

**61. Deborah and Richard Schmidt (web form dated October 15, 2008)**

Letter 61

9/22/2008 17:26

Deborah Schmidt  
look4heaven@hotmail.com

**Subject:** eBart to Antioch

■ THANK YOU, we have been waiting for this for many years and are excited that it is finally in the works! We have lived in Pittsburg, Antioch and Brentwood for a total of 55 years. We have paid taxes for 30+ years for Bart.


61-1

■ We hope that eBART will be approved and in operation as soon as possible. Wouldn't it be great to even extend it to Brentwood and Oakley, but we are happy that it is finally going to be in Antioch. Thanks for keeping us posted with the Planning Department flyer that was mailed to us a few days ago.  
■ Deborah & Richard Schmidt

**61. Deborah and Richard Schmidt (web form comment dated September 21, 2008)**

61.1 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. Construction of the Proposed Project to Hillcrest Avenue is Phase 1 of a longer project envisioned to eventually extend farther east to Oakley, Brentwood and Byron/Discovery Bay. Please refer to page S-11 of the Draft EIR for more information.

62. Dr. David Schneider (letter dated October 15, 2008)


 Dr. David Schneider  
 OPTOMETRIST  
 (510) 848-6733 • ds6956@earthlink.net  
 1736 HEARST AVENUE • BERKELEY, CA 94703

Letter 62

10/15/08

I urge BART to  
 study + implement ELECTRIC  
 LIGHT - RAIL TECHNOLOGY for BART

THANK you —  
 Dr. Schneider

**62. Dr. David Schneider (web form comment dated October 15, 2008)**

- 62.1 The commentor expresses a preference for light rail technology over the Proposed Project. Two electric propulsion alternatives - conventional BART and Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) technology - were considered in Section 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Also, please refer to Master Response 3 in Section 3 of this document regarding electric propulsion technology.

**63. Douglas P. Sibley (letter dated October 16, 2008)**

Letter 63

Douglas P. Sibley  
2175 Blackrock Place  
Martinez, CA 94553-4957  
October 16, 2008

Bay Area Rapid Transit District  
Oakland, CA

Subject: Comments on Draft EIR for the East Contra Costa BART Extension Project

- 63-1 ■ 1. I am concerned as to whether BART can legally propose a different rail car, track gauge, and accoutrements than the existing BART rail system without going back to the voters of the entire BART District seeking their approval. When BART was first presented to the voters, the voter package assured us voters that the proposed BART cars, equipment, gauge, etc, would remain uniform throughout the entire BART system, that the equipment used for any track extensions would not be different from what was to be used throughout the basic BART system. The current eBART proposal does not appear to be consistent with the commitment BART made to the voters.
- 63-2 ■ 2. BART has shown simulations of what the BART station would look like and how trains from two different systems would operate. Are there any existing similar rail station operations anywhere in this country? Why hasn't BART shown actual, real-life operations of such a station operation? Or is the BART proposal actually so different from any current real-life operations that Pittsburg would be the first of its kind?
- 63-3 ■ 3. Since the current proposed alignment is directly along the median of a soon-to-be widened State Highway 4, why isn't current BART equipment the recommended proposal? With different equipment and a fossil fuel power source both requiring additional property to purchase, would these additional property requirements to unnecessary if the current BART cars were used for the entire extension?
- 63-4 ■ 4. Would the cost of buying two types of operating, maintenance, fuel/power equipment and facilities cost more combined than having a uniform system of operating equipment, maintenance equipment and a new and unique maintenance site prove more costly in the long run, over the next 20, 50 or more years?
- 63-5 ■ 5. Would not BART need to establish union contracts with unions different from those BART now has agreements, resulting in increasing possibilities of BART strikes affecting the entire system? If the service is to be contracted out, isn't BART requiring that the successful bidders be unionized or be paid comparable union wages and benefits?

Page 1 of 2

- 63-6 6. Why is BART turning to fossil fuel operations when the need for cleaner operating equipment is becoming an increasing necessity as times goes by and opportunities to reduce fossil-fuel emissions are more difficult to achieve as time goes by? BART originally was taking the lead in the transportation industry with its clean, electric motive power.
- 63-7 7. I have read in all the transportation planning theories I have come across that the more transfers a person makes using public transportation, less likely a person will decide to choose public transportation. Since a transfer between modes would take place at the Pittsburg station, an obvious decrease in potential ridership is to be realized when compared with through equipment with no transfers. Why is BART trying to intentionally trying to reduce its possible ridership from eastern Contra Costa County?
- 63-8 8. Considering Americans with Disabilities Act (federal) and similar State laws, why is the two types of equipment with resulting cross-platform transfers twice for every round trip considered optimal service in serving the potential ridership for people boarding anywhere in the BART system and traveling to eastern Contra Costa County?

Sincerely,

*Douglas P. Sibley*

- PS  
63-9 9. Considering the proposed mode choice is "DMU" - diesel motive units, why wasn't electric power preferred,
- 63-10 10. If BART were not currently planning to extend from Fremont to downtown San Jose, would BART still claim poverty in not being able to fully fund basic BART in eastern Contra Costa County?
- 63-11 11. If the "DMU" is chosen, how much additional cost would there be to construct basic BART "on top" of an operating DMU BART system?

Page 2 of 2

**63. Douglas P. Sibley (web form comment dated October 16, 2008)**

- 63.1 The BART District Act authorizes BART to operate a rapid transit service, broadly defined as the transportation of passengers by any means (Cal. Public Utilities Code Sections 28505, 29030). The Act allows BART flexibility in rail technology and also includes authority to operate bus lines (Public Utilities Code Section 29035).
- 63.2 There are other transfer platforms in the Bay Area. The transfer platform between BART and Caltrain at the Millbrae BART Station is one example. However, unlike the BART-Caltrain platform at Millbrae, which can be accessed directly by station patrons, the proposed transfer platform at Pittsburg/Bay Point serves only as a transfer between BART and the DMU, and would not be accessible by patrons who are not already on one of the trains. This arrangement may be a unique design. A simulation was developed to illustrate how the proposed transfer platform would operate. The simulation is available at the eBART website ([www.ebartproject.org/content/10007/preview.html](http://www.ebartproject.org/content/10007/preview.html)).
- 63.3 As discussed in Section 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project, which uses DMU technology, would not require additional property acquisition compared to a conventional BART extension. The widened median will be of sufficient width to accommodate any of the Proposed Project alternatives, whether it is the Proposed Project (DMU), BRT, LRV, or conventional BART. Property requirements would be greater for a BART system compared to other alternatives, because BART requires traction power stations, whereas the Proposed Project does not, and a BART extension would require a 25-acre maintenance yard near Hillcrest Avenue, which would be much larger than that needed for the DMU.
- 63.4 The DMU is more cost effective in both the short-term and the long-term. Constructing conventional BART to Hillcrest would cost approximately \$1,173 million compared to \$479 million for a DMU. The DMU also would have lower operating and maintenance costs (\$8.3 million annually compared to \$14 million annually for BART) (see Table 5-10 on page 5-39 of the Draft EIR). The lower operating and maintenance costs for the DMU would be continued over the life of the project. One of the major costs for conventional BART compared to a DMU is the “systems” components of BART, which includes communications, traction power, and train control systems. DMUs have less sophisticated systems, which are less expensive than BART systems. Therefore, a DMU is more cost effective than BART.
- 63.5 BART will be responsible for operating the DMU system. BART’s contracts and its relationship with its unions are not an environmental issue. Since this comment



does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA, no further response is necessary as part of this EIR.

- 63.6 Please refer to Master Responses 2 and 5 in Section 3 of this document. Master Response 2 explains the decision to pursue the Proposed Project rather than the BART Extension Alternative, which would use existing BART technology. Master Response 5 describes the health risk assessment performed for the diesel emissions that are predicted from the proposed DMU technology. Master Response 5, along with the more detailed examination, presented in Impact AQ-7 in Section 3.11, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR provide background for the EIR conclusion that health risks from the Proposed Project would be less than significant.
- 63.7 BART is not constructing a transfer platform to reduce ridership, but is trying to provide transit service at an appropriate cost. It is true that increasing the number of transfers can reduce the efficiency of transit, and therefore the likelihood that patrons will use it. However, the ridership numbers in this EIR are a net number and already take into account any reduction in ridership due to the reluctance of patrons to transfer between two transit modes. The resources are currently not available for extending conventional BART to Antioch and the anticipated ridership does not justify conventional BART technology.
- 63.8 Cross-platform transfers are required at several locations within the BART system. For instance, a BART trip from Pittsburg/Bay Point to Coliseum Station requires a cross-platform transfer between the Concord Line and the Richmond-Fremont line. A trip between Berkeley and Dublin-Pleasanton requires a cross-platform transfer. The cross-platform transfer at the Pittsburg/Bay Point transfer platform would be the same, only the rail technologies on either side of the platform would be different. The transfer platform would meet the requirements of all federal and state laws for accessibility.
- 63.9 Two electric propulsion alternatives – conventional BART and Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) technology – were considered in Section 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Also, please refer to Master Response 3 in Section 3 of this document, regarding electric propulsion technology.
- 63.10 The Proposed Project and the proposed BART extension to Santa Clara County are two independent projects. Each has its own history, characteristics, and sources of funding. An extension to Santa Clara County is planned to cover its own capital and operating costs with no BART funds required. Funding for the Proposed Project is primarily being provided by regional, Contra Costa County, and state funding measures. The Proposed Project funding plan in Table 2-5 on page 2-39 of the Draft EIR shows the funding sources for the Proposed Project.



- 63.11 The Proposed Project does not preclude a future BART extension along the alignment. The alignment and structures of the Proposed Project have been designed to accommodate BART, as well as any of the other alternatives. Although no costs to retrofit a DMU system with BART have been developed, some of the DMU infrastructure would need to be replaced to accommodate BART. Tracks would have to be replaced and reballasted, stations would need to be replaced, and a new maintenance facility would be necessary. Communications, train control, and traction power systems would all need to be added as well.

**64. Jeff Smith (web form dated September 22, 2008)**

Letter 64

9/22/2008 9:05

Jeff Smith  
jeffsmith@paulhastings.com

**Subject:** Yes to BART in Antioch

64-1

Yes, I agree that BART should come to Antioch. I live in Oakley and commute to work every day to San Francisco. I vote yes that BART should come to Antioch and perhaps Brentwood. I believe it would increase development to the area and increase property values as well. Thank you. Jeff Smith, Oakley, CA

**64. Jeff Smith (web form comment dated September 22, 2008)**

- 64.1 The commentor expresses support for the Proposed Project, and notes that BART should come to Antioch and perhaps to Brentwood. This comment concerns the merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA. Please see page S-11 in the Draft EIR for more information about the Proposed Project extending to Brentwood.

**65. Steve Vaccaro (web form dated September 30, 2008)**

Letter 65

9/26/2008 12:58

Steve Vaccaro  
sjvacc@sbcglobal.net**Subject:** EBart

65-1

Wondering why you are planning on using a train that runs solely on diesel??? (CalTrain's engines run on diesel also and they are quite noxious and polluting). Any type of train you use is going to have ex car drivers using it so the argument that you are reducing carbon emissions is a little hollow. The link below will take you to a page of Issue 43 of Nipponia Magazine. It shows a 2 car hybrid train running on the Koumi Line in Nagano Prefecture, Japan. It runs on diesel also but it's engine generates electricity which charges the battery that runs the motor. In the eco conscious Bay Area wouldn't this be an easier sell?

<http://web-japan.org/nipponia/nipponia43/en/feature/feature05.html>

Steve Vaccaro

**65. Steve Vaccaro (web form comment dated September 26, 2008)**

- 65.1 Please refer to Master Responses 3 and 4 in Section 3 of this document, regarding electric versus diesel-powered vehicles, alternative fuels, and hybrid drive. As explained in Master Response 3, either the electric or diesel powered DMU would improve overall air quality, because of the net reduction in emissions that would result from the reduction in personal vehicle use as drivers switch to transit. The commentor's reference to a hybrid train concerns vehicles with a hybrid drive. A hybrid drive allows energy produced during a brake cycle to be stored for use at a later time; for example, when the vehicle is accelerating again. This technology is well suited for transit applications, in that the frequent starts and stops are amenable to the energy recovery feature. It can be adapted for DMUs, but requires a diesel-electric powered vehicle. Such diesel-electric DMUs are available, and would be suitable for the eBART project. However, the hybrid feature is not yet readily available. There are some vehicles in service on an experimental basis, mainly in Japan. However, the additional development and components also increases the vehicle cost.

**66. Paul J. Wigowsky (web form dated September 30, 2008)**

Letter 66

9/30/2008 16:38

Paul J. Wigowsky  
paulj@wigowsky.com

**Subject:** BART in Antioch

66-1

■ After reading about the proposed BART extension into Antioch (Hillcrest Station), I want to know why not keep it a standard system without the DMU (Diesel) train which entails a transfer?

The standard system (BART) would allow riders in Antioch to ride on the standard BART system without making any transfers. That seems to be the simplest and most cost-efficient way to do it. Just extend the BART line!

■ Antioch and Brentwood would be able to use that station. It's about time that the 1999 proposal becomes a reality!

**66. Paul J. Wigowsky (web form comment dated September 30, 2008)**

66.1 Please refer to Master Response 1 in Section 3 of this document, regarding BART's decision to advance the DMU technology, rather than extending existing BART technology.



**67. Anonymous (written comment at Antioch Public Hearing dated October 13, 2008)**

Letter 67

10/13/2008

Anonymous

**Subject:** BART in Antioch

67-1

I hope in the future BART considers having a station at Century Plaza in Pittsburg, CA. It is a nice shopping area I visit often. I would like BART to project what a station at Century Plaza with platform location and costs would if you still plan to extend to Discovery Bay in the future. I believe you should get more riders at your Railroad Pittsburg Station more than 2,000 riders. If you get 8,000+ riders for your Antioch station then hopefully you get more than half 4,000+ for Railroad. I know a lot of people that live in Pittsburg that will take BART when service is extended East.

**67. Anonymous (web form comment dated October 13, 2008)**

67.1 A station in the vicinity of Century Plaza (off Somersville Road) was considered for a possible station site during the original feasibility study for the Proposed Project. However, it did not meet the criteria used to identify potential station sites, which included the following issues:

- Station spacing – Century Boulevard and Somersville Road are very close to Railroad Avenue.
- Density of existing and potential future development – The predominant land use is low density retail. Most of the vacant land is slated to be developed as auto dealerships. There is limited opportunity for transit-oriented development (TOD) and the current uses are not transit supportive.
- Accessibility from the local and regional highway network – Century Boulevard does not have freeway access and the Somersville Road interchange is very congested.
- Potential transit connections – Los Medanos College, which is nearby, is the current local transit hub, and is one of the more important focal points for Tri Delta Transit. If a new hub were created at Century Boulevard, it would compete with the Los Medanos hub.
- Constructability – The commercial development in this area has been built right up to the existing right-of-way. The planned widening of SR 4 with the Proposed Project in the median would require a partial taking of several commercial parcels and a total taking of one major motel. Further widening to accommodate a station would involve displacing additional commercial buildings.
- Ridership – The Proposed Project’s ridership model showed lower patronage at Century Boulevard than at Hillcrest Avenue.

**68. Anonymous (written comment at Antioch Public Hearing dated October 13, 2008)**

Letter 68

68-1 ■ EBART will affect the local east bay economy, residents, business and surrounding areas. I am a long time supporter for a FULL BART extension from the current Pittsburg Bay Point (PBP) station and for a long time this EBART idea does not seem like a great idea.

68-2 ■ I believe there should be a station on the PB line at the Century Plaza Shopping area because that is the next "happening", "popular" shopping area next down Highway 4 after PBP.

68-2 ■ Century Plaza resembles Dublin Pleasanton with its car dealerships, business park feel and AAA offices. I am glad that BART re-evaluated the proposed Fair Grounds EBART station for Phase 1 (horrible spot for a station) but a station at Railroad and Antioch Hillcrest area sounds nice. I really do hope in the future BART has a Century Plaza station as described in the previous paragraph. BART, you need to re-evaluate the transfer station because why spend all that money on a transfer station?

68-3 ■ It is going to be hard and go back and build a full extension. I like the Daly City extension to Colma and then to the city of Millbrae. I cross my fingers praying and strongly believe that BART can one day have a full extension to the City of Oakley (behind Slatten Ranch Shopping Center) and maybe all the way to Tracy.

68-4 ■ The 523 Million proposed to be spent on Phase 1 EBART is better spent placing that money towards a FULL BART extension.

68-5 ■ Some benefits of a FULL extension are: Century Plaza BART station (CP) would be a great station for LMC students, shoppers, people traveling to Somersville Towne Center. And even for people traveling to the Fairgrounds or The Antioch marina. It is an ideal station that is centerly located for multiple events going on in the cities of Pittsburg or Antioch.

68-6 ■ I love the decisions that the BART board have made in the past and now that Warm Springs is funded do not mess that up BART board by building this EBART extension. Take the fare revenue, tax dollars, and other feedback and build a FULL BART extension.

I am a college student and enjoy my rides on BART to college, Ikea, Apple store, movies, plays, concerts or other places that I need to go. I do not want this area- the east bay to be "shortchanged" because we do not have a FULL proposed BART extension like the proposed planned extensions to Santa Clara or Hercules. Thank you BART board for reading this letter.

**68. Anonymous (web form comment dated October 13 2008)**

68.1 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. 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.

68.2 A station in the vicinity of the Century Plaza Shopping area (off Somersville Road) was considered for a possible station site during the original feasibility study for the Proposed Project. However, it did not meet the criteria used to identify potential station sites, which included the following issues:

- Station spacing – Century Boulevard and Somersville Road are very close to Railroad Avenue.
- Density of existing and potential future development – The predominant land use is low density retail. Most of the vacant land is slated to be developed as auto dealerships. There is limited opportunity for transit-oriented development (TOD) and the current uses are not transit supportive.
- Accessibility from the local and regional highway network – Century Boulevard does not have freeway access and the Somersville Road interchange is very congested.
- Potential transit connections – Los Medanos College, which is nearby, is the current local transit hub, and is one of the more important focal points for Tri Delta Transit. If a new hub were created at Century Boulevard, it would compete with the Los Medanos hub.
- Constructability – The commercial development in this area has been built right up to the existing right-of-way. The planned widening of SR 4 with the Proposed Project in the median would require a partial taking of several commercial parcels and a total taking of one major motel. Further widening to accommodate a station would involve displacing additional commercial buildings.
- Ridership – The Proposed Project's ridership model showed lower patronage at Century Boulevard than at Hillcrest Avenue.

The transfer platform would cost an estimated \$36 million of the \$479 million cost of the DMU system. BART would cost approximately \$1,173 million. As BART would be 2-1/2 times more expensive than the Proposed Project, the cost savings of eliminating the transfer platform for BART would not be justified.

- 68.3 The DMU project is Phase 1 of a project that is envisioned to go on to Oakley, Brentwood, and beyond. The alignment and structures of the Proposed Project are designed to not preclude conventional BART in the future. The alignment and structures for the Proposed Project have been designed to accommodate BART, as well as any of the other alternatives. Although no costs to retrofit a DMU system with BART have been developed, some of the DMU infrastructure would need to be replaced to accommodate BART. Tracks would have to be replaced and reballasted, stations would need to be replaced, and a new maintenance facility would be necessary. Communications, train control, and traction power systems would all need to be added as well.
- 68.4 The commentor expresses a preference for conventional BART over the Proposed Project. Please refer to Response 68.1 above.
- 68.5 The commentor expresses the desire for a station at Century Plaza (off Somersville Road). Please refer to Response 68.2 above.
- 68.6 The Proposed Project is independent of a conventional BART extension toward Warm Springs, and has its own development history and funding sources. The commentor expresses a preference for conventional BART technology over the Proposed Project. Please refer to Response 68.1 above.