernell Hollis (web form dated October 24, 2008)

Letter 33

10/24/2008 17:20

Bernell Hollis
bernell13@yahoo.com

Subject: Comments/Support of extending rail service to Antioch

Hello,

33-1

I want to go on record in supporting extending rail service to Antioch. I'm an Oakley resident and we need rail service out that way too. Thousands of bay area residents are buying homes in new communities in Oakley and surrounding areas so therefore the demand for rail service to Antioch and surrounding areas is high.

Sincerely,

33. Bernell Hollis (web form comment dated October 24, 2008)

- 33.1 The commentor expresses support for the Proposed Project and supports the extend rail service to Antioch. This comment concerns the merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

34. William Iwamoto (electronic mail dated September 23, 2008)

Letter 34

September 23, 2008

To: info@ebartproject.org

Comment on DEIR eBART Contra Costa BART Extension

The original eBART project has been greatly reduced in scope. In this circumstance, there is a glaring omission in the alternatives considered in the DEIR relating to using standard BART trains. This alternative is described below.

Extend the BART dual tracks in the SR4 median from Pittsburg/Bay Point Station eastward to Hillcrest Avenue and add a 1000 feet tailtrack, also in the median. Do not add a BART Maintenance Facility. Use a three car BART shuttle between the new Hillcrest Station and Pittsburg Bay Point. Use the unaltered Pittsburg Bay Point Station as the intermodal Station. Do not build the Railroad Avenue Station now, only its base slab ala East Dublin Station until ridership justifies. The architectural character of the Hillcrest Station would resemble the Orinda Station, not the Pittsburg Bay Point Station to reduce its cost. Please note, the DMU Stations are simple slab on grade stations so the architectural quality issue should not be a critical issue.

There can be operating issues raised by BART's Operating Department regarding non-building of the new Maintenance Facility at Hillcrest, but they must be challenged. The distance between Hillcrest Station and the Concord yard is far less than Daly City Yard to Oakland Maintenance Facility. In the original BART configuration in 1972, BART operated trains without the benefit of the Daly City Yard between 1972 and 1989, For 17 years disabled train on the M-Line were repaired at Oakland, a distance much greater than Hillcrest to Concord.. Therefore trains operating on extended C Line can be repaired in Concord.

Bottom line, the Hillcrest Extension can be built for the same cost as DMU and many benefits accrue to BART in the process. They are:

- The standard BART cars can be used.

34-1

34-1
(cont'd)

- Train operations can be controlled from BART Central.
- The same trade unions will operate the shuttle trains, no training is involved.
- The same maintenance facilities can be used.
- The fail-safe operating procedure of BART is one of the safest in the nation will be used on the extension.
- Use the same fare collection and ticket vending machines common to all BART Stations. No need for new systems.
- Use existing spare part stocks.
- Use the same car cleaning and car wash facilities.
- Use the same ballast cars, ballast tampers, spare railroad ties and rail.
- Extend fiber optics to East County.
- Use existing procedures of station agents, BART Police, BART Engineering services, BART administration and BART engineering standards.
- Use same train control operators, components and train control standards.
- When ridership justifies greater service, merely eliminate shuttle trains and use standard 10 car trains.
- Avoid sympathy strikes when the new DMU personnel collectively bargain, thus shutting down the entire BART system.

It is unknown when the next phase of the DMU system will be installed, if ever. Extending BART eliminates operation of a 10 mile DMU system in the 100 mile BART system.

The DMU system will be useful when the California High Speed Rail System is opened. DMU trains from an intermodal station in the vicinity of Modesto would link East Bay to Sacramento and Los Angeles. It will be easier to create a DMU/BART intermodal station with long term parking and DMU maintenance facility in relatively unpopulated Oakley than more crowded Antioch.

William Iwamoto
375 Winesap Drive
Brentwood, CA 94513-2672
iwamotowilliam@att.net

e bart_23sep08

34. William Iwamoto (web form comment dated September 23, 2008)

34.1 The BART Extension Alternative that is presented in Section 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR was developed by BART departments overseeing planning, engineering, and operations. The commentor suggests that the BART Extension Alternative could have been designed for far less such that the cost of the BART Extension Alternative would be in the same cost range as the Proposed Project. Two of the biggest cost items for the BART Extension Alternative are the maintenance facility and the Hillcrest Avenue Station design. Reasons why the commentors' suggestions for simplifying or eliminating these components are infeasible are offered below.

- The existing BART maintenance yard at Concord is at capacity. There is insufficient space to accommodate the added trains that would be needed if BART were extended to Hillcrest Avenue. There is storage for ten BART trains at Pittsburg/Bay Point. This storage area would be displaced by the BART Extension Alternative. As a result, there would be a need for a BART yard and maintenance facility at Hillcrest Avenue. This facility could not be accommodated in the median of the freeway.
- An Orinda-style BART Station requires a very large space in the freeway median. There is not enough space for such a station in SR 4 at Hillcrest Avenue. In particular, there is not enough space for all the required parking, which is much more than that provided at the Orinda BART Station.
- The option of operating a shuttle service between the Pittsburg/Bay Point and Hillcrest Avenue Station using BART technology was considered. The minimum size BART trains is three cars, which would offer more than enough capacity to serve the projected ridership. This option was rejected because in order to effect the transfer between the BART shuttle and the regular BART transit at the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, the train platform would have to be extended to accommodate both a 10-car BART train and a 3-car BART train at the station. Because of physical design constraints on the siting of the station, this expansion would be very difficult and costly. In addition, there would need to be ability to store out-of-service BART trains during the midday and other off-peak periods. There would not be room to do this at Pittsburg/Bay Point, so that it would have to occur east of the Hillcrest Station or at the Concord yard facility. Either option would involve a significant operating expense. Thus, the potential operating costs savings of the shuttle operation as compared with the BART technology alternative presented in the Draft

EIR would not be fully realized and the cost of the total project would increase substantially.

- The City of Pittsburg has agreed to fund the construction of the Railroad Avenue Station. As a result, the cost of this station is not a factor in terms of the timing of funding or the availability of funds for the overall project.

35. Amy Jones (web form dated September 22, 2008)

Letter 35

9/22/2008 14:559

Amy Jones
Antioch, CA
AJones@afevans.com

Subject: Comment on DEIR eBART East Contra Cota County Extension

35-1 ■ Proposed eBART extension to Antioch I definitely think this project has taken way WAY too long to come to fruition! The residents of Antioch passed a bill to pay additional taxes in order to bring BART to Antioch and this said bill was over 15 YEARS AGO! Antioch should really be given an actual "station" over this cheaper version but no matter what the residents, me included, should get our station before the City of San Jose whose residents voted down a bill to bring BART to their city.
■ Lovely, isn't it?

- Amy Jones
Antioch, CA

35. Amy Jones (web form comment dated September 22, 2008)

- 35.1 The commentor expresses a preference for conventional BART over the Proposed Project. Please refer to Master Response 2 in Section 3 of this document regarding the Contra Costa County taxpayer's contributions to the BART system and BART's evaluation of providing conventional BART technology. It should be noted that the Proposed Project is independent of a BART extension toward the South Bay, and has its own development history and funding sources. This comment concerns the merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA. Discussions of the Proposed Project's merits will occur during the upcoming BART Board public hearing.

36. Miranda Jung (web form dated October 5, 2008)

Letter 36

10/5/2008 22:03

Miranda Jung
mirandajung@comcast.net

Subject: approval

Hello-

■ I just wanted to send my support for the project of extending BART (by whichever means) ten miles
36-1 | further in to Antioch. I have recently been hired for Kaiser Antioch, and there is no way to get to Delta
■ Fair by BART, and I live in Oakland. I just wanted to send my support for the project. Thanks,

Miranda Jung

36. Miranda Jung (web form comment dated October 5, 2008)

36.1 The commentor expresses support for the Proposed Project. This comment concerns the merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

37. Roshan Khorshidchehr (web form dated October 7, 2008)

Letter 37

10/7/2008

Roshan Khorshidchehr

Subject: Bart extension into East Contra Costa

■ It sure is very exciting news that the bart is extending upto Hillcrest, but it seems that not enough thought has gone into it.

37-1

there is no vision and no lon-term planning. As you are aware there are lots more shops and malls being extended in Brentwood and it is an upcoming and busy town. so there will be more jobs and people will want to commute. Why does the bart stop at Hillcrest, it took approximately 10 years to make that move, and again it is going to be vey congested. Instead of taking small steps and then again on the drawing board few years down the line, why not plan for the future?

■ Have a VISION, forward thinking, and work on extending upto Oakley.

goodluck with the project.

37. Roshan Khorshidchehr (web form comment dated October 7, 2008)

37.1 The commentor suggests that the Proposed Project should be extended to Brentwood and Oakley. As stated on page S-11 in the Summary section of the Draft EIR, BART would like to extend transit service through Oakley and Brentwood to Byron/Discovery Bay in the future. As indicated in a Feasibility Study for the SR 4 Corridor completed in 2002, plans originally called for the extension of the Proposed Project approximately 23 miles east of the existing Pittsburg/Bay Point BART terminus in order to provide direct service to the communities of Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, and Byron/Discovery Bay. However, as described in the Draft EIR, despite regional support for the expansion, the feasibility of the full development of the eBART corridor is limited under current funding conditions.

38. John S. Leyba (web form dated November 5, 2008)

Letter 38

11/5/20081

John S. Leyba

Subject: Against eBART

38-1 I urge the BART board to vote against the "eBART" system in Eastern Contra Costa County and choose NOTHING, a bus system, or hold out for the real thing. But skip the light rail or intermediate rail systems.

38-2 To be a complete network, BART needs to expand with the system it already has, even if it is costlier than other rail systems. It is true that there are less expensive systems available. However, most people simply do not want to and will not transfer again and again to arrive at their destinations: Drive to a station, park, get on eBART, then transfer to BART, then transfer lines if necessary? Most people will simply drive where they can get on one train and skip the transfers.

38-3 Furthermore, it is possible that BART would be overkill for the suburban density of Eastern Contra Costa County, but will it always be that suburban? Will development fill in?

38-4 Will you regret not extending real BART in 20 years when the DMUs are at capacity, or worse, diesel fuel costs 10x what it does now?

38-5 In the meantime, can't we just upgrade the bus system if people really want to take that last mile on transit?

REAL BART or NO BART. Let's keep our transit network as simple and compatible as possible.

Sincerely,

John S. Leyba

38. John S. Leyba (web form comment dated November 5, 2008)

- 38.1 The commentor expresses a preference that the BART Board vote against the Proposed Project in favor of conventional BART. The comment relates to the perceived merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the environmental analysis in the Draft EIR. Therefore, no response is required.
- 38.2 The commentor expresses a preference for conventional BART over the Proposed Project. Please refer to Master Response 2 in Section 3 of this document regarding BART's evaluation of providing conventional BART technology. This comment concerns the merits of the project, and discussions of the Proposed Project's merits will occur during the upcoming BART Board public hearing.
- 38.3 As discussed on Section 1.8, page 1-25, and Section 3.1, page 3.1-7, of the Draft EIR, the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch are responsible for preparing Ridership Development Plans (RDPs). An RDP is a station area plan that is created by a local jurisdiction to achieve transit ridership thresholds. The RDPs can be in the form of rezoning, a specific plan, or a general plan amendment, or a combination of these actions, with the goal of improving access to, and encouraging transit-oriented development (TOD) around, the proposed stations. These specific plans envision greater levels of development than anticipated by the current General Plans in the immediate environs around the stations and are acknowledged in this cumulative assessment. Please refer to Table 3.1-2, on page 3.1-8 of the Draft EIR for the projected new development in the Railroad Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue Station RDP areas. The proposed DMU technology would be capable of serving the projected development, while preserving the option to convert the service to conventional BART technology in the future if warranted.
- 38.4 As stated in Response 38.2 above, the commentor expresses a preference for conventional BART over the Proposed Project. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 2 in Section 3 of this document, regarding the choice of DMU trains over conventional BART technology. Regarding future fuel costs, the cost of super refined fuel (known as low-sulfur diesel) and future fluctuations in oil prices are important concerns for the future operations and maintenance costs of the transit service. To address this fact and to be conservative, the operating cost analysis for the DMU technology assumed a cost of \$4.00 per gallon. This is a very high cost assumption, as BART would be able to buy fuel in bulk at rates lower than what the typical consumer price would be.
- 38.5 The commentor expresses a preference for conventional BART over the Proposed Project. However, commentor asks, "In the meantime, can't we just upgrade the bus system if people really want to take the last mile on transit?" As described on page 3.2-26 of the Draft EIR, the current bus system is provided by Tri Delta Transit. Information regarding the route and service types and frequency can be

found on Figure 3.2-7 and Table 3.2-10, respectively, of the Draft EIR. Tri Delta Transit's operations in the SR 4 corridor are subject to the traffic delays and congestion that affect the area. Although possible slow downs would be minimized for buses using high-occupancy vehicle lanes on a portions of SR 4 where they exist or are planned, the reliability of Tri Delta service would remain in flux as traffic continues to increase throughout the area. Bus service in the SR 4 corridor was evaluated as part of the No Project Alternative in Section 5 of the Draft EIR. Express bus improvements also were considered in earlier stages of the SR 4 corridor evaluation but were rejected because they failed to create a dedicated transit link to existing BART service and because they failed to offer enough routes to carry the number of riders that can be served by the Proposed Project and other alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR.

39. Sam Lipson (web form dated September 22, 2008)

Letter 39

9/22/2008 17:34

Sam Lipson
samlipson@hotmail.com

Subject: disagree DMU is cheaper

39-1

I'm all for the BART extension. However, you will be adding more passengers to an already stretched rail system. BART needs to run more trains, which means BART needs more cars.

The DMUs are a waste of money. Work harder to bring down the cost of a real BART extension, and amortize the cost of additional BART cars against the DMU cars you are not buying.

39. Sam Lipson (web form comment dated September 22, 2008)

39.1 BART recognizes the need to provide additional train capacity and has plans to eventually replace its fleet of cars with cars that can accommodate more passengers. Computer system improvements are planned that would allow the number of trains in service to be increased. This is discussed on page 3.2-90 and 3.2- 92 of the Draft EIR.

Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 2 in Section 3 of this document for an explanation of why BART is pursuing the DMU technology rather than extending existing BART technology.

40. K. Alix Maiden-Baillie (web form dated October 13, 2008)

Letter 40

10/13/2008

K. Alix Maiden-Baillie

Subject: Keep Antioch trains electric

40-1

I really applaud BART's proposed extension into Antioch, but I do not want to see the use of diesel-powered trains on the extension. We do not need more fossil-fuel pollution in central and East Contra Costa County. Please find a way to make the line all electric, all the way to Antioch.

40. K. Alix Maiden-Baillie (web form comment dated October 13, 2008)

40.1 The commentor expresses a preference for the Proposed Project to be powered by electricity rather than diesel. Please refer to Master Response 1 and 2 for a discussion of the process that went into advancing DMU technology as the Proposed Project, and Master Response 3 regarding the viability of an electric propulsion technology extension.