

# Section 5

## Responses to Oral Comments on the Draft EIR

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Oral comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) made at the October 13, 2008, public hearing in the City of Antioch and the October 16, 2008 public hearing in the City of Pittsburg are reproduced in this section. Discrete comments from transcripts from the two public hearings are denoted in the margin by a vertical line and numbered. Commentors who provided comments to the court reporter at a “comment station” are denoted with a “CS,” and speakers that provided oral comments at public hearing are denoted with an “S.” Responses are enumerated to correspond with the comment number. Response H1-S2.1, for example, refers to the response for the first comment from Speaker 2 at the first public hearing in Antioch; Response H2-CS1.1, for example, refers to the response for the first comment from the first commentor at one of the comment stations at the second public hearing in Pittsburg. Many responses in this section refer to master responses, which are found in Section 3 of this document.

---

### 5.2 PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

---

Transcripts for the October 13, 2008 public hearing in Antioch are reproduced beginning on the next page, followed by responses to the court reporter commentors and public hearing speakers. Transcripts for the October 16, 2008 public hearing in Pittsburg and responses follow.

Public Hearing 1

**East Contra Costa BART Extension  
eBART**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Nick Rodriguez Community Center  
213 "F" Street  
Antioch, California 94509

MINUTES

October 13, 2008

The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) conducted a Public Hearing at 7:00 P.M. to gather comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the East Contra Costa BART Extension (eBART).

Participants were encouraged to ask questions and fill out a comment book with any issues, concerns or questions he/she might have. There were approximately 30 people in attendance.

Stations were arranged to inform the public of the project and the process, with details on the:

- **PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) – COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**
- **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES – ATTAINMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES**
- **eBART PROPOSED PROJECT**
  - PITTSBURG AND ANTIOCH STATION MAPS**
  - TRANSFER STATION MAP**
  - ALIGNMENT MAP**
- **DMU [Diesel Motorized Unit] TECHNOLOGY**
- **COORDINATION BETWEEN eBART PROJECT AND HIGHWAY 4 WIDENING PROJECT**

The following were comments offered prior to the presentation:

**H1-CS1.1** ■ JOSE ANGUIANO: "I would like to say that eBART is not classic BART, that it doesn't reflect the needs of the community that they fail to support the ridership of students from LMC [Los Medanos College] because there's not a station close by and that it doesn't support the population of Antioch."  
▼

eBART Public Hearing  
 October 13, 2008  
 Page 2

H1-CS1.1 (cont'd) ↑ "As compared to Berkeley where Berkeley has 150,000 people and they have three stations, Antioch will have only one station with 100,000 plus people. I don't believe that BART should be funding eBART and that eBART should be separate. They're different propulsion systems. One is electric and the other is diesel power, and therefore there's a conflict of interest and a lack of confidence that BART will improve and that eBART will finally become classic BART. Forty years of BART promises cannot be made up at this meeting."

H1-CS2.1 ■ ROD FLORES: "I live in Antioch near Hillcrest Avenue where one of the stations would be open. I lived in Hayward. I just moved here and I lived in Hayward and it was a mile away from BART so it would take me a couple of minutes to get to BART, almost the same distance as to the Hillcrest station. I moved out here because my friends and family are out here and it's a wonderful area to live. I work in Oakland and my job pays for 75 percent of my BART. The biggest difficulty I have is driving from my house to the Bay Point BART station which is only 12 miles and which can range anywhere between 30 and 40 minutes just getting there. That doesn't include the 40-minute ride. My commute ride home can range anywhere between 40 minutes to an hour because of the traffic stalled at Loveridge Road. So any kind of construction on BART is going to help me out whether they're going to open up the Railroad Avenue or the Hillcrest station. Certainly I feel they're not quick enough in building the line out here since it's been paid for years ago. So any kind of urgency they can have to build the station would be, I think, not only beneficial to me but anyone who commutes from this bedroom community to the East Bay or to San Francisco at 6:00 in the morning is quite a lot for people. And also the fact that people rely on the bus system to get to BART can take anywhere to an hour to get from Antioch to the Bay Point BART station, which is a major inconvenience and not much of a service to the people who live here. I guess it doesn't really affect people unless you have to commute. People don't really feel it unless you have to commute. But nowadays, there's people coming from as far east as Stockton and Tracy because once they get to Antioch there's a lot of people on the road."

H1-CS2.2 ■

H1-CS2.3 ■

H1-CS3.1 ■ JOHRENE THOMAS: "My comment is against the bus system."

#### **INTRODUCTIONS**

Lou Hexter from Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc. (MIG), a member of the BART team, opened up the presentation to gather comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). He invited District 2 BART Director Joel Keller to make introductions.

Joel Keller, District 2 BART Director, welcomed those present to the Nick Rodriguez Community Center and to the launch of the final phases of the eBART EIR and the opportunity to comment on the report.

eBART Public Hearing  
October 13, 2008  
Page 3

Director Keller advised that a second hearing had been scheduled in Pittsburg on Thursday, October 16. All comments received verbally and in writing would be evaluated by staff and presented to the BART Board of Directors in the spring, which would likely adopt an EIR to move forward to actually build a transit extension to Eastern Contra Costa County. He acknowledged that many residents had been paying sales taxes for some time and BART was working so that the residents' commitment to BART would allow BART to make a commitment to the residents. He added that responses would be recorded and responded to as part of the process. He thanked those who were present and looked forward to seeing everyone when eBART was completed so that those who commuted could get out of their cars and use a world class transit system in the County.

Mr. Hexter explained that the first half hour of the evening had been spent inviting those present to visit the stations to be apprised of the various aspects of the project. He added that a court reporter was present to take comments. He explained that the format would offer a brief presentation of what he characterized as a complicated, but exciting project for those who lived in East Contra Costa County and who wanted to see enhanced transportation choices.

Mr. Hexter advised that there would be a brief presentation of the project and the environmental document. The bulk of the time had been set up to allow comments to be made on the environmental document. The public hearing allowed a chance for residents to make comments for the record, which comments would be documented and responded to in the Response to Comments document which would become the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). He thanked those present and urged those who wanted to speak to fill out a speaker card. He referred to the comment station set up for those who did not wish to speak in public but who would still like to make comments. He reiterated that comments would be accepted orally and in writing.

Mr. Hexter added that as with most opportunities, residents could visit the websites at [www.ebart.org](http://www.ebart.org) or [info@ebartproject.org](mailto:info@ebartproject.org). All comments whether electronic, written, or those spoken to the court reporter were all considered to be public comments. He pointed out the materials available to the public for its perusal; a summary of the EIR and a graphic overview of the project providing key facts and figures in a simple overview of the project. Full copies of the DEIR were available in the Community Center for the public's perusal. Copies were also available at the Antioch and Pittsburg Libraries and at BART and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) offices in Oakland.

**PRESENTATION – ELLEN SMITH, eBART PROJECT MANAGER, BART**

Ellen Smith, eBART Project Manager, presented a summary of the project and the DEIR and the proposed project alternatives.

eBART Public Hearing  
October 13, 2008  
Page 4

Ms. Smith advised that the purpose of the hearing was to talk about project alternatives, the proposed project, the environmental analysis, and the next steps, all of which were part of the EIR process pursuant to CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act] law, informing agencies and members of the community that the document was available. Responses to comments would be part of the FEIR available in March 2009.

Ms. Smith stated that the EIR process had included scoping sessions to describe the project to select a reasonable range of alternatives to move forward. As part of that process, the environmental impacts of the technology had been evaluated, draft mitigation measures had been identified, and the DEIR had been published. The proposal would go to the BART Board of Directors for approval in April 2009.

With respect to project history, Ms. Smith explained that in 2001 the idea of a different type of technology than BART had been proposed to provide service to congested communities around the State Route 4 corridor. BART and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) had conducted a quick feasibility study and had considered an alignment along the Mococo corridor owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), with the intent to move forward in 2003. Unfortunately, State funds had been halted and that had not occurred. With the passage of Measure J in 2004, substantial funds were provided to be able to move forward with the project. In 2005, project scoping had been conducted. The proposed project had been defined in 2007, which meant that the corridor had originally been studied all the way to Byron/Discovery Bay.

Ms. Smith reported that the project had been phased back for funding reasons and had not been approved by UPRR in the Mococo alignment. As a result, the alignment had been switched to the median in the freeway and BART had been working with the CCTA as part of its Highway 4 Widening Project.

Ms. Smith referred to the full eBART project corridor and phase extension all the way from Pittsburg to Discovery Bay. She explained that for funding reasons, the resources could only be brought 10 miles to Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch. She identified that as Phase 1 of the project. Four technologies had been considered for the extension; DMU trains, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), classic BART, and light rail vehicles, all of which had been evaluated in the DEIR. She offered a comparison of the alternatives and noted that a detailed comparison was available at one of the stations to allow a detailed review.

Ms. Smith explained that the same projects had been arrayed against a series of project objectives, which objectives were important to BART, to the public, to the elected officials and to the funding agencies.

The proposed project would utilize DMU vehicles in the median of Highway 4 being planned in coordination with the CCTA's freeway widening, 10 miles to Hillcrest Avenue, using multiple unit trains widely used in Europe.

eBART Public Hearing  
October 13, 2008  
Page 5

Ms. Smith advised that the DMU vehicles would be clean, using ultra low sulfur diesel fuel. A transfer station and platform close to the platform at the Pittsburg/Bay Point station had been proposed. Passengers would arrive on a DMU vehicle, walk 28 feet and get on a BART train. Service could be provided every 15 minutes. The next station would be in the median at Railroad Avenue in Pittsburg, with the next station at Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch.

Ms. Smith reported that the capital cost had been escalated at \$509 million. There was currently \$502 million in hand. The project was 99 percent funded. BART was confident to be able to fund the \$7 million gap.

Ms. Smith presented a video of eBART from the point of view of the rider, 13 minutes from Hillcrest Avenue to the Pittsburg/Bay Point station, including the transfer to BART trains. She identified the existing platform in the median of the freeway and described the proposed train-to-train transfer station. The eBART train would travel west in the morning, come in on the south side of the track, allow passengers to disembark and cross a 28-foot platform and get on the BART train to access the 104-mile BART system. She commented that there would be a 3-minute wait to ensure the ability of eBART passengers to access the BART train. She emphasized the commitment to the community for a seamless, uncomplicated transfer.

Ms. Smith also explained that BART was working with the City of Pittsburg on a specific plan for a Railroad Avenue station. The City of Pittsburg was working on a specific plan to show substantial jobs and housing between Railroad Avenue and Harbor Street.

For the City of Antioch, Ms. Smith reported that there were many more opportunities as well as more complexity for a station location. Four station options had been proposed including a "project median station" on which preliminary engineering had been completed and which had 90 percent funding. BART would be located on the north side of the freeway on a pedestrian bridge. BART was in discussions to cover the cost of parking. Of the options, there was also a "median station east" offering better opportunities for development although there would be an additional cost. A "north side west" station would be out of the median on the north side just south of the UPRR corridor, at a greater cost. A "north side east" station would be situated farther towards SR 160 with opportunities for jobs and housing at this site but with even greater costs. BART was working closely with the City of Antioch to determine which station site would be the best.

With respect to the DMU, Ms. Smith explained that DMU engines were in use worldwide including San Diego County and New Jersey. She reported that each train would carry 200 passengers as opposed to BART which carried one thousand passengers. As to environmental benefits, the train could carry as many people as an entire additional lane of Highway 4 at peak hours, reduce the equivalent of 99 million miles, and reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

eBART Public Hearing  
October 13, 2008  
Page 6

Ms. Smith advised that the environmental document had evaluated 14 different concerns, among them transportation, land use, population and housing, visual quality, cultural resources, geology, hydrology, biology, air quality, public health and safety, community services and utilities. She referred to the DEIR for a description and evaluation of all those concerns. She advised that the environmental benefits of the proposed project would result in reduced greenhouse gases by 250 pounds per day and improve freeway operations while getting people out of cars.

While there were regional benefits there would also be some significant environmental impacts in that transportation cumulatively at Hillcrest Avenue and State Route 4 would worsen the eastbound off ramp and there would be noise and vibration as a result of construction activities.

As to the \$509 million project cost, Ms. Smith stated that using regional monies, Measure J, BART, State and a small amount of East County fees would total \$502 million. She believed that the project would be in compliance with MTC policy related to transit oriented development (TOD) and believed there would be enough housing units to satisfy the funding partner. It was also expected that the project would be in compliance when a study was completed of BART's Expansion Policy. She noted that BART was not a land use agency and only expected riders. It looked as if the ridership expectations would be met and BART would work with cities to bring necessary changes to station sites.

Ms. Smith urged public comments at the microphone, at the comment desk, or by mail, email or through the website prior to November 5. She explained that the next opportunity would be at the April 2009 BART Board of Directors meeting when BART would consider the project. The next steps would involve the publishing of the FEIR next year, with intended construction in 2010. Depending upon the Highway 4 Freeway Widening Project, eBART service could be expected by 2014.

Mr. Hexter stated that now was the time when public comment would be taken. While questions could be asked, responses would occur in the FEIR. He opened the session to public comment at this time.

H1-S1.1 RICHARD CONVERSE: "I'm Richard Converse. I live at 115 Shady Lane, Antioch, and I have lived here for 30 years. I have grown up out here and have lived here since 1975. My wife was born and raised here. We've seen a lot of things go on and not go on. In the early 1960s transportation there was money allocated to widen Highway 4 all the way across. That money went to San Francisco for an elevated freeway. This gets into transportation and they lost out on that one. When they built 680/242 and Highway 4, they were 20 years ahead. Now we're 20 years behind and we're still getting jilted? eBART will not make much of a dent on what is going on. eBART is just another bus on rails as far as diesel unless they go to electric and there would be 20 years again. It's already in the wind that San Jose will get the real BART and all we'll get is diesel. "

eBART Public Hearing  
 October 13, 2008  
 Page 7

H1-S1.2 "For the \$500 million, you can always go by the government and tell them it's going to cost \$1 billion by the time it's done and paid for. You think I'm kidding, just think what was going on in the past. And pollution. They still haven't come out with the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] ratings on the diesel emissions. Is that correct or am I wrong? Well,

H1-S1.3 being a resident of Antioch and hoping to be here a lot longer I would like to see things go on."

H1-S2.1 BOB ALLEN: "I'm Robert Allen. I was a Director of BART in Livermore for 14 years from 1974 to 1988 and I'm retired from Southern Pacific in Engineering and Operations where I did a large amount of cost estimating and had to estimate costs within 10 percent or really had to explain to management. I strongly oppose the concept of eBART. Perhaps I might read a letter which I have written to the Planning Department. 'BART's East Contra Costa Extension should be BART gauge, that's 5 feet 6 inches and not the freight gauge of 4 feet 8.5 inches, and be regular BART at grade and in the freeway median. The maintenance facility, transfer station, and flyover should be deleted. The track way cost (ballasted double track, third rail traction power, train control, communications, ductwork, and barriers and fencing) in a freeway median should run \$13.1 million per mile in today's dollars. That's based on BART's historic costs escalated per Bay Area CPI-U. That cost does not include stations, rolling stock, land, special track work, environmental work and minor structures and earthwork that would be required, nor contingencies, nor future escalation.

H1-S2.2 BART's Dublin/Pleasanton extension shows how well such a BART line can work, with car storage on tail tracks and maintenance performed elsewhere until the line is further extended. After the line will be extended you can have the yard and maintenance facility there. I strongly urge two intermediate remotely-staffed stations: Pittsburg at Railroad Avenue and Los Medanos at Century Boulevard. Los Medanos is in direction for most Antioch patrons, while Hillcrest is not. A Century Boulevard station would be near Los Medanos College. As far as track gauge goes, it was originally proposed to have eBART go along the Mococo line of UPRR that is only one of two water level freight routes serving the San Francisco Bay Area. The other serves Sacramento. With freight trains, it's really wasteful to have them go over the hill and so UPRR had wisely decided to reactivate the Mococo line. The Mococo line is nearly flat, would involve minimum waste of fuel, minimum exhaust and no mobile units would be required. BART at grade in a wide Route 4 Bypass median would need no new separation structures and little earthwork. People talk about the cost of BART; the main cost is structure and earthwork. BART at grade cost \$13.1 million a mile for just the track work to get out to Antioch.' I urge that be done. It also makes sense to add a station at Century Boulevard in Pittsburg."

H1-S2.3 MR. WILKIN: "My name is Wilkin and I'm a resident of Antioch and I've just got a quick question. Have you guys actually considered putting a station at Century Plaza Shopping Center?"

H1-S2.4

H1-S2.5

H1-S2.6

ROD FLORES: "My name is Rod Flores and I live in Antioch and I really enjoyed your



eBART Public Hearing  
October 13, 2008  
Page 8

H1-S4.1 comments because I just moved out. I get on the BART train. I leave my house at 5:15 A.M. and I get to BART at 5:40 A.M., and Hillcrest Avenue down the corridor is bumper to bumper every morning. When I lived in Hayward it was a mile to BART and I could get there no problem. The points you made earlier, I would be happy with one line from Hillcrest all the way to Pittsburg. That way - I don't know anything about the structures and things like that - from Hillcrest is bumper to bumper all the way down the road and there's enough room in the median for BART all the way down. When BART goes down to Brentwood, we're not going to be alive. I mean, it took 30 years to get to this point. I just hope when it comes we'll be alive."

H1-S4.2

Director Keller thanked everyone who came out to share their point of view. He looked forward to going to the BART Board in April. He stated that many people experienced the same type of frustration in the morning and BART was working hard to address those concerns.

H1-S5.1 JOHRENE THOMAS: "I've got to tell you, but you're talking BART, I'm talking bus. I'm on that bus all week long from San Francisco down to San Lorenzo, Hayward. Half the time it takes 45 minutes to get to BART. And on Sundays and Saturdays we have two buses, right. What happens if they don't connect to go to BART, we're stuck two hours waiting for BART. It's terrible when you have an appointment to get somewhere. This is ridiculous. We need something to get people somewhere in half the time. What's really crazy when it comes to the buses, when we don't have this commute, you can make it in 8 to 10 minutes where I live instead of one hour."

H1-S5.2

Mr. Hexter reiterated that comments could be made at the comment station, by mail, by email, or on the website. Another hearing in Pittsburg had been scheduled for Thursday, October 16 in the Council Chambers of City Hall from 7:00 to 8:30 P.M. He urged all interested parties to attend.

H1-S6.1 GEORGE STIKORESKEY: "Hi, I'm George Stikoresky. I live in Antioch and I've lived here for 29 years. I've heard about the project, about and when we start paying taxes to have BART, we pay taxes to have BART. The thing is that this area will keep growing and we're going to get this alternative BART and we're going to still be running behind and always catching up in this area. Stop treating us like that. Give us what we paid for. Thank you."

H1-S7.1 BOB ALLEN: "One of the reasons for asking for additional stations, normally BART station operations cost a fair amount. There's a cost to have a station agent. Back in its early days, BART tried something called remotely-staffed stations, stations without people where people could contact station agents through modern communication devices which reduced the cost of BART."

"However, the remotely-staffed station program failed because it involved retrofitting two stations; Lake Merritt and Fruitvale, which had already been built. I encourage additional

eBART Public Hearing  
October 13, 2008  
Page 9

H1-S7.1  
(cont'd) ↑ stations at Pittsburg and at Century Boulevard.”

Mr. Hexter re-emphasized the several ways members of the public could offer comments. He referred the public again to the eBART website at [info@bartproject.org](mailto:info@bartproject.org) to receive information, documents and media notifications.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Public Hearing was adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

**H1-CS1. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Jose Anguiano (dated October 13, 2008)**

H1-CS1.1 A station at Los Medanos (Century Boulevard) was considered during the original eBART feasibility study. However, it did not meet the criteria used to identify potential station sites, which included the following considerations:

- Station spacing – Century Boulevard is 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 nearby 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 will 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 commentor also expresses a preference for conventional BART over the Proposed Project. The commentor also believes that the Proposed Project should not be funded by BART. Funding for the eBART project is from a variety of state and regional sources. See pages 2-38 to 2-41 of the Draft EIR for a more detailed description of project funding. Also, 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.

**H1-CS2. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Rod Flores (dated October 13, 2008)**

H1-CS2.1 The commentor expresses general 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.

H1-CS2.2 Contra Costa County, as an original member of the transit district, has been supporting the BART system since its inception; however, transit fees from Contra Costa County have gone to support the system as a whole, including construction of the original system, extensions (including \$480 million extension to Pittsburg/Bay Point) and operations. Funding for the Proposed Project is from a variety of state, regional, and county sources. See pages 2-38 to 2-41 of the Draft EIR for a more detailed description of project funding. It should be noted that the Proposed Project has sufficient funding to be constructed and would offer rail transit service and congestion relief to SR 4 for east Contra Costa County commuters.

H1-CS2.3 The commentor has identified one of the primary benefits of providing transit services in an exclusive right-of-way; namely, the avoidance of mixing transit vehicles with other traffic in the SR 4 travel lanes. Table 5-10 on page 5-39 of the Draft EIR provides travel time comparisons between Hillcrest Avenue and the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station. The table shows that under the No Project Alternative, this trip would take approximately 21 minutes; whereas with the Proposed Project, this trip can be completed in 10 minutes. The Proposed Project would induce travelers to divert from driving along SR 4 and take eBART instead.

**H1-CS3. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Johrene Thomas (dated October 13, 2008)**

H1-CS3.1 The commentor expresses opposition to the bus system. 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.

**H1-S1. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Richard Converse (dated October 13, 2008)**

H1-S1.1 The Proposed Project has secured or committed funding for a total of \$502 million (Table 2-5 of the Draft EIR) and could be constructed. Approval of the eBART project will be determined on the merits of the project. The eBART project is independent of a BART extension toward the South Bay, and has its own

development history and funding sources. According to the arrangement between BART and Santa Clara County, an extension to Santa Clara County would cover its own capital and operating costs and would not require BART funds. The selection of a Diesel Multiple Unit technology is described in Master Response 1 in Section 3 of this document.

H1-S1.2 The cost to construct the DMU is estimated to be approximately \$479 million. This includes a 9 percent construction contingency. When costs are escalated to the midpoint of construction, the construction cost is estimated to be \$502 million.

H1.S1.3 Regarding diesel ratings from the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the EPA does not classify diesel particulate matter as a hazardous air pollutant (HAP); however, they do consider diesel exhaust “likely to be carcinogenic.” In 1998, the California Air Resources Board classified particulate matter from diesel-powered engines as a toxic air contaminant with carcinogenic characteristics. The health risk assessment that was performed for the Draft EIR is summarized in Section 3.11, Air Quality, and evaluates the potential health effects associated with the diesel particulate emissions from the Proposed Project, taking into account the Air Resources Board’s designation of diesel particulate matter as a toxic air contaminant. Additional details and information regarding the health risk assessment are provided on page 3.11-27 of the Draft EIR (Impact AQ-7), as well as in Master Response 5 in Section 3 of this document.

The EPA and the State Air Resources Board have also developed additional regulations for diesel engines and diesel fuels. The regulations that could be applicable to the Proposed Project are described on page 3.11-13 of the Draft EIR. These regulations include a diesel engine control program designed to lower the emissions standards for several categories of off-road engines. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would use trains with diesel engines that are compliant with EPA Tier 3 and Tier 4 standards, which are the two most stringent standards proposed. These regulations are discussed on pages 3.11-13 and 3.11-14 of the Draft EIR.

**H1-S2. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Robert Allen (dated October 13, 2008)**

H1-S2.1 The commentor expresses opposition to 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. Discussions of the Proposed Project’s merits will occur during the upcoming BART Board public hearing. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

- H1-S2.2 Please refer to Responses 18.1 and 18.2, which address similar issues about the need for and costs of different features that were raised by the commentor in his comment letter. Information in those responses and in previous correspondence with Mr. Allen indicates that his estimate of \$13.1 million per mile is understated.
- H1-S2.3 Please refer to Response 18.3, which addresses a similar issue about the feasibility of a maintenance facility not at the end of the line that was raised by the commentor in his comment letter.
- H1-S2.4 Please refer to Response 18.4, which addresses a similar issue about an alternative station location that was raised by the commentor in his comment letter. The commentor's recommended station at Los Medanos at Century Boulevard would not satisfy a number of siting criteria, including accessibility, supportive land use development, distance from another station, and constructability.
- H1-S2.5 Please refer to Response 18.5, which addresses a similar issue about the track gauge that was raised by the commentor in his comment letter.
- H1-S2.6 The comment states that earthwork and structures would be the main cost associated with an extension of conventional BART technology. BART staff has estimated the costs for a BART extension to Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch. Based on these estimates, construction of retaining walls and aerial structures for the BART Extension Alternative is estimated to be \$31 million. In actuality, the two main costs for the BART Extension Alternative are BART systems (communications, traction power, and train control) estimated at \$471 million and vehicles estimated at \$130 million.

**H1-S3. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Mr. Wilkin (dated October 13, 2008)**

- H1-S3.1 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.

**H1-S4. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Rod Flores (dated October 13, 2008)**

- H1-S4.1 The commentor notes how crowded SR 4 is in the westbound direction during the AM peak period and expresses support for a transit line from Hillcrest to Pittsburg. This comment supports the need for extended transit service into east Contra Costa County, and reinforces the information in Table 3.2-4 on page 3.2-11 of the Draft EIR, which identifies the poor level of service in the westbound direction in the morning.
- H1-S4.2 eBART Phase 1 service to Hillcrest Avenue is expected to be in operation by 2015. A date for transit service beyond Hillcrest Avenue has not been determined.

**H1-S5. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Johrene Thomas (dated October 13, 2008)**

- H1-S5.1 The commentor describes the difficulties and shortcomings of the bus system. 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.
- H1-S5.2 The commentor observes that travel times are lengthy during the commute periods. Table 5-10 on page 5-39 of the Draft EIR provides travel time comparisons between Hillcrest Avenue and the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station. The table shows that under the No Project Alternative, this trip would take approximately 21

minutes; whereas with the Proposed Project, this trip can be completed in 10 minutes. The Proposed Project would induce travelers to divert from driving along SR 4 and take eBART instead. As noted by the commentor, commuters cannot take advantage of the faster travel times if they cannot easily access eBART. Towards this end, the Proposed Project includes modifications to the Tri Delta Transit bus lines to better feed and connect to eBART.

**H1-S6. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by George Stikoresky (dated October 13, 2008)**

H1-S6.1 The commentor supports conventional BART rather than 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. Discussions of the Proposed Project's merits will occur during the upcoming BART Board public hearing. 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.

**H1-S7. Antioch Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Robert Allen (dated October 13, 2008)**

H1-S7.1 Please refer to Response 18.4 for answers to similar comments raised in Mr. Allen's comment letter about station staffing and a station at Century Boulevard.



Public Hearing 2

**East Contra Costa BART Extension  
eBART**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

City Hall  
65 Civic Avenue  
Pittsburg, California 94565

**MINUTES**

October 16, 2008

The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) conducted a Public Hearing at 7:00 P.M. to gather comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the East Contra Costa BART Extension (eBART).

Participants were encouraged to ask questions and fill out a comment book with any issues, concerns or questions he/she might have. There were approximately 40 people in attendance.

Stations were arranged to inform the public of the project and the process, with details on the:

- **PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) – COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**
- **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES – ATTAINMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES**
- **eBART PROPOSED PROJECT**
  - PITTSBURG AND ANTIOCH STATION MAPS**
  - TRANSFER STATION MAP**
  - ALIGNMENT MAP**
- **DMU [Diesel Motorized Unit] TECHNOLOGY**
- **COORDINATION BETWEEN eBART PROJECT AND HIGHWAY 4 WIDENING PROJECT**

The following were comments offered prior to the presentation:

H2-CS1.1

TERRY ROBINSON: "Quoting from a blue collar comedian, I say 'Git 'er done.' We in Pittsburg want it the sooner the better. It creates job. Why wait until 2009 and 2010. This would be an opportune time, like killing two birds with one stone. If they could just expedite the process. They're doing the environmental report and now they say they have to have final BART approval. If everything looks okay now, just expedite it. I think it's like I say, get people working too because there's a lot of layoffs."

eBART Public Hearing  
 October 16, 2008  
 Page 2

H2-CS1.2 "When I say kill two birds with one stone, not only will the project be very welcome here but it would get everyone working here."

H2-CS2.1 BRUCE OHLSON: "I'm Bruce Ohlson representing bicyclists in the City of Pittsburg and East Contra Costa County. Our concern is that the construction of BART or eBART will ignore the transportation needs of bicyclists both to cross the tracks and to get to the stations. We fear that BART will say it's not our job to be concerned with transportation issues other than the actual DMU or BART. We are very concerned with both being able to cross the tracks and to bicycle safely to the stations."

H2-CS3.1 MATTHEW CARMAN: "A gentleman I spoke to in the next booth had mentioned that you were expected to start as early as 2010 and have the entire project completed by 2015. How is this being funded, through the CCTA [Contra Costa Transportation Authority]?"

H2-CS3.2 We are very very excited. Myself and my neighbors are very very excited about having this come to the City of Pittsburg."

Ellen Smith, eBART Project Manager, explained to Mr. Carman that BART had six sources of funds, mostly through the County and the region, and that the project was 99 percent funded. She commented that eBART would be one of the keystones to rebuilding Pittsburg, and that eBART, the transit hubs and the growth that would take place around the facility would benefit not only the community but the region as well.

#### **INTRODUCTIONS**

Joan Chaplick from Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc. (MIG), a member of the BART team, emphasized the several ways members of the public could offer comments. She introduced BART Director Joel Keller to make comments.

Joel Keller, BART Director, District, 2, commented that this was an exciting time for BART, looking forward to an extension in Eastern Contra Costa County, which was long overdue and badly needed. He noted that anyone traveling on Highway 4 knew what that impact was. He explained that what had been proposed would eliminate one lane of traffic on Highway 4. He added that over the last several years a consensus had been developed as to how to move forward.

Director Keller emphasized that each comment from the public would be considered and recorded and identified with responses in the EIR, which would hopefully be certified by the BART Board of Directors in April 2009. He stated that BART was well on its way to have a project that was 99 percent funded, close enough to begin a rail extension to Eastern Contra Costa County. He thanked those present for their participation.

eBART Public Hearing  
October 16, 2008  
Page 3

**PRESENTATION – ELLEN SMITH, eBART PROJECT MANAGER, BART**

Ellen Smith, eBART Project Manager, also thanked those present for joining her in the important session which would not respond to comments but which would collect comments. She explained that the final document was expected to be issued in March 2009 and would identify each comment from speakers, those speaking before the group at large, to the court reporter in the room who would record individual one-on-one comments, and to those who submitted written comments. All comments would be included in the final document.

Ms. Smith identified the current public hearing as the second in a series of two meetings scheduled to collect comments on the environmental document. She explained that the purpose of the hearing was to follow CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act] law to collect comments from the public, make sure the comments were heard and include those comments in the environmental document. Comments were also being accepted from public agencies.

Ms. Smith reported that scoping hearings had been conducted, a reasonable range of alternatives had been selected, existing conditions in the cities of Antioch and Pittsburg had been identified, environmental impacts had been evaluated, mitigation measures had been adopted and the DEIR had been published. BART was now soliciting comments, to be responded to in the final document, with that document to be submitted to the BART Board of Directors in April 2009 asking the Board to adopt the project and advance it to procurement and construction.

Ms. Smith explained that eBART had been considered in 2001 although the funding was not available to build classic BART. She emphasized that BART was committed to bringing transit service out to East County as soon as possible and wanted to provide service. A feasibility study had been conducted by BART and the CCTA, which study had considered an alignment in the Mococo corridor using DMU technology. Work had stopped for lack of funding. In 2004, Measure J passed and Regional Measure 2 also passed which provided a large amount of funds from bridge tolls that had been dedicated to the project.

Ms. Smith identified the full eBART project corridor from the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station at the northeastern corner of the BART system, extended through Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley Brentwood and Byron/Discovery Bay. BART was currently considering a first phase for funding reasons only, 10 miles from the Pittsburg/Bay Point station through Railroad Avenue in Pittsburg to Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch. BART was considering four technologies along with a no build project.

eBART Public Hearing  
October 16, 2008  
Page 4

Ms. Smith presented examples of those technologies from a DMU train which was currently in service in New Jersey, Ottawa, Canada and San Diego County, a classic BART train, a light rail train similar to what was in service in Santa Clara County and Sacramento, and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) which had the capability of carrying almost as many riders as a train. Each of those technologies had been compared against a series of criteria and objectives provided by elected officials. eBART had been proposed in the median of Highway 4 with a 10-mile extension from the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station to a Railroad Avenue Station in Pittsburg and then to a Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch, using DMU vehicles. Capital costs had been identified as \$509 million. The project was currently 99 percent funded with a committed \$502 million.

Ms. Smith was confident that the resources could be found to cover the shortfall. She added that the total ride time from Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch to the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station would be 13 minutes. A transfer station located east of Bailey Road had been proposed. A video showed how the transit station would work in a seamless manner.

Ms. Smith explained that seamlessness between the BART technology and the eBART technology was one of the most important criteria. BART had spent a lot of time trying to work it out and not create impacts to the operation of the entire BART system. The next station would be at Railroad Avenue in Pittsburg. She explained that the Pittsburg Planning Department had worked through a Ridership Development Plan which looked at land uses around the station site. She described a pedestrian bridge from BART to City Hall in Pittsburg and explained that the City had committed to funding the station and parking and was working closely with BART in that effort. A formal agreement on funding by the City was expected.

With respect to Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch, Ms. Smith reported that there were four possible station sites, all to the east of Hillcrest Avenue before Highway 160. The funded station site had completed engineering. The next site was closer to the median with additional costs of \$30 million. If going outside the lanes, there would be two additional station options with stronger development opportunities. The third option would require an additional \$60 million in funding while the fourth site all the way out to SR 160 would require an additional \$80 million in funding. BART was working with the City of Antioch to determine which station was more appropriate.

Ms. Smith showed the DMU technology train which ran on ultra low sulfur fuel. She noted that the technology was very clean and would meet California and all environmental standards. The train would eliminate one full lane of Highway 4, take people off the freeway, reduce 99 million vehicle miles, and the amount of CO<sup>2</sup> released into the air would be reduced. The environmental analysis had evaluated transportation, land use, population and housing, visual quality, cultural resources, geology, hydrology, biology, air quality, public health and safety, community services, and utilities, among others.

eBART Public Hearing  
October 16, 2008  
Page 5

Ms. Smith advised that the proposal would actually improve freeway operations, help with air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reduce the use of energy and petroleum. Noting significant unavoidable environmental impacts, she reported that eastbound operations in the evening at the Hillcrest Avenue exit would add some traffic and some mitigations would have to be considered. She noted that eBART would represent 8 percent of the trips in 2030 although there would be cumulative impacts. The westbound on ramp in the morning would also be worse, and there would be noise and vibration associated with the construction phase.

The cost of the project was identified as \$509 million. Five hundred two million dollars was currently available. The project was therefore 99 percent funded. There had been questions as to whether or not the project would meet MTC expectations for development around it. MTC wanted dense development around train stations to take the maximum number of people off the road. The project was expected to meet those expectations.

Ms. Smith reported that the BART Board of Directors wanted to ensure that the appropriate ridership was available to justify the investment in the train station. Studies were in process and it looked as if the proposal would meet those expectations.

Ms. Smith advised that there were a number of ways to make comment on the environmental document; provide them now, speak at the comment station or provide written comments. After this meeting, she explained that comments could be received up to November 5, the deadline for responses. The environmental documentation was expected to go to the BART Board in April. The BART Board would evaluate the project against expectations, check on the funding and consider whether or not to advance the funds to construction.

Joan Chaplick opened up public comments at this time.

- H2-S1.1 MIKE LENGYAL: "I'm Mike Lengyal from Pittsburg and I'm glad you're working on this project but I have three desires to be considered. The first is the difference in premature deaths from diesel DMUs versus classic BART. What is the difference in premature death caused by air pollution? That's a cost to the community so that somehow should be figured into the project cost. The second thing that concerns me is the intermodal aspects seem very meager. There's an Amtrak train station in Antioch. There's going to be a ferry terminal in Antioch, and as I understand it, it will not leave Highway 4 in modality and there's also an infill and a potential ferry perhaps but the project looks like a cheaper version of BART, which has a limited intermodal aspect. The third thing that has bothered me for some time, a few years ago I was trying to put up some posters and there is nowhere where there is a possibility of a public member putting up notices so I think there should be room for a community bulletin board/community information kiosk where the public could put up its own information and commercial posters of community interest. I want to have a public kiosk aspect considered."
- H2-S1.2
- H2-S1.3

eBART Public Hearing  
 October 16, 2008  
 Page 6

H2-S2.1 BOB ALLEN: "I'm Bob Allen and I was a BART Director from 1974 to 1988, and a very good friend of Nello Bianco. And in the early days we did a lot with BART to get an extension in this direction. I'm ecstatic that the policy board decided to follow the median of the freeway instead of going along the railroad. The Mococo line is the only water level route from the Bay Area towards San Joaquin Valley and it probably will have a lot of heavy freight. It's certainly not anything that could be used for a transit type operation. In the freeway median there are no additional grade separations and there is no heavy structural work or earthwork required. The median is already basically protected against intrusion by trespassers. It's a very safe route to follow. I'm happy that the freeway median has been chosen. Beyond that I would urge that the BART extension be full BART rather than the DMU type and that the track be laid to BART gauge which is 5 feet 6 inches between the inside of the ball of the rail instead of 4 feet 8.5 inches. Seventeen percent wider. I don't know why the costs should be considered to be twice as much. I don't think that's a reasonable cost. The cost I have at BART grade based on BART historic costs escalated per Bay Area CPI-U would be about \$13.1 million per mile for the track way, double track, at grade with traction power, with train control. Putting in the DMU, a separate type of operation would require a new type of maintenance facility. It would require - if the track were not built to BART gauge, the difference between the rails, it would require - different maintenance equipment. It's better to keep it all the same gauge especially since there was no likelihood it would ever go on a freight gauge track. I urge a BART alternative to include a Pittsburg station. I see no reason why a Pittsburg station had not been included. It should be there and it shouldn't be any more trouble, especially since the station is being built in the median and there should be an additional station at Los Medanos College at Century Boulevard. That would be a different direction for people from Antioch. A lot of people from Antioch would come from the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station, crowd the freeway and avoid going to Hillcrest which is the opposite direction for most of them. I urge that this be full BART, double track in the middle of the freeway, that it extend down to tail tracks along the State Route 4 Bypass. The tail tracks will take care of car storage, that there be no flyover to get to a separate maintenance yard and that maintenance be performed at the current maintenance shop. I've written a number of these comments to the DEIR and I think getting a Pittsburg station in the BART alternative was the most important part of the program. It would avoid the cost of an interchange facility. It would also eliminate the cost of a maintenance facility leapfrogging over the westbound Route 4."

H2-S2.2

Ms. Chaplick asked if there were any other comments. She expressed her appreciation for those present and would like to hear additional comments.

H2-S3.1 ROB GILFETHER: "My only observation was that it would also seem that it would be a viable alternative to Pittsburg to have something near Somersville otherwise you would leave Pittsburg and have no stations. Also being involved with Amtrak and building stations and the like and when changing trains I've watched people get soaked in the winter time just going from here to there."

H2-S3.2

eBART Public Hearing  
October 16, 2008  
Page 7

H2-S3.3 "The train will stop at the same spot all the time. I don't see why you can't go BART all the way out. If you don't, I think there should be a way for people to get from the new train to the BART train. I take BART a lot and in the winter time it's a hassle. Across the top I remember we worked on the Amtrak at Jack London Square and we forgot the gutters. A

H2-S3.4 simple thing like that you think they would need gutters but they didn't. If you're going to build from here to point 'B,' you should have covers, that's all."

H2-S4.1 ED FRANZEN: "I'm Ed Franzen, City of Antioch, taking on his idea. I've been thinking about the same thing that from outside of train to outside of train should be covered and there should be solar panels on the top to help run the train and keep people dry."

H2-S5.1 MATTHEW CARMAN: "First thing, my neighbors we're excited about this thing coming to the area. No one, I think, is worried by diesel fumes and causing more deaths and things  
H2-S5.2 like that because it's going to actually take cars off the road. I love the thing about the solar  
H2-S5.3 panels. And the other thing too, if you're going anywhere, commuting to the City, it's raining in the Bay Area you're going to get wet, get off anywhere you're going to get wet.

H2-S5.4 Just focus on some transportation out here that we've been waiting for here. I mean the gauge, sounds great but, my God, it's taken forever. Let's take the narrow gauge and just get there."

H2-S6.1 ROB GILFETHER: " Why isn't the BART track all the way out?"

Joan Chaplick explained that question would be answered in the draft report.

H2-S7.1 GEORGE AVERY: "I'm George Avery and I'm from Antioch. I'm originally from Massachusetts and I grew up on the New Haven Railroad System, and in 1989 the State of Massachusetts stopped giving subsidies to New Haven Railroad and I'll tell you that was something that was devastating, and years went by and there was no freight on this section of the New Haven Railroad and the trees grew. They left the rails and the ties. And all of a sudden they had the Southwest Expressway which was the reason for canceling the subsidy. Then the "Big Dig" came along. The New Haven Railroad right-of-way, the deal on the Big Dig was to restore the three lines. Two of them were intact so they could bring them up to par and the trains were going and then we ran into the NIMBES, The thing is, when you have a change in your train going from one train to another it's not the same as if you're going to get on a train and go through. My desire

H2-S7.2 would be to have a station at Loveridge Road and bring BART here. You're going to have to creep and crawl to Antioch. But I think the idea of having two systems, more management, more yards to take care of this stuff, it's going to cost money. I would rather

H2-S7.3 see BART go piecemeal, go to Loveridge Road and then I think we'll have a real system. I hope it happens."

eBART Public Hearing  
October 16, 2008  
Page 8

When asked by an unidentified speaker if there would be any people at the eBART station, Joan Chaplick reiterated that there would be responses to those comments that would comprise the Final EIR (FEIR).

**H2-S8.1** ■ **MIKE LENGYAL:** "How much parking has been proposed?"

Director Keller thanked everyone for their comments and for taking the time to come out. He emphasized that the comments would be fully evaluated and become part of the document. He was persuaded that eBART would be a first class world class facility that everyone would be proud of it. He had ridden on similar systems in Europe. He also noted that there was a system between Oceanside and Escondido in San Diego County that was similar to eBART, had been very well received and was being utilized in that part of California. He thanked everyone for being very patient, stated that anything was better than nothing, and that nothing in the eBART Project would preclude a BART extension if the resources could be found and if the ridership justified the extension. He thanked everyone again for all their comments and looked forward to building the rail extension sometime in the next few years.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Public Hearing was adjourned at 8:15 P.M.



**H2-CS1. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Terry Robinson (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-CS1.1 The commentor expresses support for the Proposed Project and a desire to get the project underway as soon as possible. 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.

H2-CS1.2 As noted by the commentor, the Proposed Project would create new jobs in east Contra Costa County. As stated in Impact PH-1 on page 3.4-9 of the Draft EIR, operation of the Proposed Project would create 40 to 80 full-time equivalent positions and 33 additional jobs in the following sectors: Retail Trade; Health Care and Social Assistance; and Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services. During construction, the Proposed Project would also create 614 jobs in the Construction, Information, and Public Administration sector, as well as 367 additional jobs through the economic multiplier effect.

**H2-CS2. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Bruce Ohlson (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-CS2.1 The Proposed Project, with an alignment and a station in the median of SR 4, would not pose a hazard to bicyclists. For station options with out-of-the-median station platforms (such as Northside East or Northside West), streets would be grade separated where they cross revenue tracks. As noted in the revised discussion of Impact TR-8 of the Draft EIR (see Response 1.57 and Section 6, Revisions to the Draft EIR, in this document), bicycle facilities around the Railroad Avenue Station would be improved as part of the City of Pittsburg's Specific Plan. Similarly, the City of Antioch's Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan includes bicycle lanes in the vicinity of the Hillcrest Avenue Station.

**H2-CS3. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Matthew Carman (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-CS3.1 The commentor questions how the Proposed Project would be funded. As stated on page 2-38, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, project funding is provided by a combination of revenues from Contra Costa County's transportation sales tax (Measure J) and State and regional funds. These sources would fund the \$502 million escalated capital costs of the Proposed Project. As identified in MTC's Regional Transit Improvement Program, adopted as Resolution No. 3839, the Proposed Project's funding plan involves the sources listed in Table 2-5 on page 2-39 of the Draft EIR, including bridge tolls, state funds, Contra Costa Measure J funds, and money from the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and

Financing Authority. The largest single source of funding comes from the CCTA Measure J, which would provide approximately \$175 million to the Proposed Project, net of program and finance costs as reflected in the Measure J Strategic Plan. The costs for any additional phases of the project are not included in the funding plan. The Proposed Project currently has approximately \$502 million in secured project funding. A more detailed discussion of project funding is presented on pages 2-38 through 2-41 of the Draft EIR.

H2-CS3.2 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.

**H2-S1. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Mike Lengyal (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S1.1 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. Regarding the difference in health risks between the Proposed Project and the BART Extension Alternative, Section 5, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR (page 5-152) explains that the BART Extension Alternative would not increase toxic air contaminants (TACs) exposure to individuals living near the alignment because propulsion under this alternative would be from electricity. As a result, impacts from exposure to TACs would be even less than the less-than-significant effects identified for the Proposed Project. Impact AQ-7 in Section 3.11, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR describes the health risks that would result from the Proposed Project. The maximum modeled cancer risk from exposure to DMU particulate matter emissions is three in one million at the maximally exposed individual (MEI). The MEI is the location of highest modeled impact at a residence and assumes an individual would be present at this location for 70 years. In other words, the analysis predicts that there is a chance that three more people in a million would get cancer over a 70-year exposure period due to the Proposed Project. Additional details and information regarding the health risk assessment (HRA) are provided on page 3.11-27 of the Draft EIR. Also, please refer to Master Response 5 in Section 3 of this document regarding the health risks of the Proposed Project.

H2-S1.2 Consistent with the BART System Expansion Policy, the Proposed Project would extend transportation services to communities currently not served by rail transit, as discussed on page 1-10 of the Draft EIR. Stations would be designed to provide intermodal regional links to bus, shuttle, automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian

networks. The Proposed Project would enhance the public's access to jobs, education, shopping, and social activities throughout the Bay Area.

Although the Proposed Project would not leave the SR 4 median, as stated by the commentor, intermodal transport would still be able to connect with BART. As stated in Section 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, access to the stations would be provided via pedestrian overcrossings and bridges (see pages 2-9, 2-17, and 2-19 of the Draft EIR). From outside of SR 4, BART riders would be able to transfer to other modes of transportation such as buses, shuttles, automobiles, bicycles, and pedestrian linkages.

In particular, Tri Delta Transit would serve the Proposed Project and connect BART via bus to locations across east Contra Costa County. As stated on page 3.2-26 in Section 3.2, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, Tri Delta Transit operates 16 local bus routes Monday thru Friday, including four express services, and three local bus routes during weekends and holidays. Regarding the commentor's concern about connection of the Proposed Project to the Amtrak train station in Antioch, Tri Delta Transit Route 387 would link Amtrak with BART.

The commentor also expressed concern about a potential ferry terminal in Antioch and how the Proposed Project would not connect with this ferry. The ferry terminal is currently under study by the City and the Water Emergency Transit Authority, and bus connections to the ferry service would be developed as part of that proposal. Tri Delta Transit Route 387, which currently travels within the vicinity of the Antioch Marina, may be able to link the Proposed Project with the potential ferry terminal, although this route would be subject to approval by Tri Delta Transit.

- H2-S1.3 The commentor requests a community bulletin board or other space available to the public for posting notices. The request for comments during the Draft EIR public review period is intended to solicit comments on the adequacy of the document to characterize the Proposed Project's impacts. The Draft EIR was prepared to fulfill BART's obligation under CEQA to identify the significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project, regardless of the Proposed Project's merit. Accordingly, the commentor's opinion regarding public kiosks at the station is a matter outside the scope of CEQA and will be reviewed further by BART.

**H2-S2. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Robert Allen (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S2.1 The commentor expresses support that the Proposed Project would follow the SR 4 median, rather than the Mococo Line. 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.

H2-S2.2 Please refer to Response 18.1 for issues related to track gauge, the transfer platform, the flyover, and the maintenance facility, and to Response 18.2 for issues related to project costs. Response 18.3 addresses comments about car storage. These responses address comments raised by Mr. Allen in his written comments. Operation of the DMU would require a maintenance facility different from a BART maintenance facility, but the DMU maintenance facility would occupy less land than a BART maintenance facility and would cost less to build and operate. Construction of a maintenance facility for the DMU is estimated to cost \$28 million compared to \$125 million for a BART maintenance facility, which helps to reduce overall project costs.

As noted in Response 18.4, a BART station at Century Boulevard would be approximately 3 miles from the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station, which is too close to an existing station. Typically, BART prefers its stations 4 to 5 miles apart in suburban areas for BART extensions. In addition, a station at Century Boulevard was previously considered and did not satisfy other siting considerations including accessibility, supportive land uses, and constructability.

**H2-S3. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Rob Gilfether (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S3.1 A station at Century Boulevard, about one mile west of Somersville Road, was considered but was rejected. There is very limited space available at Somersville Road for a station and Century Boulevard was the closest location where there was land available. A station at Los Medanos (Century Boulevard) was considered for a possible station site during the original feasibility study of the Proposed Project. However, it did not meet the criteria used to identify potential station sites, which included the following considerations:

- Station spacing – Century Boulevard is 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 nearby Somerville 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 will 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.

H2-S3.2 The transfer platform at the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station, where BART and DMU passengers would transfer, would have a canopy over the central portion of the platform to protect patrons from the weather. The typical station cross-section (see Figure 2-6 on page 2-14 of the Draft EIR) shows that the width of the canopy would nearly extend across the entire station platform, except for 2 feet at either end.

H2-S3.3 The commentor asks why BART cannot be extended. Please refer to Master Response 1 in Section 3 of this document concerning BART’s decision to pursue the DMU technology, rather than extending existing BART technology, and to Master Response 2 in Section 3 of this document regarding BART’s evaluation of providing conventional BART technology.

H2-S3.4 Please refer to Response H2-S3.2 above regarding design features that would protect passengers from the weather.

**H2-S4. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Ed Franzen (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S4.1 The transfer platform at the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station, where BART and DMU passengers would transfer, would have a canopy over the central portion of the platform to protect patrons from the weather. The typical station cross-section (see Figure 2-6 on page 2-14 of the Draft EIR) shows that the width of the canopy would nearly extend across the entire station platform, except for 2 feet at either end. Solar panels at the transfer platform are not currently planned, but could be

added during the next stage of design. BART is actively experimenting with generating solar power from structures on BART property. Currently, solar panels are being installed at the Orinda BART Station, the Hayward Yard, and the Richmond Yard as part of solar demonstration projects.

**H2-S5. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Matthew Carman (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S5.1 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.

H2-S5.2 The potential public health concerns due to exposure to diesel fuel emissions from the DMU trains are addressed in Master Response 5 in Section 3 of this document. As noted by the commentor, these health impacts would be offset, in part, by the reduced automobile emissions as commuters who drove their vehicles would switch to the Proposed Project.

H2-S5.3 Solar panels are not currently planned, but could be added during the next stage of design. BART is actively experimenting with generating solar power from structures on BART property. Currently, solar panels are being installed at the Orinda BART Station, the Hayward Yard, and the Richmond Yard as part of solar demonstration projects.

H2-S5.4 The commentor expresses support for the Proposed Project and constructing the project as quickly as possible. 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.

**H2-S6. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Rob Gilfether (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S6.1 Please refer to Master Response 1 in Section 3 of this document concerning BART's decision to pursue the DMU technology, rather than extending existing BART technology.

**H2-S7. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by George Avery (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S7.1 The comment addresses the merits of the BART Extension Alternative and not having to transfer from one train to another train. BART recognizes that inconvenient transfers between travel modes have an adverse effect on ridership. It

is for this reason that BART has taken considerable care to design the transfer platform and to schedule the BART and DMU trains so that transfers are convenient and without significant wait times.

H2-S7.2 A number of criteria were used to select station sites, such as:

- Station spacing;
- Density of existing and potential future development;
- Accessibility from the local and regional highway network;
- Potential transit connections;
- Constructability; and
- Ridership.

Loveridge Road did not meet the criteria for a station site because the location is too close to the Railroad Avenue Station and there is no land available for a station at Loveridge Road.

H2-S7.3 The commentor expresses support for the BART Extension Alternative to Loveridge Road, rather than paying for two systems. The previous Response H2-S7.2 provides an explanation why a station at Loveridge Road was rejected. Other reasons why the DMU project is cost effective now, rather than the BART Extension Alternative, are found in Master Response 1 in Section 3 of this document.

**H2-S8. Pittsburg Public Meeting - Public Hearing Comments by Mike Lengyal (dated October 16, 2008)**

H2-S8.1 At the Hillcrest Avenue Station, 1,000 parking spaces would be provided in the year of opening (2015), with an additional 1,600 parking spaces (for a total of 2,600 spaces) provided by 2030. At the Railroad Avenue Station, 300 parking spaces would be provided in the year of opening (2015).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK