



Community Dialogues – BART to Livermore Workshop 3 of 3

The Shrine Event Center | 170 Lindbergh Avenue, Livermore
Thursday, January 21, 2010 | 6:30 pm – 9:00 pm

MEETING SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 21, 2010, the City of Livermore hosted the third in a three-part series of community dialogues to discuss Station Area Planning for BART stations proposed in Livermore. The purpose of the meeting was:

- to educate participants about the BART station area types and related planning concerns and benefits;
- to facilitate discussion and collect input about Isabel/I-580, Greenville, and Vasco stations;
- to discuss the nine identified community objectives and how they are achieved by Isabel/I-580, Greenville, and Vasco stations; and,
- to work in groups and collectively prioritize nine community objectives as high, middle, and lowest priorities.

Background

Since the 1960's, BART development plans included service along the Union Pacific Railroad with a station in Downtown Livermore. Since then, BART acquired land near Isabel and Greenville in the 1980's, relocated the alignment to I-580 and the City of Livermore identified BART extension and transit-oriented development (TOD) in the General Plan.

Comprehensive planning is essential to ensuring the appropriate and most feasible BART station areas are planned within the City of Livermore. BART is conducting a Program EIR that assesses potential alignments and station sites. Results from this workshop process will help outline a strategy for future Station Area Planning, when actual station sites are known, and inform the City Council and Tri-Valley Regional Rail Policy Working Group's recommendation to the BART Board.

The City of Livermore hosted the first of a three-part series of community dialogues on November 12, 2009. At the meeting, participants learned about the components of BART Station Area Planning, discussed priorities related to BART station place types,

and provided input regarding the important qualities and features for proposed BART station types in Livermore.

The City hosted the second of the three part series of community dialogues on December 10, 2009. At the meeting, participants learned about the components of BART Station Area Planning; discussed how different station qualities can help the community achieve the goals outlined in the City's General Plan; selected station pairs that best achieve the City's goals; and, provided input regarding images that best illustrate desired station type characteristics.

Meeting Agenda and Format

The third and final workshop was held on January 21, 2010. At this meeting, Council Member John Marchand welcomed participants and provided brief opening remarks. Council Member Jeff Williams was also in attendance. Council Member Marchand then introduced Gregory Tung of Freedman Tung & Sasaki of the project consulting team. Mr. Tung described the team's approach to station area planning and introduced the informational presentation that was shared with the group. Joan Chaplick of MIG, Inc. served as the meeting facilitator. Also in attendance from the City of Livermore project team were Linda Barton, Steve Sweeney, Marc Roberts, Cheri Sheets, Bob Vinn, and Debbie Bell. Malcolm Quint, of BART was also in attendance. An additional 13 city staff members provided facilitation and recording assistance for the small group discussions.

Mr. Tung reviewed the first and second Community Dialogue meeting presentations and community discussion results. Following this, Mr. Tung gave a comprehensive presentation on the project's background, station planning concerns and benefits, community goals, priorities, and station area character and design. The power point presentation and other meeting materials can be found on the City's website at:

http://www.ci.livermore.ca.us/eng/BART_docs/BARTworkshops.html#BARTtoLivermorWS3

Mr. Tung then turned the meeting over to Ms. Chaplick who invited meeting participants to ask questions related to the presentation.

II. INDIVIDUAL EXERCISE

After a short break, Ms. Chaplick provided instructions for the individual exercise. This exercise asked participants to identify the extent to which the three non-Downtown stations achieve community objectives. The nine objectives used in the exercise were distilled from the first and second Community Dialogue individual worksheet and group discussion results. The nine identified community objectives (not listed in any priority order) include:

Community Objectives

- (A) Provide San Joaquin County commuter/freeway access and parking.
- (B) Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking
- (C) Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (Isabel/I-580 – 1 mile walk)

- (D) Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.
- (E) Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion
- (F) Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion
- (G) Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary
- (H) Provide ACE – BART Transfer
- (I) Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing)

The individual worksheets are referred to at the end of the discussion exercise. The results of the exercise are tabulated below:

Community Objectives – Individual Results

The following tallies for Isabel/I-580, Greenville, and Vasco BART Stations represents the top three ranking community objectives out of nine total objectives (A-I) in each category (Achieves, Partially Achieves, and Does Not Achieve).

Isabel/I-580

Rank	Achieves – Top Ranking	Number of Votes
1 st	C. Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (Isabel/I-580 – 1 mile walk)	57
2 nd	E. Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion	34
3 rd	A. Provide San Joaquin County commuter/freeway access and parking.	33
Partially Achieves – Top Ranking		
1 st	F. Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion.	36
2 nd	B. Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking.	35
3 rd	I. Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing)	29
Does Not Achieve – Top Ranking		
1 st	H. Provide ACE – BART Transfer	62
2 nd	D. Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.	61
3 rd (tie)	G. Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary	34
3 rd (tie)	I. Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing)	34

Greenville

Rank	Achieves – Top Ranking	Number of Votes
1 st	A. Provide San Joaquin County commuter/freeway access and parking.	66
2 nd	F. Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion	51
3 rd	E. Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion	46

Partially Achieves – Top Ranking

1 st	D. Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.	41
2 nd	B. Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking	33
3 rd	I. Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing)	32

Does Not Achieve – Top Ranking

1 st	C. Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (Isabel/I-580 – 1 mile walk)	63
2 nd	G. Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary	43
3 rd	I. Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing)	32

Vasco

Rank	Achieves – Top Ranking	Number of Votes
1 st	H. Provide ACE – BART Transfer.	65
2 nd	D. Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.	64
3 rd	G. Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary.	57

Partially Achieves – Top Ranking

1 st	E. Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion.	37
2 ^{rd (tie)}	B. Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking.	27
2 ^{rd (tie)}	F. Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion.	27
3 rd	A. Provide San Joaquin County commuter/freeway access and parking.	19

Does Not Achieve – Top Ranking

1 st	C. Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (Isabel/I-580 – 1 mile walk).	64
2 nd	D. Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.	11
3 rd	B. Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking.	6

III. GROUP DISCUSSION

After completing the Individual exercise, participants were asked to work in small groups and discuss identified community objectives. Each group prioritized the community objectives into high, middle, and lowest categories. They were asked to do this process three times, one for each priority level and explain their choices and record their comments on the group worksheet.

A staff facilitator and recorder helped keep the discussion on track and record the group results on a worksheet. Members of the consulting team were available to answer questions during the discussion period.

A total of fourteen small groups, with 8-10 participants each, completed this exercise. A representative from each group shared the results of the group's discussion. An overall tally of the results was kept as they reported out. (Please note that after the workshop, the results tally was cross-checked with the worksheets to correct any tallying errors that may have occurred during the meeting.)

The following is a summary of groups' comments from this discussion. Individual worksheet results, group discussion results, and written comment cards received at the Community Workshop are attached as an Appendix to this summary.

Community Objectives

The following tallies for Top Priority, Middle Priority and Lowest Priority Community Objectives identify the ranking order of community objectives (A-I) for each priority level.

Top Three Priorities – Group Votes

Rank	Top Priority Community Objectives	Total Number of Groups
1 st	B. Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking.	9
2 nd (tie)	A. Provide San Joaquin County commuter/freeway access and parking.	7
2 rd (tie)	I. Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing).	7

Additional Community Objectives Selections

3 rd	G. Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary.	5
4 th	F. Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion.	4.5
5 th	H. Provide ACE – BART Transfer.	4
6 th	D. Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.	3
7 th	E. Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion.	2
8 th	C. Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (Isabel/I-580 – 1 mile walk).	1

Middle Three Priorities – Group Votes

Rank	Middle Three Priority Community Objectives	Total Number of Groups
1 st	D. Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.	9.5
2 nd (tie)	E. Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion.	7
2 nd (tie)	H. Provide ACE – BART Transfer.	7

Additional Community Objectives Selections

3 rd	F. Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion.	4.5
4 th	B. Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking.	4
5 th	G. Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary.	3
6 th	C. Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (Isabel/I-580 – 1 mile walk).	2.5
7 th (tie)	A. Provide San Joaquin County commuter/freeway access and parking.	2
7 th (tie)	I. Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing).	2

Lowest Three Priorities – Group Votes

Rank	Lowest Three Priority Community Objectives	Total Number of Groups
1 st	C. Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (Isabel/I-580 – 1 mile walk).	10.5
2 nd (tie)	G. Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary.	5
2 nd (tie)	E. Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion.	5
2 nd (tie)	F. Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion.	5
2 nd (tie)	A. Provide San Joaquin County commuter/freeway access and parking.	5
2 nd (tie)	I. Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing).	5

Additional Community Objectives Selections

3 rd	H. Provide ACE – BART Transfer.	3
4 th	D. Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the future science and technology center.	1.5
5 th	B. Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking.	1

IV. Report Backs and Next Steps

Upon completion of the group interactive exercise, Ms. Chaplick invited a representative from each group to share their group’s key findings and points of discussion.

The workshop was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

BART IS COMING TO LIVERMORE!

COMMUNITY MEETING

Thursday, December 10, 2009

Comment Card Results

- Be very wary about expecting a large ridership associated with LLNL and Sandia Labs. A large percentage of employees either live in Livermore or points north and east of Livermore in communities that will not “ever” see BART service. Please contact the labs for a resident analysis. In addition, I’m extremely concerned about noise abatement surrounding the trackways as they travel through existing low density neighborhoods. I understand that (particularly along the UPRR right-of-way) it will not increase the noise beyond the trains that already run there. However, there is a big difference between a train a few times a day and one every 15 minutes.
- What is the cost factor compare – surface/raised? Understand that “subway” is 26% higher than surface. Older residents do not wish to have stations within city limits – and very confused about the parking involved.
- My opinion is that protection of the urban growth boundary is essential!
- I believe that the BART station being close to Las Positas College because I would utilize that very often. Castro Valley and Dublin/Pleasanton stations do not provide adequate seating or shelter. For at-grade station, Bayfair is more comfortable. Hate the Dublin/Pleasanton roof-line.
- It seems that any underground segment accounted for in the Isabel/Downtown pairing would be very similar to any underground segment needed for Downtown/Vasco pairing. Is this true? I’m a big fan of Downtown/Vasco, but I think underground would be better. Also it seems like underground wouldn’t need to occur until North Livermore/Junction area. Wouldn’t it let more of the trackway be elevated/surface?
- BART needs to go to downtown and Vasco.
- I would hope that we can keep traffic off of local streets. Especially downtown.
- I wish more attention would be paid to the Portola hybrid proposal. A route down Portola appears in documents on the BART web site but doesn’t seem to get much discussion.
- Vasco!
- Do it right, build a station downtown with underground track. Vasco Road is a superior choice to Greenville Road. Having easy access to Livermore Lab is a great idea. This could provide significant BART ridership. Surprisingly BART will not help freeway traffic. When BART starts and people see the freeway is not as congested it will fill in again.

- Please forward the graphics to BART showing the Isabel Station constraints of the Airport Protection Area and Urban Growth Boundary...it's needed in the FEIR! Add the Greenville fault zones to the graphics for the Greenville Station Area. I love hybrid: Downtown and Vasco below grade (with optional future Isabel).
- Top priorities are determined by supporting Livermore citizen benefits and protecting core values of UGB, jobs and TOD. Las Positas access is important but may be best achieved with other modalities.
- The Downtown station is very important because it will stimulate and preserve the downtown cultural and economic development for years to come. City centered growth should be our goal. Vasco provides TOD, protects the UGB, supports technology development near the labs. Isabel and Vasco provide limited TOD and break the UGB. They should be avoided.
- I would like Livermore BART station to come downtown. It would help maintain the existence of businesses and theaters in the downtown area for future generations. Many people will use BART to come to the theaters and restaurants from nearby cities to Livermore. Theaters, shops, restaurants and hotels in Livermore can be a visitors' destination and BART can be a way to get to the destination. Vasco would be my pairing choice of stations.
- Downtown station very important – brings more people downtown; new, larger theater would be served; good access for Livermore residents. Vasco best partner with downtown.
- I feel that serving the existing population and providing TOD are the top priorities for BART service.
- Support Downtown and Vasco stations. Most important objectives are B, G, I which (B) provide Livermore residents, (G) protect the Urban Growth Boundary and (I) ensure potential TOD.
- The maintenance of the UGB was more important from table comments than the leader reported.
- Please start on time and end on time. Many of us work and need to get in and out of meetings as quickly as possible. Probably could have done less summarizing of past workshop. Would have liked more time for Q&A and more time for dialogue.
- Subway down Portola/Junction – Downtown at grade to Vasco.
- Important to bring BART downtown (underground) to enhance downtown living, dining, shopping and entertainment options. Vasco is best for TOD and ACE-BART alignment.
- Connect BART to Isabel within two years. After that continue it as next addition and go to Greenville. If you don't get it done fast we will never get to use it.
- I believe there are two major considerations. One is what is ideal. Second is what is feasible. We should determine what is ideal and ask for it. Let the finances decide what gets built.
- Since I've been paying a BART tax for most of my adult life, I think a station in Livermore should be built before any other additions to the BART system. 2035 is too long to wait!

- Least invasive and costly would be freeway only, no downtown. BART is regional – greatest number served by freeway stations.
- A very good series of workshops. Thank you for including us in the process.
- I definitely support having a downtown station and the Vasco Road station. I feel it would be best if prior to these “workshops” the bullies need to allow other people to have different opinions. And not shove their personal opinions on everyone else, and then get upset if people choose to disagree. Tonight went well until we went to table discussion.
- Site the BART station – Greenville, Quarry, Isabel, etc. – urban growth boundary will change to accommodate. Greenville is straw man – North Front Road east of Vasco allows level and infill – not presented as option. If Pleasanton does not like Quarry, run BART east of airport then downtown west side of Isabel to Stanley – cheaper than Portola tunnel. Or just tunnel under airport runway. The example of TOD in the DOT brochure, Ballston Station in Arlington, VA is a nightmare to drive around. Like that would ruin downtown, it’s not at all like Walnut Creek BART. Environment – contract to buy less noisy BART trains – technological fix. Plan R&D now. Mufflers on air brakes on wheels buses, hybrid wheels buses, obviate underground. Put Isabel I-580 station out near Las Positas College – lots of infill there – growth boundary will move (allowing water). High speed rail best going southeast of Lab, south of town toward Sunol. High speed rail begs Greenville.
- Keep BART on the freeway! The students need BART for transportation. Livermore Lab will take care of their workers with a shuttle that the Lab will pay for!
- No downtown! Buses work well.
- I feel that you should think about the students at Las Positas College who could use this station. The freeway is a nightmare, why wouldn’t you want them off the road if they could use BART to get to their job. Keep it out of my backyard. I already have the train and ACE in my backyard and I don’t want BART back there. Keep it on the freeway. You don’t have to build housing to get riders. They will use it if they need it.
- Most important for me personally is a noise impact for El Rancho Drive. Good – easing congestion on freeway and local streets is very important. And it would be good to be close to the college. It would also be somewhat useful for the LLNL employees.

Please note: the following four comments were submitted as separate letters.

1. BART to Isabel I-580 soon. 2. Don’t louse up Livermore. 3. Demonstrate BART noise in Livermore.

A very important key environmental factor is noise. Our small valley is already the home of over 200,000 people. So far we have the noise impacts on a 24/7 basis of a major freeway with the many thousands of cars and trucks unregulated as to their noise pollution and only partially regulated as to air pollution. Also 24/7 railroad and a 24/7

airport trying to become a jetport. The power company subsidizes the running of pool pumps during our sleeping hours. Our small valley like the Los Angeles Basin is subject to thermal inversion resulting in bad air days and increased noise pollution. Our small valley could be likened to a good hearted woman who is deserving of care.

In your November 18 and January 6 meetings I made the suggestion that a demonstration of BART'S noise should be made first for the people of Livermore and Pleasanton as a part of a complete EIR report. BART should retain the expertise of an experienced and independent acoustical consultant to first make recordings of the grade and aerial BART trains in San Leandro and Oakland. Then the recordings should be played for 3 days, as the train schedules, sequentially at the worst locations of all 9 of the alignment alternatives. There should be 2 to 4 loudspeaker locations on each route depending on its length with 360 degree noise coverage. The standards and protocols of ASTM should be followed. This procedure will be very prudent before more valuable time and money are wasted on wild goose chases over the years.

A maintenance yard for BART does not belong in our primarily residential and fragile valley but rather in one of the bay area industrial sections. A major objective is to improve our valley and not to screw it up after our 46 year \$260 million wait for BART.

BART'S \$1.12 to \$3.8 billion alternates do not include the massive additional cost and time of underground trains if such is feasible in our earthquake zone? Even the majority of the speakers from Livermore at the meeting who favor downtown indicated a preference for underground as quieter. However, given that, they are in the minority as a vote would confirm.

Your BART website indicates that your 3.2 mile extension in Oakland will create or support over 13,000 jobs. Our 5.2 mile extension to Isabel on I-580 will create even more jobs which are desperately needed now. Alternate 4 is shovel ready for stimulus money.

Forty years ago we lived in Cedar Grove, New Jersey. Some days my work took me to Manhattan. I drove to Weehawken and then took the Park and Ride bus through the Lincoln Tunnel to Manhattan and connected with the subway system. The parking was free and secure and the fare competitive. Why isn't this duplicated from land rich Tracy to our existing BART station in the valley? It could be implemented in several months with reduced freeway traffic, pollution, wasted time and gasoline consumption plus increased fare revenues. Some day BART may be powered by the electricity generated by solar and wind in the hills between here and Tracy.

A few years prior to 1970 we lived in the Queens Borough of New York City. The rentals and house prices were higher the further you were located from the noisy elevated (aerial) IRT trains. Downtown BART in Livermore would make a few people very rich at

the expense of thousands of the present homeowners. Many aerial train tracks have been torn down. Been there, done that.

California's great Central Valley is severely depressed and improved transportation will help to make California more competitive and solvent. The importation of petroleum must be reduced. Time must be saved for many thousands of Californians. A positive impact should be made on our environment sooner rather than later! Let us not continue to kick the can down the road for the 10 to 25 years estimated by BART Director McPartland in the November 18 meeting.

I attended the previous two route and site workshops. They were very good well run and very informative.

At these workshops, the various route and site rating questions may have inadvertently been a little directed. After rating the various routes and sites based on the questions, the choice seemed obvious. The obvious choice appeared to be the route to come down El Charro and through the Quarries then along Stanley Boulevard to downtown Livermore, then continuing along the railroad to the Vasco Road (Ace Station) site. This would be the end of Track, other than a maintenance yard somewhere.

The principal advantage of this paired set of stations was the pedestrian access and the potential for a Transit Village. The downtown station would also blend into the plans for the realignment of Railroad Avenue plus a dual use parking facility to be shared with the proposed 2000 seat Theater. However after thinking about this I now realize the negatives to this option outweigh the advantages.

Start off with the El Charro-Quarry alignment. This would be in litigation for years. It would have to be an elevated system, plus the City of Pleasanton, the Quarry owners and probably Zone 7 will attack that alignment for several reasons including the master plan for the proposed "Chain of Lakes". For these reasons Alameda County will probably join in with the objections. While there should be adequate separation from end of the airport runways an elevated structure may be a problem for the FAA, especially if anyone starts a letter writing campaign to DC. This route will undoubtedly stir challenges to any EIR, thus creating more delays and litigation.

Secondly the route along Stanley Boulevard through Livermore would have to be elevated. A double set of elevated tracks through Livermore would create a crowded right of way, and an overhead downtown station would be massive. An elevated track through Livermore would create a visual and physical divider to Livermore, much like BART and the Old Cypress section of 1-880 was to west Oakland. The possible undergrounding of this line is not really practical. In addition to the expense and disruption of utilities it would destroy the underpasses at Isabel Avenue (84), "P" Street and North Livermore Avenue.

Finally the option of accessing downtown Livermore by the means of an underground system under the present Portola Avenue is not practical. It would be very costly and would move the station site east. When you apply a 1500 foot radius to transition from under Portola Avenue to the Railroad right of way it would probably push the station site at or beyond Inman Street before it would be parallel with the railroad tracks. This location would be a quarter of a mile from the current downtown business district and almost a half mile from the proposed 2000 seat Theater site. This location would then be at the eastern edge of any possible Transit Village development. The Vasco Road site has many potentials and very few drawbacks, however unless this site paired with downtown Livermore, this site is neither practical or possible.

This leaves us with the two freeway sites, Isabel and Greenville. This freeway route and pairing has several obvious advantages and few physical or visual objections. The I-580 corridor exists therefore right of way acquisitions would be minimal with no apparent litigation potholes. BART already has large undeveloped land holdings north of the freeway and east of Herman Avenue. The Greenville site located south of the freeway and east of Greenville Road is currently undeveloped.

The Isabel Avenue/I-580 site would serve Las Positas College and would probably be the principal station for the Livermore residents requiring a fairly large parking facility. However, this site basically on the City's bike trail and easy has direct access to any connecting bus routes. This site is within area covered by the "Save our Hills" ordinance, therefore a high density, high rise Transit Village would not be allowed. Personally I don't think this all bad as I do not want Livermore to look like Dublin.

The Greenville site is a natural. The existing Railroad track is situated part way up the hill, allowing a proposed BART station to be constructed adjacent to and below. There is ample room for a major parking lot. This site is an ideal location to intercept vehicle traffic from San Joaquin County to access either BART to Oakland and SF or ACE to San Jose. A Transit Village is not practical at this location. This station would be primarily a transfer station, for use by the residents of San Joaquin County or the Brentwood Area. It would substantially lower the traffic count on I-580, this is the prime force in obtaining funding for a BART project.

The pairing of the two I-580 locations is the most practical from both construction and financial aspects. While not being the Cadillac solution desired by many, I believe they have the best chance of being approved and funded. We will need to justify our choice to obtain the financial backing needed to construct the project. This route will cost 113 that of the downtown route, and stands a chance of approval in months rather than after years of litigation. We have a once in lifetime chance to get BART, lets not blow it with impractical dreams. Personally this is plan that BART has had for many years, approval of this alignment will help BART and will speed up the design work and construction.

BART is a regional (Bay Area) transportation system. An eastward extension from Dublin/Pleasanton (D/P) should most expeditiously (least cost, quickest execution, minimum impact on existing residents and businesses) expand BART availability to Tri-Valley residents and those in San Joaquin County and beyond. As a regional system it must coordinate with the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), sharing a station location. It should be confined to the major regional transportation corridor, contiguous with I-580. Alternative 1 most strongly fulfills these requirements; -I-580 alignment with stations at Isabel and Greenville.

The other Alternatives carry a variety of design features that make them inferior to Alternative 1.

Alternatives 3 and 3a have the easternmost station, the terminus, in downtown Livermore. These should be considered non-starters simply because of the need for any easternmost station to provide access and parking for the daily commuters from the Central Valley as well as locals. Visualize parking accommodations greater than that at D/P (already inadequate at that station) in Livermore's downtown core, and the daily flood of traffic from the freeway down First Street to the station. That in itself would redefine the character of downtown. Furthermore those Alternatives include a major industrial facility, the maintenance yard, along much of the First Street entrance to the City, inconsistent with new zoning planning that would make the City portals inviting rather than industrial.

Proponents of a downtown station, most notably a variation of Alternative 3a with a terminus (and maintenance yard) at Vasco appear to believe this a low-impact Alternative with great economic benefit to the City. Alternative 1 along I-580, will be a "stealth" project compared to the construction and operation impacts to a subset of Livermore residents. That subset will bear the burden of construction - including loss of some homes and businesses, and impacts of noise and vibration during operation - some of which cannot be mitigated according to the P-EIR. Even the underground portion along Portola to the station is not without its impacts - beyond the noise and vibration of the construction period - as power stations and ventilators distributed along the route are noted as significant potential noise sources - day and night. Livermore residents should not be subjected to these impacts when they are not necessary.

The reality of economic benefit is hard to judge. It's been noted that Pleasanton hasn't opted to bring regional transportation downtown (a BART spur?). Livermore's attractions, like Pleasanton's, must be a strong-enough draw in themselves to bring strollers to downtown - without the expense or need for a downtown BART station. Building the downtown station to bootstrap a weak or optimistic City business plan would be a mistake. Furthermore, BART is but a narrow linear transportation lane heading west out of (or east into) the valley. It's not a 360 degree accumulator of people

wanting to come to Livermore. If there is such a 360-degree population out there, BART will serve only a small fraction of them. A strongly attractive Livermore, with local BART stations - even though not downtown - will get Livermore merchants together with them and their money.

Transit-Oriented Development is described as an important feature in obtaining funding and maintaining the vitality of the BART service. It consists of high-density housing and people-oriented businesses clustered within a half mile of a BART station with the synergy of TOD and BART being important. A half-mile circle around a downtown Livermore BART station encompasses all of "historic downtown". If developed as other TOD districts (see, for example the Pleasant Hill station area north of Walnut Creek) it would dramatically redefine the character of the community.

Transit-Oriented Development in the vicinity of any station will provide but a fraction of the local ridership. The rest of the local BART customers will arrive in local transport modes - busses, taxis - or by private auto. In fact, of the Livermore riders, if uniformly distributed throughout the City, will get to the station in those vehicles. Little will it matter to them, once sitting in their favorite vehicle, whether the station is downtown or on the freeway, distances won't be an issue - just so it has good access and parking. The historic downtown core - restaurants, theater, etc., the wine country, and other local attractions, unchanged by BART infrastructure and its TOD component will be easily accessible with dedicated bus services. We're talking 15 years away; creative, green (hydrogen-powered?), uniquely designed "busses" can be part of the local character - and probably less costly than downtown-station alternatives.

Maintenance Yards.

Maintenance yards are described as being noise, vibration, and light pollution sources during construction and in operation (perhaps) 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. A new BART Maintenance Yard must not adversely impact existing residential areas.

In the nine alignment alternatives described in the Draft Program EIR, four options for Maintenance Yards are considered; Two of the nine alignment alternatives have no Maintenance Yard; Two locate a yard south of First Street just east of the downtown railroad bridge; Two locate the yard at Vasco Road near the location of the current ACE station; Three show the yard at the east end of the valley near the Greenville station.

The downtown and Greenville locations place the yard adjacent to or close to existing and planned residential areas. Of the three yard locations considered, only the Vasco location is free of residential impacts.

The "no yard" option, of course, is ideal from this consideration, and is apparently a viable solution with respect to BART operations in the Livermore area. That choice would also free money for operational features (another station?) of interest to Livermore residents.

The preliminary analysis says that Yard noise impacts can be mitigated from "Potentially Significant" to "Less Than Significant" in each of the proposed locations. Significance of course is in the eye or ear of the impacted party. The best of mitigation plans frequently have problems. We've recently read of continuous noise from railcar turntables - which of course is fixable. "Small" things like back-up beepers in the middle of the night, outdoor telephone pagers, continuous light "spillage" into nearby properties, continuous low-level noise may meet code requirements yet impact life quality. At this stage, more detail -beyond noise, alone - should be addressed in the P-EIR for residential areas in proximity to the proposed Greenville and Portola Yard sites. Or better yet, rather than accept "no-impact" assurances for sensitive nearby residences, the potential for life-quality impacts should be avoided entirely.

If there is to be a Yard in this project it should be sited at the Vasco location, independent of the station configuration selected. Thus an I-580/Greenville station plan, for example, would integrate the Vasco location into the operations. I would ask that you show this as an alternative in the P-EIR (and that the Portola and Greenville Yards be dropped from consideration).

I would like to address two areas that I believe are important to the environmental impact of BART to Livermore. First, however, I would like to point out an out-of-date feature on the maps that show the area around the Portola Maintenance Yard.

A Map Correction:
Refer to fig 2-14 (The Portola Maintenance Yard):

The Hexel plant is shown in map 2-14. It is on the south side of the UP tracks from the Mines Rd. overpass west to just past Trevarno Rd. The Hexel plant has been demolished by a developer (Northbrook Homes). In the future they plan to erect medium to high-end homes on that property. Therefore, the UP tracks will be bordered on the south side by homes from Mines Rd. westerly to the First St. overpass a distance of approximately 0.7 miles.

My two areas of concern are first: the impact of the Maintenance Yards on homes and business; and then, the impact of a downtown station on parking in Livermore. I believe that street parking is an environmental issue that can effect business as well as the quality of life for homeowners.

The Impact of Maintenance Yards:

Of the nine alternative alignments proposed, three alignments (1, 1a, 1b) include a Maintenance Yard near Greenville Rd.; two alignments (2,2a) include a Maintenance Yard near Vasco Rd; two of the alignments (3,3a) include a Maintenance yard at the end of Portola near the UP tracks and Mines Rd.

According to sec 3.10 (Noise and Vibration) a Maintenance Yard has the potential of generating noise levels that can be significant. I also believe that there will be a significant level of night lighting associated with these yards. Continuous night lighting will significantly affect the quality of life for homes in the immediate area.

According to the report 3.10 sec NO-2, alternatives 3 and 3a (the Portola and Railroad alternatives) represent the greatest potential for exceeding acceptable noise levels. Followed by this are the alternatives 1 , 1a, and 1b (the Greenville East, Downtown Greenville East, and Downtown Greenville East via SPRR) that represent the next in .the severity of the impact of noise. The Vasco Maintenance Yard which is used in alternatives 2 and 2a (Las Positas, Downtown-Vasco) represents the least intrusive as far as the impact of noise on homeowners.

I would like to emphasize that the Portola Maintenance Yard would represent a terrible choice for the location of a Yard. Its placement would affect a long line of homes directly to the south of the UP railroad from the First St. bridge west to Mines Rd. a distance of over 0.7 miles. In addition the Trevarno Rd. historic district would be greatly affected since the yard would be directly adjacent to this Cultural Resource. (Cultural Resources 3.6 sec CR- 1 alternatives 3 and 3a). Also, there are many businesses along First St. from the First St. bridge to Trevarno Rd. which would be closed. I have personally counted over 70 businesses along this corridor together with 7 homes. The destruction of the corridor would adversely affect the economy of Livermore because of the many jobs that would be lost. (Taking an average of 5-6 employees per business that would be approximately 400 jobs lost to Livermore. Another adverse effect on the economy of Livermore would be the loss of tax revenue from these businesses because BART is a government agency that does not pay taxes to the cities in which it owns land.

The Greenville Maintenance Yard map (fig 2-5) shows that there is the potential of significant noise and light levels near homes bordering on the west side of Laughlin Rd. According to the map, there does not seem to be any impact on business in the area where the Maintenance Yard would be located.

I would say that if BART wants a Maintenance Yard, then the Vasco Yard would be the best choice as far the impact of noise and light on homeowners is concerned. There is the question of lost jobs and tax revenue from the businesses that would be closed in that area since what is shown on the map (fig 2-11) are a number of large buildings that would be demolished to make space for the yard.

The most favorable alignment with a Maintenance Yard would be the Las Positas alignment (alternative 2) with the Vasco Maintenance Yard. The Las Positas alignment would be slightly more expensive than Greenville-East (alternative 1) but would have the least environmental impact. According to the table in the summary (fig S-3) the predicted new ridership would be 29,800. This is less than the Greenville-East new ridership of 31,700. The Greenville-East cost is projected to be 2.92 billion while the Las Positas alignment is projected to cost 3.28 billion. In addition, the Greenville Maintenance Yard is much larger (119 acres) vs. either the Portola Yard (47 acres) or the Vasco Yard (52 acres). If the goal is to increase ridership and have a Maintenance Yard, then the Greenville-East alignment is the one to choose. However, the cost of the Greenville-East alignment could go up if mitigation measures are taken to reduce the noise and the light levels that would affect the homes on the west side of Laughlin Rd.

The Impact of the Downtown Station:

I think that a downtown station in Livermore would be an environmental disaster. It would turn Livermore into a BART parking lot. There is precedence for this: During the week between Monday and Friday the Trader Joes parking lot in Pleasanton (just off of Highway I-580 on Santa Rita Rd.) is always full. When investigated it is found that overflow from the BART parking lot finds its way there (and many other business parking lots in the area). This is not just overflow parking but it seems that people also arrange to drop their cars at these lots and then meet in a carpool to take only one car to the BART station; the car with a parking permit. This saves on parking fees.

This would also happen in Livermore, even if there were a large parking lot at Greenville or Vasco Rds. because these large lots always fill up during commute days. People will then find other places to park and the Livermore neighborhoods will be the places that they will find. Law enforcement would ignore this issue as they ignore the issue in Pleasanton; Trader Joes cannot get the Pleasanton Police to act (other than a minor parking citation), so the overflow continues and the businesses suffer. Because of the carpool strategy, Livermore will still suffer from the Trader Joe parking lot problem even with no downtown station.

I know some of this is far beyond BART to Livermore, but it is pertinent. Too bad the meeting came just a few hours after DPEIR comment period ended. Maybe some of this will help, anyway.

History

The Livermore City Council on March 10, 1986, voted 5-0 to support a freeway orientation for the BART line. They sold the 11-acre Brickyard that had been bought with a transportation grant for a station site in downtown Livermore. BART then bought the 53-acre Gandolfo property on Airway Blvd. near Isabel for an I-580 West Livermore station. The site was many times the size of any other BART station site, but it brought

land for the new Isabel/I-580 Interchange into public ownership. BART also acquired land for an East Livermore station site near the truck scales and for a train yard near Greenville Road.

Altamont Rail

ACE now runs on UP (formerly WP) tracks over the Altamont, through the Valley, and down Niles Canyon. Its gentle grade was designed for freight trains, and ACE trains are frequently delayed for UP freight. ACE is considering a new line of its own with major High Speed Rail funding. Early studies show that, though shorter, it will require long and costly tunnels and a new alignment through Livermore and Pleasanton. With BART being extended to the Silicon Valley, an obvious alternative over the Altamont is to extend BART along the former SP beyond Greenville Road toward Mountain House, Tracy, Banta, Lathrop, and Manteca. This BART extension, with an HSR intermodal at Manteca, would serve many more people far better – and probably at less cost – than the new ACE line being considered.

Even if ACE ignores the concept of replacing its commute service with BART, the location of its new line would require changing of ACE/BART intermodal stations. That decision should be made later – after ACE decides on its future. That is one reason for extending BART now along I-580 just to the Isabel interchange.

Cost

The cost of extending BART in a widened I-580 meridian just to Isabel is about one third or less than the cost through downtown. Almost no costly structure or earth work is required. BART noise is minimal, and mostly masked by noise from the freeway. Right of way costs are minimal. (I have asked BART to include a BART footprint to east of Greenville Road in their estimate.)

TOD

Development oriented to transit should maximize surface parking near the station and minimize dense residential. As attractions near the station develop, land will be available and parking structures can replace portions of the surface parking. There will be no need to demolish residential uses. The station will serve a *much* larger community than just the walkable area. Until personal helicopters come about, the ¼ and ½ mile circles are unrealistic for planning purposes.

Stations

An Isabel/I-580 station is in direction for nearly all Livermore BART users. I strongly suggest another station near the truck scales as was originally planned. This would serve eastern Livermore's employment centers well. Further extension under the elevated westbound I-580 lanes to the former SP roadbed, an ACE intermodal station, and shop would come after ACE decides on whether Altamont rail should be commute or transit. Operating costs for the stations could be cut by designing them for remote staffing (RSS).

I-580 Widening

Critical to any BART extension to Livermore is widening I-580. Property acquisition and structure designs allowing BART in the median should come ASAP. The City of Livermore has made a great start by setting plan lines. Acquiring the property comes next. I have suggested that Caltrans plan new very heavy duty truck lanes just outside the existing truck lanes, resurface the existing truck lanes, and convert the inside lanes to median for BART, HOV lanes, etc. This might bring new funding from bonds voted for truck corridors.

Governance

Form a five-county rail district effectively merging BART and Caltrain. That would allow BART around the Bay, to Livermore, Brentwood, Crockett, and the Golden Gate Bridge, as well as East Bay bullet trains. Adjusted for population and inflation, a balanced bond issue like BART's in 1962 (paid off a decade ago) would raise about \$16 billion. Let the voters decide!

BART to Livermore Alternatives Ranked by Cost 11 November 2009

Alternative #	Stations	Route	Cost per DPEIR (000,000)	
			Construction	Total
			Line 6	Line 11
4	1	Isabel/I-580	\$ 720	\$ 1,120
5	1	Quarry	1,010	1,610
1	2	Greenville East	1,980	2,920
2	2	Las Positas	2,080	3,280
3a	2	Railroad	2,080	3,380
3	2	Portola	2,360	3,470
1a	2	Downtown via WP	2,450	3,610
1b	2	Downtown via SP	2,530	3,650
2a	2	Downtown/Vasco	2,390	3,800

Why I favor Alternative 4:

- By far the least costly alternative;
- Very little earth or structural work;
- No "Great Wall";
- In direction for all of Livermore;
- Easily accessible for most of Livermore;
- Easily accessible from travel corridors;
- Relieves I-580 congestion west of Isabel;
- Lower fares (BART fares are mileage-based);

- Shorter travel time;
- Easily extended later to Greenville via modified Alternative 1

Modified Alternative 1:

In widened I-580 median at grade to east of Greenville Road;
Curve left east of Greenville, tunneling under high I-580 westbound lanes;
Future station near truck scales (close to both Vasco and Greenville);
Pointed to Central Valley along former SP and Altamont Pass Road;
Convert Altamont Corridor plans to BART at low cost;
TOD and intermodal station north of I-580 east of Greenville Rd.

Group Worksheet Results



LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

Prioritizing Community Objectives - Results

Identified Community Objectives		Top 3 Priorities		Middle 3 Priorities		Bottom 3 Priorities	
		Tally	Total	Tally	Total	Tally	Total
A	Provide San Joaquin County commuter /freeway access and parking		7		2		5
B	Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking		9		4		1
C	Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (1 mile walking distance)		1		2.5		10.5
D	Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and i-Hub, the City's future science and technology center		3		9.5		1.5
E	Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion		2		7		5
F	Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion		4.5		4.5		5
G	Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary		5		3		5
H	Provide ACE - BART transfer		4		7		3
I	Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing)		7		2		5

Group Comments

Comments on Prioritization of Community Objectives		
Top 3 Priorities	Middle 3 Priorities	Lowest 3 Priorities
Objective A: Provide San Joaquin County commuter /freeway access and parking		
Table 1: ranked #1 of top 3 (tied w/Objective C); take San Joaquin County commuters off I-580		Table 4: BART won't help freeway congestion
Table 6: A takes care of E and F		Table 7: F automatically satisfies A
Table 10: In order to get vehicles off freeway		Table 8: "A" is tied with "F" – F includes A, A is a subset. Eliminate A
Table 13: Isn't this important?; A and H – similar end results		
Objective B: Provide Livermore resident/local rider access and parking		
Table 1: ranked #3 of top 3		
Table 5: 40 years of paying taxes – need to benefit; increase Livermore resident ridership		
Table 13: H vs. B – ACE tends to be used by non-residents		
Objective C: Provide nearby BART access to Las Positas College (1 mile walking distance)		
Table 1: ranked #1 of top 3 (tied w/Objective A); growing with universities harder to get into; college BART is <u>critical</u> for students with no auto	Table 7: ranked ½ middle 3, ½ lowest 3; Las Positas College people use BART frequently	Table 4: Las Positas will not be a big BART draw
Objective D: Provide nearby BART access to Livermore/Sandia Labs (Vasco – less than 3/4 mile to west gate and 1/4 mile walk to northwest corner of campus; Greenville – 2.1 miles to east gate) and iHub, the City's future science and technology center		
	Table 1: ranked #2 of middle 3; provide BART to the 8,000 LLNL workers	
Objective E: Avoid/minimize adding to local street congestion		
Table 7: Concern about 1st Street congestion	Table 1: ranked #1 of middle 3; reduce local street congestion	Table 13: No more congestion
	Table 6: A takes care of E	
Objective F: Avoid/minimize adding to freeway congestion		
Table 7: F automatically satisfies A	Table 1: ranked #3 of middle 3; reduce freeway congestion	

Comments on Prioritization of Community Objectives		
Top 3 Priorities	Middle 3 Priorities	Lowest 3 Priorities
Table 10: In order to get vehicles off freeway	Table 6: Same as A; A takes care of F	
	Table 8: "A" is tied with "F" (ranked ½ top 3 and ½ lowest 3) – F includes A, A is a subset. Eliminate A	
Objective G: Avoid development pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary		
Table 5: Stop sprawl	Table 13: Need to qualify for federal stimulus funds; doesn't achieve this (UGB); break UGB – defeat idea of downtown development	Table 1: ranked #1 of lowest 3; can adjust UGB (possible)
Table 8: Growth boundary focuses smart growth. Question: urban growth boundary tied to TOD?		Table 10: Concerns about urban growth boundary should be higher priority (<i>minority opinion?</i>)
Objective H: Provide ACE - BART transfer		
Table 8: Important to link the various transit systems	Table 5: ACE = funding	Table 1: ranked #2 of lowest 3; ACE-BART can happen at Greenville or Vasco
Table 9: Focus on the Vasco station	Table 13: Important to have different transit; H vs. B – ACE tends to be used by non-residents; A and H – similar end results	
Objective I: Ensure potential for walkable TOD development (jobs and/or housing)		
Table 5: TOD = funding	Table 4: "I" was a strong contender for top 3 priorities (after B, G, and D)	Table 1: ranked #3 of lowest 3; TOD – low priority
Table 7: BART should serve Livermore; TOD is important		
Table 10: In order to get vehicles off freeway		

General Comments:

Table 6:

- Timing bad – too long to wait
- Very concerned about increase to interior street congestion
- Four said must include downtown, three said no downtown station

Table 8:

- Serving Livermore is so important.

Overall comments:

- Keep cars off freeway
- Avoid street congestion
- TOD+
- Labs
- Livermore access
- Las Positas not close enough to Isabel/I-580

Individual Worksheet Results

Isabel/I-580, Greenville, and Vasco: Achieving Objectives

Objective	Isabel/I-580				Greenville				Vasco			
	Achieves	Partially Achieves	Does Not Achieve	N/A	Achieves	Partially Achieves	Does Not Achieve	N/A	Achieves	Partially Achieves	Does Not Achieve	N/A
A	33	26	12	3	66	6	0	2	50	19	4	1
B	20	35	13	6	10	33	28	3	39	27	6	2
C	57	10	4	3	3	3	63	5	1	3	64	6
D	1	1	61	11	16	41	14	3	64	5	2	3
E	34	18	17	5	46	17	7	4	22	37	11	4
F	18	36	15	5	51	16	1	6	39	27	2	6
G	14	19	34	7	7	18	43	6	57	9	1	7
H	2	2	62	7	31	27	12	4	65	3	2	4
I	4	29	34	7	4	32	32	6	53	17	3	1

Comments:

- Objective C: One mile is "nearby?"
- Objective G: no response given; should not be an unsolvable issue
- Objective H, Greenville: partially achieves, if ACE station combined
- Vasco: Really the only choice of 3