

T1

VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PUBLIC HEARING

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
DOCUMENT FOR THE
PROPOSED BART EXTENSION
TO MILPITAS, SAN JOSE
AND SANTA CLARA

**CERTIFIED
ORIGINAL**

PUBLIC HEARING

Date: Monday, April 12, 2004
Time: 6:36 p.m.
Location: SANTA CLARA SENIOR CENTER
1303 Fremont Street
Santa Clara, California 95050

Reported by: Howard Schroeder, CSR
License Number 1123

#15484

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1083 Lincoln Avenue, San Jose, California 95125, Telephone (408) 920-0222, Fax (408) 920-0188

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Tom Fitzwater, Environmental Planner
Ann Jamison, Deputy Project Manager
Kay Wilson, Moderator

Reported by: ADVANTAGE REPORTING SERVICES
 HOWARD SCHROEDER, CSR 1123
 1083 Lincoln Avenue
 San Jose, CA 95125
 (408) 920-0222

--o0o--

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. WILSON: OK. It's blue card time.
Would anybody like to come up and make some
comments? We hope so.

Raise your hand. I will come and
collect your card.

(Laughter)

MS. WILSON: This is your chance, folks.
Do you want to make some official comments on the
document? Yes. If I could just get your blue
card.

VOICE: I don't have a blue card.

MS. WILSON: We'll bring you one.

Raise your hand if you would like a
blue card and then raise your hand when it's filled
out and we'll collect it.

OK. For those of you who came in,
we're going to have a three-minute time limit. And
we would like you to focus your comments on the
Draft Environmental Document. And Rose Zukas has
turned in the first card.

Please come forward to the microphone.

MS. ZUKAS: I just wanted to look at the
slide again that showed the rerouting of the -- of

T1.1

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

3

1 the Santa Clara Street. Are you going to reroute
2 some of the traffic along San Fernando Street? And
3 my question is, what impact will this have on the
4 construction of the new city hall and the new
5 library and in there. Because it's pretty

T1.1

T1.2

6 congested right now.

7 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

8 MS. ZUKAS: I didn't get a chance to see
9 where it was routed.

10 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

11 Next speaker. Next card.

12 CLAUDIA DAW: If there's going to be a
13 bridge that crosses the railroad tracks in Santa
14 Clara, the one that -- right there. How will the
15 noise from pedestrian traffic be abated because
16 that can reach well over 65 decibels, people that
17 are crossing, the noise, the shoveling, the
18 talking, the trains, your station. How will all of
19 that noise be abated?

T1.3

20 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Thank you for
21 your comment.

22 We'll go ahead and take all of your
23 comments and we may be able to go back and clarify
24 some of these points. And let's go ahead and get
25 all the comments for the record. And that was

4

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 Claudia Daw.

2 CLAUDIA DAW: Yes.

3 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Any other blue
4 cards?

5 ROSE ZUKAS: Can I make another comment?

6 MS. WILSON: Yes. Please state your
7 name for the record.

8 ROSE ZUKAS: Rose Zukas. You had said
9 earlier I think that 7,000 people would be going
10 back and forth. And I understand you have parking
11 for 2,000. So where are the other 5,000 going to
12 go?

T1.4

13 MS. WILSON: Thank you.
14 Are there some people filling out blue
15 cards?

16 ROSE ZUKAS: I had another comment.

17 MS. WILSON: OK. Let's get everybody
18 and then we can --

19 ANDREW RATURMAVIL: I'll make all my
20 comments at once.

21 MS. WILSON: Anybody like to make some
22 official comments?

23 ANDREW RATURMAVIL: Just a second.

24 MS. WILSON: Please take your time.

25 Andrew Raturmavil.

5

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

1 ANDREW RATURMAVIL: That's correct.

2 MS. WILSON: Please go.

3 ANDREW RATURMAVIL: I'm not sure this is
4 appropriate. I mostly have questions. I noticed
5 that they have traffic mitigation issues at several

6 intersections Monroe and Homestead, which is
7 actually a surprising one to me. But I didn't see
8 any Brokaw, Coleman.

T1.5

9 Also where the overpass, Lewis Street
10 overpass comes down and intersects with Lafayette
11 Street, I would anticipate since the point of
12 departure is on the -- I am not sure whether
13 it's -- that's the south side or to the east side
14 of the railroad tracks. I guess we will call it
15 east and north, depending on how you look at it. A
16 large amount of the traffic from the City of Santa
17 Clara itself will use the overpass from Coleman, go
18 through Brokaw, and then use the parking structure
19 that's either north or south there.

T1.6

20 So what I wanted to know, whether there
21 is any traffic mitigation, because Lafayette Street
22 and El Camino, both of the two outlets for that
23 overpass in rush hour are somewhat impacted right
24 now. And I don't know whether this is something
25 that has been considered or not.

1 MS. WILSON: Thank you very much for
2 your comments.

3 Any other new speakers?

4 Rose, would you like to come back?

5 ROSE ZUKAS: The bus transit center, are

6 you referring to the one that's down in the -- down
7 in the center of Santa Clara or where is that
8 location? And then how late will BART run through
9 the new area from Warm Springs to downtown San Jose
10 and then to the airport?

T1.7

11 And will all the trains come in at one
12 time in the evening, or are they going to be coming
13 in one or two at a time? Or are we going to have a
14 whole rush of trains coming in and turning around
15 all at once and making all kinds of noise? And
16 that was it.

T1.8

17 And then what will you hopefully do if
18 people like to use this ramp as a party place, like
19 drinking and things like that?

T1.9

20 MS. WILSON: Thank you. We have had a
21 number of people wander in since we started.
22 Welcome.

23 This is one of several public hearings
24 we're holding on the proposed BART extension. And
25 the purpose of tonight's meeting is to comment on

7

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 the draft environmental document. So if you just
2 come in we would still love to hear from you.

3 You can Just fill out a blue card and
4 I'll call you up to make your comments. Anybody
5 else with some more blue cards? Thank you.

6 OK. Toby McPheeters.

7 TOBY MCPHEETERS: Yes.

8 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

9 TOBY MCPHEETERS: My question was --
10 actually, I have a few of them.

11 First, what it looks like the BART is
12 going to run under Guadalupe River. And I'm
13 concerned how it's -- the environmental impacts on
14 that river, especially during the flooding that we
15 have had previously in that area.

T1.10

16 My next question, I'm kind of going to
17 echo the concern about the noise in the Santa Clara
18 station and the switching yard area. I'm wondering
19 how that's going to -- all the noise just from the
20 trains. And if -- I don't know if it's a
21 maintenance facility or so on. That seems like a
22 lot of added noise there.

T1.11

23 And otherwise, I think it's a good idea.

24 MS. WILSON: OK. Thank you.

25 Any more blue cards? Interested

8

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

1 speakers? Would you like to come back?

2 CLAUDIA DAW: Yeah.

3 MS. WILSON: Please state your name for
4 the record.

5 CLAUDIA DAW: My name is Daw, Claudia

6 Daw. I do have a question just about that
7 turnaround. They have a turnaround for the trains.
8 How do they -- you know, so that they can make a
9 loop and go back. In Santa Clara right by the
10 police station in that particular train station,
11 after a certain hour, it -- it magnifies sound
12 just because of its logistics, its location, the
13 way it's amongst other buildings, everything. It
14 reverberates sound.

T1.12

15 I live a mile from that and I can hear
16 trains going by at certain times of the night. So
17 that would be an important aspect that I would want
18 this committee to address. The -- the sound, the
19 noise, it's significant in that here. So that
20 would have to be abated or find some way of abating
21 that noise.

T1.13

22 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Yes.

23 Heinz Bodeker.

24 HEINZ BODEKER: I would just like to
25 know what the impact will be on the businesses

T1.14

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

9

Advantage  Reporting
Services, LLC

1 located along Santa Clara Street? And I would like | T1.14
2 to know what the duration of the construction
3 period for downtown San Jose is. How long it would | T1.15
4 take.

5 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

6 Anybody else?

7 KEN SINCLAIR: Yes.
8 Sorry about being late.

9 MS. WILSON: Not a problem.

10 KEN SINCLAIR: Probably some of those
11 things have already been gone over.

12 MS. WILSON: Please go to the
13 microphone. And this is Ken Sinclair.

14 KEN SINCLAIR: Ken Sinclair, president
15 of the Merchants Association. I was noticing the
16 one you have on the wall here. Why is the BART | T1.16
17 station going to impact those areas right there?

18 MS. WILSON: We're going to go ahead and
19 take all your comments right now, not respond to
20 questions. And we'll do that after we get through
21 with all of the people's comments.

22 KEN SINCLAIR: I am all for BART coming. | T1.17
23 I don't know why these things out here should be
24 affected by BART.

25 MS. WILSON: Any other questions?

10

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

1 KEN SINCLAIR: No.

2 MS. WILSON: OK. Thank you. Next
3 speaker. Richard Preston, please.

4 RICHARD PRESTON: Since I'm a resident
5 of Santa Clara and since Santa Clara station is one
6 that is most of interest to me, I wanted to address
7 those points.

8 The first thing I wanted to address was
9 I think the walkway. I noticed that you have three
10 options there. The overpass going north of the
11 tower, the overpass going south of the tower.

T1.18

12 On the paperwork that was also handed
13 out, it seemed like it was also mentioned there was
14 an underground passage. I didn't hear that
15 addressed in the conversation we had. I think
16 based on what I'm hearing that the underground
17 passage would probably be the most logical thing.

18 The other thing that I like about the
19 Santa Clara station is the fact that it is very --
20 we're talking about four different -- four
21 different access points there. In other words, we
22 have CalTrains. We have BART. We have the large
23 bus hop legs as well. And we also have the People
24 Mover to the airport.

T1.19

25 One question I think that I also have as

11

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARCS* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 well as I referenced this is I'm wondering whether
2 or not the People Mover to the airport is really a
3 necessary part of this. It seems to me that in
4 terms if we're looking at places where we could
5 reduce the project rather than trying to say, well,

6 maybe we won't do as much, maybe we'll just go to
7 Warm Springs and stop there for the time being.

8 I think it's more important to complete
9 the project all the way around rather than putting
10 some of these other elements that might be less --
11 less substantial in place.

12 So I would say if we're looking to a
13 place where we can cut something out, I would
14 actually cut the People Mover in the short-term and
15 then continue forward with BART.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Any other
18 comments?

19 Go ahead.

20 MINH THAI: I have a question. I'm not
21 sure if it has to do with the environmental, but it
22 has to do with money. What I have read in the
23 newspaper was the Congress did not pass any money
24 to the project at all. Zero money.

25 So how are we going to be paying for

T1.19

T1.20

12

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

ORIGINAL

1 this? Is Santa Clara residents going to be heavily | T1.20
2 taxed on this? And so that's my question.

3 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Anthony.

4 ANTHONY SMRDELI: Yes. Hi. I am

5 Anthony Smrdeli. I have a question regarding the | T1.21
6 airway walkway at the Santa Clara station. It
7 looks to me like it isn't closed or covered from
8 the elements.

9 And I also wanted to know how it would | T1.22
10 be accessible to both bicyclists and to the
11 disabled, whether there would be no steps or
12 stairs, but rather a ramp to go across.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Toby McPheeters
15 again.

16 GREG MCPHEETERS: I am his brother. Not
17 again.

18 MS. WILSON: My apologies.

19 GREG MCPHEETERS: I've got some | T1.23
20 questions regarding cyclists' access, as a cyclist
21 who uses CalTrain quite regularly. I would like to
22 just make sure that the EIR includes impacts for
23 bicycle access during construction. I know that is
24 a big issue right around near the airport and 237,
25 with some water district improvements that are

going on there with the 237 bicycle path. I would like to make sure that it includes cyclist impacts at those intersections that you mentioned, where there would be increased traffic. And those impacts are included.

T1.23

And likewise cyclist impacts at places where the tracks are going to be crossing streets. I noticed -- I haven't made it all the way around the room yet. I notice there would be some under or above grade crossings. And just -- I know what I would hate to see happen is what we have right here at the Santa Clara station where the train tracks were built, and if you're on a bike trying to get across the tracks, it's a little tricky. You have got to go over Lafayette or the De La Cruz overpass and neither one of those is particularly cyclist friendly. I haven't had a chance to read your report, so I don't know if the proposed pedestrian crossing here will have stairs at either end. I assume it's going to be aviator compliance. I am also curious, I would like to make sure it will be able to connect to the east side of the tracks near the FedEx Depot and access to the airport and those types of things.

T1.24

T1.25

1 MS. WILSON: Thank you for your
2 comments.

3 Claudia, did you want to come back up?

4 CLAUDIA DAW: No.

5 MS. WILSON: OK. Any other new
6 speakers? OK.

7 What my colleagues have suggested that
8 we could do is temporarily suspend the formal part
9 of the public hearing. Take 15 minutes, see if we
10 can answer some of your questions one on one, go
11 around the max and do whatever. And then we'll
12 come back and see if anybody wants to make any more
13 formal comments on the record. You have asked some
14 interesting questions tonight.

15 So I will convene this, back at 7:15.
16 Why don't we just look at the maps and talk to
17 staff and see if we can clear up some of your
18 questions.

19 Thank you.

20 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

21 MS. WILSON: How are we doing out there?
22 It's 7:15. Would you like to come back and sit
23 down?

24 If you could take your seats, please. I
25 would like to reconvene the group and see if we

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

15

1 have any more comments.

2 OK. Hopefully during our informal
3 recess you got some of your questions answered.
4 And maybe now you have some additional comments you
5 would like to put on the record. We would be glad
6 to take them.

7 Any more blue cards?

8 KEN SINCLAIR: Again, you're rushing us.

9 MS. WILSON: Oh, I'm sorry. Take your
10 time.

11 Yes, Rose. Did you want to come up?
12 Please give your name.

13 ROSE ZUKAS: Rose Zukas. I just really
14 wanted to emphasize the fact, you know, I am not
15 down on students. But we're having problems in our
16 neighborhood with students walking in the streets,
17 2 o'clock, yelling, drinking in the streets.

T1.26

18 So I really, really want to emphasize
19 that we need to have some kind of security or
20 something there to alert the -- to make these
21 students understand that this is not a party place.

22 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Ken Sinclair.

23 KEN SINCLAIR: On the overcrossing.

24 This is the Merchants Association,
25 Franklin Square. I am pretty well up to speed I

16

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 think now.

2 I would like the -- over the tracks to
3 put an escalator on the west side of the tracks for
4 people who were carrying suitcases. It's a lot
5 easier going up stairs in an elevator. You go in

T1.27

6 and set it down whereas in an escalator you have to
7 hold it. I would like the north option as opposed
8 to the south option on the actual station itself.

9 MS. WILSON: OK.

10 KEN SINCLAIR: Thank you.

11 MS. WILSON: For those specific
12 comments.

13 Anyone else? I see a couple of our
14 regulars do you want to comment tonight?

15 VOICE: Are you looking at me?

16 MS. WILSON: I am. Oh, a blue card.
17 Richard Preston.

18 RICHARD PRESTON: All righty. Took some
19 additional looks at the Santa Clara station. I
20 want to make a few comments with regards to the
21 Santa Clara station.

22 First of all, with regards to the
23 walkway, I think that the north walkway does not
24 make any sense at all. It brings you out behind
25 the tower. It actually brings you out -- if I read

T1.28

17

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 that map correctly, it brings you out like kind of
2 behind the police station. It would probably be in
3 a darkened area.

4 I kind of alluded to the fact that a
5 mugger probably wouldn't be very smart to hang out
6 near the police station. But that is a good place
7 for someone who wanted to prey on -- it's a dark
8 place. So I think it's better to bring it out on
9 the south side. I thought might make more sense to
10 actually bring the walkway a little bit further
11 across so that you could actually connect to the
12 bus service.

13 In other words, the buses come into that
14 round and they are on the side away from the
15 CalTrain station. It might make more sense to
16 maybe either have one ramp that would bring you
17 down the CalTrain side and continue the walkway
18 across so people could get them both. The more you
19 do to neighboring, more accessible to everybody, I
20 think the better.

21 I was also looking at the structure.
22 You have two options, the north option and the
23 south option. I think the better option is the
24 north option. But I would like to make sure that
25 the level is sufficient. We're talking about a

T1.28

18

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 very big station there that will be accommodating a
2 lot of different, very multi-level uses.

T1.28

3 I was telling some people that I am
4 going to San Francisco. I am starting to commute
5 that way. One of my options is to go through the
6 Millbrae station, which I like very much. Millbrae
7 has CalTrain and BART right next to each other.
8 And it has San Jose and the South Bay down below.
9 I love that. I want to see that kind of option in
10 Santa Clara. I think we are very close though, the
11 way it's designed. There a few modifications to
12 tweak it and make it better. Extend the walkways,
13 make it all accessible, and then make sure that
14 there's enough parking.

T1.29

15 Because one of the problems we have -- I
16 live a block from BART. We have bus line 81. It's
17 about the only one that comes by there, and doesn't
18 come all that often. Unless you add more bus
19 lines, I have to drive to the station and I have
20 got to have a place to park. So thank you.

21 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

22 OK. One of our main purposes tonight is
23 to really hear any comments that you have on the
24 Draft Environmental Document. And we're getting a
25 lot of good comments on the station and alignment

19

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 preferences and some of those things.

2 But if you have any specific comments on
3 the Draft Environmental Document, that would be
4 great too.

5 Anybody else? I'm getting close to the
6 last call for blue cards.

7 OK. I would like to make a couple more
8 just announcements.

9 First off, thank you for coming. We
10 will stick around after I close the hearing and
11 answer any more questions that you may have
12 informally that may have been the best part of the
13 meetings for some of you.

14 So I do want to go over the upcoming
15 remaining hearings so you are aware of them. We
16 have two hearings scheduled in San Jose. One will
17 be Wednesday, April 14th. That's this Wednesday.
18 And one will be Monday, May 10th. And both of
19 those will be at the First United Methodist Church,
20 29 -- excuse me, 24 North First Street in San Jose.

21 And then we have a public hearing in
22 Milpitas. And that will be Monday, April 19th.
23 And that will be at the Joseph Weller Elementary
24 School, 345 Boulder Street in Milpitas.

25 And all of those meetings are the same

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

20

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1 format as this one. And they begin at 6 o'clock.

2 And last but not least, you do still
3 have time for additional comments until 5 p.m. May
4 14th. Tom always like me to say, the sooner you
5 get them here, the sooner he will start working on
6 them.

7 But you do have a full 60-day comment
8 period since the document came out. So hopefully
9 that will be sufficient time. Thank you so much
10 for working with us here this evening. And we'll
11 stick around and answer any other questions that
12 you have.

13 The hearing for right now is closed.

14

15 (Whereupon, the public hearing was
16 concluded at 7:15 p.m.)

17

18

19 --o0o--

20

21

22

23

24

25

VTA PUBLIC HEARING

21

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, HOWARD SCHROEDER, do hereby certify:
That the foregoing public hearing was
taken down by me in shorthand at the time and place

therein named, and thereafter reduced to
computerized transcription under my direction.

And I hereby certify the foregoing
transcript is a full, true and correct transcript
of my shorthand notes so taken.

I further certify that I am not
interested in the outcome of this public hearing.

Dated: 4-13-04 

HOWARD SCHROEDER, CSR #1123

RESPONSE TO TRANSCRIPT T1

Rose Zukas

T1.1 *The construction phase of the project will require periodic temporary rerouting of traffic. Some of that traffic will be rerouted to San Fernando Street. Section 4.19.3.1, Vehicular Traffic Impacts, discusses traffic detours and Figures 4.19-31 through 4.19-38 depict the proposed construction routing.*

Rose Zukas

T1.2 *According to the City of San Jose, Office of the City Manager, Public Outreach Coordinator, the new City Hall project continues on schedule. Construction is expected to be complete early/mid-2005, with move-in scheduled for the late summer of 2005. Construction of the new Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library began in July 2000. The new library opened to the public in August 2003.*

Utility relocation for the BART Alternative project is scheduled to begin in mid-2007 and will continue for 2½ years (see Figure 4.19-30). Construction of the full-build BART Alternative or the MOS scenarios will follow. This construction work will not interfere with construction of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library, as construction of this facility is complete, or the new City Hall, as construction of this facility is scheduled to end at the latest in mid-2005.

Construction of the BART Alternative will continue for several years. For the tunnel, the use of tunnel-boring machines rather than cut-and-cover techniques will reduce construction impacts on business and residential communities. However, construction of the stations and the crossover in downtown using cut-and-cover techniques will impact vehicular traffic and parking, as well as pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus service. For example, construction of the Civic Plaza/SJSU and Market Street stations will require the closure of certain travel lanes along East Santa Clara Street and associated cross streets (1st, 5th, 6th, 7th, Market, San Pedro, and Almaden). Details of lane closures, as well as other impacts to vehicular traffic and parking, pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus service during construction of the BART Alternative are described in Section 4.19.3.1, Vehicular Traffic Impacts.

To manage traffic during overall project construction, including utility relocation, detailed traffic control plans (TCPs) will be prepared addressing traffic control, detours, and overall traffic management. TCPs are implemented during all phases of site preparation, grading, construction, materials delivery, and waste hauling (such as excavated material [muck] resulting from the use of tunnel-boring machines). In addition, VTA and the City of San Jose are working cooperatively to develop a Construction Impact Mitigation Plan prior to construction. This plan will also address the temporary relocation of displaced parking and loading zones along East/West Santa Clara Street. Details of this plan are provided in Section 4.19.2.1, Pre-construction Activities. VTA will also notify property owners, local residents (renters), and businesses in advance of construction activity.

Access plans for pedestrians and bicyclists will also be implemented during construction. Pedestrian movement will be separated from both vehicle traffic and construction activity. Signage will be used to direct pedestrians to safe and convenient pathways along existing sidewalks or alternate access routes. Construction contractors will be

required to maintain adequate pedestrian and bicyclist access in construction areas and to provide signs to indicate routes of access to businesses and other activities where normal access is obscured or impaired.

A complete discussion of construction impacts related to vehicular traffic and parking, as well as pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus service, and measures to avoid or minimize impacts is found in Section 4.19.3, Transportation and Transit.

Claudia Daw

T1.3 *The noise impact assessment was conducted using both FTA and BART noise criteria. The assessment procedures meet with both NEPA and CEQA guidelines for assessing noise impact from transit operations. The FTA noise criteria are based on the existing noise levels in determining impact and take into account changes in noise level due to the introduction of the project. Where noise impact has been identified, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise levels to within the appropriate criteria. Pedestrians on the overcrossing are at least 300 feet away from El Camino Real, a major roadway between the overcrossing and residential land uses. In addition, the Santa Clara Caltrain Depot is located between the BART Station and sensitive land uses. Therefore, the BART Alternative's contribution to the existing noise environment would be minimal.*

Rose Zukas

T1.4 *Table 4.2-14, 2025 Park-and-Ride Space Requirements, estimates the parking demand at the BART Santa Clara Station as 970 spaces. A total of 1,067 spaces are provided which includes a 10% contingency. As stated in Table 4.2-8, Mode of Access at BART Alternative Stations, the BART Santa Clara Station is projected to have only 11% of the riders using the park-and-ride. Other modes of access include bus – 53%, walk/bike – 13%, airport people mover – 12%, commuter rail – 8%, and kiss-and-ride – 3%. Additionally, many of the users would come in and out throughout the day, freeing up spaces for those coming later in the day. Therefore, adequate parking will be provided.*

Andrew Raturmavil

T1.5 *Mitigating improvements were deemed feasible at the intersections along Brokaw Road and Coleman Avenue but right-of-way issues preclude implementing mitigating improvements at the Monroe Street and Homestead Street locations.*

Andrew Raturmavil

T1.6 *Page 34 of the Santa Clara BART Station Traffic Impact Analysis, May 2003, identifies that the addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane is currently identified in the City of Santa Clara's Capitol Improvements Project list. The BART Alternative does not generate additional traffic that would result in additional traffic impacts that would require mitigation.*

Rose Zukas

T1.7 *There will be two bus transit centers to serve the proposed BART Santa Clara Station. An existing bus transit center on the west side of the tracks between the Santa Clara Caltrain Station and El Camino Real and a new facility on the east side of the proposed BART Santa Clara Station adjacent to Brokaw Road. As stated in Section 3.4.7, BART Alternative Operating Plan, BART would operate 21 hours per day between 4:00 a.m. and 1:00 a.m.*

Rose Zukas

T1.8 *Precise service schedules will be determined at a later point in time. VTA does not anticipate a "rush of trains" coming in and turning around since there will be a BART maintenance/storage yard near the BART Santa Clara Station. Therefore BART trains would gradually be added and taken out of service throughout the day.*

Rose Zukas

T1.9 *BART Police have exclusive jurisdiction over BART property. This would include the pedestrian walkway. In addition, the BART Police Department has in the past entered into mutual agreements to jointly police areas. Recognizing that the crossing is adjacent to the Santa Clara Police Department, illegal activities would not be anticipated at this location.*

Toby McPheeters

T1.10 *The BART Alternative will pass beneath the Guadalupe River, near West Santa Clara Street in two tunnels. The distance between the top of the tunnels and the bed of the river is approximately 24 feet. Each tunnel is approximately 20 feet in diameter. The two tunnels are approximately 20 feet apart. Therefore, the total width passing beneath the Guadalupe River (tunnels and width in between) is approximately 60 feet. A graphical representation of the "twin-bore tunnel" is shown in Figure 4.19-7, Conceptual Cross Section for BART Alternative Tunnel.*

The tunnels will be excavated using a closed-face tunnel boring machine, as described in Section 4.19.2.3, Location and Construction of Guideway Types, Stations, and Other Facilities, that controls ground movements so there will be no discernable surface effects. The tunnel will be lined using precast concrete segments with gasketed joints that provide a watertight lining both during construction and permanently during operation of the BART Alternative. This will prevent ingress of water so there are no impacts on groundwater levels or surface water levels in the river.

The tunnel structures will be designed for loading due to water pressure corresponding with maximum flood levels plus a factor of safety. Potential water ingress points, such as station entrances and vent shafts, will be designed taking flood levels into account. As mentioned above, the tunnels will be designed to be watertight; therefore, seepage due to flood levels will not occur.

With the construction of the BART Alternative at the Guadalupe River occurring under the ground surface and utilizing a methodology that does not adversely affect groundwater

levels or surface water levels in the river, there will be no impacts to biological resources (plants and wildlife, including fish) in the riparian, wetland, and/or aquatic habitats.

Toby McPheeters

T1.11 *The BART vehicles are substantially lighter and would be quieter than the existing freight and passenger movements that occur currently in the yard. This is a result of the slower speeds and less force involved with coupling BART cars compared to freight and passenger heavy rail vehicles. BART couplers are not designed to “free align” for coupling like the louder universal knuckle coupler design of freight cars. BART cars are also moved under their own power or a diesel hi-rail vehicle compared to a louder locomotive for the freight cars. In addition, the BART guideway is maintained more frequently than the track for freight and passenger trains also reducing noise levels. The BART maintenance activities would not exceed the FTA and BART noise criteria.*

Claudia Daw

T1.12 *The BART trains are designed to have operator cabs at both ends of the trains. At the end of the line, the operator exits the cab at one end of the train and enters the cab at the opposite end of the train to drive the train in the opposite direction from which it came. BART does use a turntable in the yards for turning cars as required for maintenance or operational needs. However, the turntable is operated infrequently and the noise related to turntable operation is minimal.*

Claudia Daw

T1.13 *The noise impact assessment was conducted using both FTA and BART noise criteria. The assessment procedures meet with both National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for assessing noise impact from transit operations. The FTA noise criteria are based on the existing noise levels in determining impact and take into account changes in noise level due to the introduction of the project. Where noise impact has been identified, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise levels to within the appropriate criteria. No impact was identified in Segment 5 of the BART Alternative, which includes the BART Santa Clara Station. Also refer to response T1.11.*

Heinz Bodeker

T1.14 *Section 4.19.2.3, Location and Construction of Guideway Types, Stations and Other Facilities, provides text and graphics depicting the construction activities. Construction traffic impacts along Santa Clara Street would be significant and unavoidable because of the duration and magnitude of activities and the need for cut-and-cover construction for the two downtown stations. As stated in Section 4.19.3.1, Vehicular Traffic Impacts, the construction of the cut-and-cover stations and crossover section in Downtown San Jose would require that one lane in each direction on East/West Santa Clara Street be closed periodically for up to 3½ years as construction material is removed from or placed within the station and crossover locations. In addition, at the start and completion of the construction, Santa Clara Street would need to be closed for one to three months to place or remove the temporary vehicle travel deck. Section 4.19.2.1, Pre-construction Activities, describes the Traffic Control Plans, Construction Impact Mitigation Plan, Pre-*

Construction Business Survey, and other activities designed to minimize disruption to businesses.

Heinz Bodeker

T1.15 *Santa Clara Street would be closed for up to three months at the start and end of construction of cut-and-cover sections. Cut-and-cover stations and cross-over sections would require periodic one-lane closures in each direction on Santa Clara Street during the 3½ year construction period.*

Ken Sinclair

T1.16 *The BART Station is proposed to be east of the railroad tracks to avoid significant impacts to the historic structures and residential neighborhoods on the west side. Furthermore, the east side has better opportunities for higher density, mixed-use, and transit-oriented developments, as well as integration with the future Automated People Mover.*

Ken Sinclair

T1.17 *Refer to response T1.16.*

Richard Preston

T1.18 *On May 26, 2004, the SVRTC Policy Advisory Board recommended the Aerial Walkway South Option as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative. This option best meets the needs of the transferring passengers. VTA staff proposes moving the historic Tower to the location south of the aerial walkway, which would preserve the visual continuity between the historic Tower and Depot. VTA staff will work with the historic resource stakeholders to resolve the location concerns and the design for the aerial walkway. The design would also comply with Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines, accommodate bicyclists, and provide adequate protection from the elements.*

The Santa Clara Historic Landmarks Commission, South Bay Historical Railroad Society, and Caltrain have expressed support for the Underground Walkway. That option requires additional elevation changes for passengers moving from BART or the future Automated People Mover to the west side of the Caltrain tracks. It could also result in additional impacts to hidden utility and hazardous materials under the tracks. This option is also the most expensive of the three evaluated.

Richard Preston

T1.19 *The 2000 Measure A Program identified funding for an Automated People Mover (APM) connection between BART Santa Clara Station and Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport. However, the VTA Board has determined that the APM project is not a priority at this time. When VTA's financial situation improves, this project may be reprioritized. The comment to "cut the People Mover in the short-term" is noted and included in the record for consideration by the decision-makers.*

Minh Thai

T1.20 Chapter 8, *Financial Considerations*, includes a complete discussion of the costs and funding for the project in combination with the EIS/EIR Recommended Project Description. In 2000, the voters of Santa Clara County passed Measure A, a ½-cent sales tax to support this and other transit projects in Santa Clara County. The recent economic decline presents challenges to the financing of this project. VTA staff continues to work with the VTA Board, the State of California, and the FTA to resolve the details of the funding plan for this project. As stated in the EIS/EIR “a feasible financial plan will need to be prepared to advance the project into Final Design.”

Anthony Smrdeli

T1.21 The walkway would be covered. Also refer to response T1.18.

Anthony Smrdeli

T1.22 The pedestrian walkway would be designed to accommodate both bicyclists and the disabled. This includes sufficient space for bicycles and tire grooves or other features to enable transporting bicycles up and down stairs. The project will also be required to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Greg McPheeters

T1.23 As stated in Section 4.19.3.11, *Design Requirements and Best Management Practices for Pedestrians and Bicyclists Impacts*, “Contractors will be required to maintain adequate pedestrians and bicyclists access in construction areas to minimize impacts to non-motorized traffic.” Regarding intersections where construction traffic would result in significant impacts, bicyclists would be accommodated but not necessarily in separate bike lanes.

Greg McPheeters

T1.24 At roadway intersections, the BART Alternative is entirely grade separated so there would be no conflicts with cyclists.

Greg McPheeters

T1.25 On May 26, 2004, the SVRTC Policy Advisory Board recommended the Aerial Walkway South Option as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative. This option best meets the needs of the transferring passengers. The walkway would have stairs on either end and elevators to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The walkway is depicted in Appendix B, Figure B-42, and shows a landing at the BART Station on the east and a landing near the end of Benton Street on the west.

Rose Zukas

T1.26 The BART Police Department maintains a “grave yard” shift of officers that patrol stations

and facilities late at night. In addition, as stated in response T1.9, recognizing that the crossing is adjacent to the Santa Clara Police Department, illegal activities would not be anticipated at this location. Prior to initiating revenue service, BART Police and local police jurisdictions will implement an agreement regarding jurisdiction. BART police are typically responsible for issues within BART right-of-way and the local police jurisdictions are responsible for the local neighborhoods.

Ken Sinclair

T1.27 *Escalators on not proposed. The aerial walkway would have stairs on either end and elevators to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Your preference for the north option for the station is noted. On May 26, 2004, the SVRTC Policy Advisory Board recommended the Parking Structure North Option at the BART Santa Clara Station as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative.*

Richard Preston

T1.28 *On May 26, 2004, the SVRTC Policy Advisory Board recommended the Aerial Walkway South Option and the Parking Structure North Option as parts of the Locally Preferred Alternative. Refer to Responses T1.18 and R5.1 for additional information about the recommendation. Security will be provided at each of the BART Alternative stations.*

Richard Preston

T1.29 *The primary reason the BART Santa Clara Station was selected as a BART station was because it is a key intermodal transit center. The Aerial Walkway South Option would provide convenient transfer and access between BART and the future Automated People Mover to Caltrain, ACE, Capitols, and VTA Bus. Bus service will be modified as necessary to support BART connections.*

This page intentionally left blank.

T2

SAN JOSE PUBLIC
HEARING ON THE DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT

**CERTIFIED
ORIGINAL**

First United Methodist Church
24 North Fifth Street
San Jose, California
Taken on
Wednesday, April 14, 2004
At
6:00 p.m.

#15485

Advantage *ARs* Reporting
Services, LLC

1083 Lincoln Avenue, San Jose, California 95125, Telephone (408) 920-0222, Fax (408) 920-0188

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

Tom Fitzwater, Environmental Planner
Ann Jamison, Deputy Project Manager
Kay Wilson, Moderator

The Reporter: ADVANTAGE REPORTING SERVICES
 BY: NOELIA ESPINOLA,
 CSR #8060
 1083 Lincoln Avenue
 San Jose, CA 95125
 (408) 920-0222

--oOo--

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S :

MS. WILSON: We'll start with our first speaker. Henry Bender, if you would please step to the microphone.

MR. BENDER: Thank you. I'm Henry Bender of San Jose. I'm the author of this book and other works on railroad history, and I commend you on the good work you're doing.

I am very much in favor of extending BART from Fremont through Warm Springs to Milpitas, Montague area. But the idea of VTA building three railroads from Milpitas, Montague to downtown San Jose seems extravagantly foolish. And I leave it at that. The cost of the third one, the BART extension in the billions, billion with a B, that stands for big money, is something that is not likely to get passed the folks in Washington, D.C. when they look at this and the folks in Sacramento that don't have that money anymore. So I urge you to concentrate on extending BART to Milpitas. Thank you.

T2.1

MS. WILSON: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Boris Landa. Good evening.

MR. LANDA: Good evening. I would like to

1 see the face of the people and you, too. Thank you for
2 this opportunity.

3 Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for this
4 opportunity to express my opinion about this BART
5 project. I'm a software engineer. I'm not working for
6 VTA.

7 MS. WILSON: Excuse me, sir. If you can you
8 step closer to the microphone so the court reporter can
9 hear you.

10 MR. LANDA: Okay.

11 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

12 MR. LANDA: I'm not working for VTA. I am a
13 software engineer working for a high-tech company here
14 in the Bay Area. And I'm one of the residents in north
15 San Jose.

16 Today I decided to come forward and tell you
17 what my opinion -- I think about this project. Because
18 in our opinion we are in our way to catastrophe
19 environmental and financial.

20 First of all, I would like to remind all of
21 us what BART really is. It is a high-speed train. And
22 it produces noise like a high-speed train. Anybody
23 whoever live in a railroad area knows that disturbing
24 sound of a passing train can be very well heard at
25 least four or five blocks on each side of the railroad.

T2.2

4

1 The high-speed train will make extreme noises even
2 stronger than that and longer distance than that. So
3 it's not an exaggeration to say that noise from the
4 BART train will be heard half a mile on each side of
5 the line.

6 The length of the proposed railroad will be
7 6.3 miles, most of which approximately 14 miles, will
8 be built on the ground. So you can imagine the area 14
9 miles long and one mile wide affected by the extreme
10 sound. Has anybody calculated how many thousands of
11 houses will find themselves on this territory of at
12 least 15 square miles. I saw this 400 numbers of
13 residents, I don't know what they mean by residents.
14 Thousands of houses will be affected, not 400.
15 Thousands of tenants.

16 Another BART feature is the frequency of
17 circulation. The letter I received said that the BART
18 trains are expected to run every six minutes. This
19 should be read as every six minutes in one direction.
20 Since it will be two directions, so the trains will be
21 passing by in an average every three minutes. I
22 guarantee you it will be a living hell for all those
23 many thousands of tenants in the 14 square mile area.
24 I'm not --

25 MS. WILSON: Time, please.

T2.2

5

1 MR. LANDA: Huh?

2 MS. WILSON: Your time is up.

3 MR. LANDA: Excuse me. We are discussing the
4 potential catastrophic environment. Not so many people
5 came today because the date for this hearing was
6 selected exactly at the deadline of tax filing date,
7 not so many people decided to come forward and talk.
8 So let us speak. I will not take you more than ten
9 minutes. It will not take you more than ten minutes.
10 I ask all of you back here, let me speak because it's
11 very, very important. Don't give us two minutes. Two
12 minutes is nothing compared with this catastrophe that
13 we are going to.

T2.3

14 MS. WILSON: I think we can do what we did at
15 other meetings. We can extend the time limit to three
16 minutes. So continue on. And then if you would please
17 submit your comments in writing --

18 MR. LANDA: What do you say?

19 MR. VAN CLEEF: Submit your comments in
20 writing like the rest of us.

21 MS. WILSON: You have one more minute,
22 please.

23 MR. LANDA: Okay. I live not far from the
24 Union Pacific Railroad. Where now there's no railroad
25 circulation. Most of the houses along this railroad --

T2.4

6

1 along this railroad there are fences, fences, fences,
2 fences, on left side and right side. Behind each fence
3 there is another residential home with a lot of houses.
4 Each house cost from 5 to \$700,000.

T2.4

5 And I guarantee you that as soon as this
6 project is approved, the value of these houses will
7 drop 30 percent, and every family will lose
8 approximately \$200,000. They will have to sell their
9 house and move somewhere. It means \$30,000. Every
10 family has go to pay only 30 percent of their houses
11 and so forth and so forth. So since I'm limited to
12 time, I will tell you this is catastrophic.

T2.5

13 No one civilized city in the world would
14 allow construction of a system like BART on the ground
15 through the heavily populated area. No one in the
16 world. Every city does construction under the ground.
17 It's more expensive. It takes more time. It's an
18 ongoing project. But it benefits a lot of generations
19 for 70, 80 years to come.

T2.6

20 If we build this BART like we propose here on
21 the ground, it will stay here for centuries, and you
22 will not be able to do anything. Thank you.

23 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

24 MR. LANDA: So can I submit my transcript as
25 my comments?

7

1 MS. WILSON: Absolutely.

2 Danny Garza.

3 MR. GARZA: Thank you. My name is Danny
4 Garza. I have two things I'd like to say.

5 I like BART -- I like the neighborhoods on
6 one-half mile on each direction of the tracks to be
7 notified of possible structural issues in the homes
8 concerning being affected, hopefully not, by
9 vibrations.

T2.7

10 And then I'd like to just say this from MAPA,
11 Mexican-American Association -- a Political
12 Association. At this time MAPA will go on the record
13 to oppose the stop at Santa Clara near 101 until a
14 written safety and security plan weekend study is
15 received, including but not limited to the immediate
16 businesses and neighborhoods, nearby streets and
17 neighborhoods, traffic , especially also the
18 surrounding schools and school-related stops within a
19 one mile circle of the corner of 28th and Santa Clara.

T2.8

20 If the Berryessa station is open and the
21 Santa Clara station will be guaranteed not to open no
22 sooner than five years later, we will withdraw this
23 opposition. Thank you.

24 MS. WILSON: Next speaker. Margaret Okuzumi.

25 MS. OKUZUMI: I'm sure that my outlines will

8

1 be submitting many more comments. Just initially --
2 well, first I would like to ask that this presentation
3 be available on your web site. I found it far more
4 informative summary of the environmental document than
5 the glossy booklet that you probably spent a lot of
6 money on. So I hope that that will be available for
7 the public, because I think it is a good summary of
8 some of the impacts and the findings.

T2.9

9 You make it seem as if by constructing these
10 panels on Santa Clara Street that somehow that will
11 take care of a lot of the impacts that will be able to
12 mitigate to only certain names at certain times. And,
13 you know, I have to look more carefully at your
14 environmental document, but I have to ask where all
15 your equipment is going to be staged, because it seems
16 to me that the construction impacts are going to be
17 much greater on the impact on the traffic -- the
18 disruption to traffic is going to be much greater than
19 what you implied in that summary presentation.

T2.10

T2.11

20 And I'd like to ask more about the noise
21 impact. You need to consider not only the absolute
22 decibel level of the noise, but also the frequency of
23 the noise. BART trains, if you go and visit the East
24 Bay, for example, and you hear the BART trains, they're
25 extremely noisy, and the tunnels they're extremely

T2.12

9

1 noisy, but also the quality of the sound is quite
2 different than for other traffic noise, and it's very
3 high-pitched sounds. And I think -- you know, somehow
4 that needs to be taken into account when considering
5 the environmental impacts and the impacts of quality of
6 life.

T2.12

7 And, again, I'm sure we'll have many more
8 comments. But, again, we feel that the construction
9 impacts are probably going to be far greater. We'd
10 like to see that addressed in the environmental
11 document.

T2.13

12 MS. WILSON: Thank you very much. Mr. Van
13 Cleef.

14 MR. VAN CLEEF: Bob Van Cleef, Portugal North
15 Neighborhood Association and Five Wounds. When this
16 was initially discussed, we went over the Alum Rock
17 position quite intensively in all our meetings. The
18 consensus was the diagonal crossing, the negative
19 impact on the neighborhoods north of Julian were a
20 factor. The big negative impact on the neighborhoods
21 south of Santa Clara were a factor. And the noise and
22 impact on the park itself and the curvature going --
23 trying to make that very sharp turn going south. And
24 it's going to impact the band building.

T2.14

25 We were very adamant that the Portuguese

10

1 cultural buildings would be protected at all possible.
2 And of course we have concern for the vibration and
3 sound when it goes through those residential areas.

T2.14

4 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

5 The next speaker is Grant Bentley. And I'll
6 ask the staff to raise your hand with more blue cards.
7 If you'd like to get another blue card, that would be
8 great.

9 MR. BENTLEY: Good afternoon. The Olinder
10 Neighborhood Association. I want to thank you and
11 commend you for a very thoughtful and
12 well-presentation. We appreciate the chance to comment
13 for VTA.

14 I have in previous public hearings brought up
15 the possibility that although a regional transit system
16 is a necessary responsibility of the citizens of the
17 Bay Area, there is a question in my mind as to the
18 six-minute headways. Because of the fact that Caltrain
19 right now runs in an hourly sort of schedule, the
20 possibility of regional BART as a new way of getting up
21 into San Francisco on the 30-minute headways would
22 create a logical compromise between Caltrain and, you
23 know, car transportation.

T2.15

24 And several times in public hearings there
25 has been this assumption made that the BART rider will

11

1 not accept a lack of frequency in headways of greater
2 than six minutes. And we've seen several situations, I
3 think, as San Jose is one of the most populated parts
4 of the BART system, that a potential alternative that
5 would start at least initially with a longer headway
6 might allow the BART system to deal with its
7 constituency in a more phased approach.

8 First of all, I understand that the cost
9 implications are significant because of the number of
10 trains and cars involved. And I'm not talking about a T2.15
11 small effect. It was described to me as a very large
12 impact if you went to 30-minute headways.

13 And second of all, you are going to allow the
14 noise issues to be dealt with in a community fashion.
15 Because if you do have the noise and vibration
16 happening in a 30-minute time frame, it's something you
17 can deal with versus the six minute, which is going to
18 be something people aren't going to get accustomed to
19 very easily. So I would like you to take that under
20 advisement.

21 I actually did grow up in the East Bay as the
22 BART system was developed there, and I can tell you
23 that it is quite an advantage for community development
24 to have BART stations in your midst. And so I commend T2.16
25 the ability for VTA to consider the land development

12

1 issues around the BART stations and how we can improve
2 Santa Clara, given that we need to deal with
3 construction delays and the impact on the traffic.

4 The possibility for good land development and
5 better development along east Santa Clara is
6 significant. So please keep that in mind as a benefit.
7 Thank you very much.

T2.16

8 MS. WILSON: Thank you very much.

9 Denise Hohman.

10 MS. HOHMAN: Hi. I live in downtown San Jose
11 near the arena. And I would like to make a request
12 that the construction vehicles not be allowed to pass
13 through residential neighborhoods. We've had some
14 problems with that with the light rail extension.

T2.17

15 My other comment is I would like to know the
16 impact of the BART extension with the Highway 87
17 widening. If those two projects would be happening in
18 conjunction as well as the double impact that that
19 would have on the neighborhood. Thank you.

T2.18

20 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

21 I would love to have some more blue cards and
22 get some more comments, please. Anybody else want to
23 come up and give us your thoughts?

24 MR. GARZA: Can I go one more time?

25 MS. WILSON: Yes, you can.

13

1 MR. GARZA: Danny Garza. I would also like
2 to personally support the Berryessa station because of
3 the future accessibility due to the improvements that
4 are scheduled to be made at the bridge on Taylor and
5 hopefully the improvements that can be made from 680
6 going right down Maybury that will end -- that can end
7 right at the BART station. There's plenty of room for
8 a parking structure and plenty of room for a BART stop.
9 Thank you.

T2.19

10 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

11 Any more blue cards? Anybody else want to
12 come up and give us some comments.

13 Okay. What I think we'll do is what we did
14 last evening, just so that we can be sure we maximize
15 everybody's understanding and chance to talk to the VTA
16 staff as well. We'll go ahead and suspend the public
17 hear for a few minutes, let's say maybe until 7:20.
18 And you can go around the room, look at the maps, look
19 at the documents, talk to our experts up here. And
20 then we'll come back at 7:20, and we can take any
21 additional comments that you may want to make. And
22 that will give you a chance to ask some of your
23 informal questions.

24 If you don't want to stick around for that,
25 you don't have to. But if you do, we'd like you to and

14

1 we'd be glad to answer your questions informally and
2 then take any more public comments. So we'll get back
3 together at 7:20.

4 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)

5 MS. WILSON: Okay. Edward Mason.

6 MR. MASON: Good evening. My name is Edward
7 Mason of San Jose.

8 One question that I have in trying to go
9 through this entire document is, how can we measure the
10 reliability of the information that's contained in this
11 document compared to the EIR that was written for the
12 BART SFO extension problem? That's just a general
13 statement.

T2.20

14 On air quality, is there going to be any
15 mention made of landscaping and specifically trees?
16 And the reason I bring it up is I heard this weekend
17 that increase in allergies has been caused by the fact
18 that all of the landscaping in the projects that have
19 gone on have selected male trees only, not female
20 trees. And as a consequence male trees generate pollen
21 to an exorbitant amount to the point now that in the
22 United States and all of the urban areas we basically
23 pollinate the urban areas with male trees in all the
24 landscaping. So I thought that was just an amazing
25 realization, because I know that Third Street light

T2.21

15

1 rail is going to with male ginkgo trees. And I have a
2 ginkgo tree in my residence that I constantly clean
3 after. The pollen I clean up. The female trees drop
4 the things that you step on.

T2.2
1

5 Noise, Daly City, especially when the BART
6 trains leaving Daly City and if you're standing on San
7 Jose Avenue and San Francisco, I agree with the
8 gentleman that was speaking, the noise is
9 extraordinary. In the tunnels between Glen Park, curve
10 as it goes into Richmond Street, it's horrendous. 16th
11 Street, Civic Center in San Francisco, is again another
12 curve. If you're a passenger in the tunnel, it's
13 horrendous.

T2.22

14 There's no mention named about redevelopment
15 agency. We just briefly talked about redevelopment in
16 San Jose. But my question is, with all of this
17 redevelopment in San Jose, what are going to be the
18 sewage requirements? Where are we going to get fresh
19 water? Is it going to be treated water, or are we
20 going to be drinking our own sewage?

T2.23

21 Where is going to be the power source?
22 They're predicting right now power shortages in the
23 near term for possibly this year, and there's no time
24 horizon for any new power source generating power
25 plants. Fair box recovery was 71 percent. I find that

T2.24

T2.25

1 to be extraordinary. How did that number get
2 generated?

T2.25
cont.

3 Ridership, parking, we're really saying we're
4 going to build all these parking facilities and parking
5 garages to the tune of in current numbers now in a
6 parking structure \$40,000 parking space. There's a
7 metric -- what we're really saying is VTA is not going
8 to provide the service for me to get to BART in an
9 adequate manner. I live in Willow Glen, I'm five miles
10 away from the downtown station. So my question is:

T2.26

11 Are we going to have stations with a little shoes, so
12 my tennis shoes so I can store them there and get down?
13 What's the mind shift that is going to encourage the
14 ridership that we're projecting?

T2.27

15 What is the analyzed capital cost of the
16 operating cost? Basically what's that percentage rate?
17 Although it's referenced in the document, it doesn't
18 say what that rate of percentage is that says it's \$30
19 per rider. And everything that I read so far -- and it
20 may be wrong because I haven't read all thousand
21 documents -- everything talks about weekday service.
22 There's no reference made to weekend service and how
23 we're going to be able to --

T2.28

24 MS. WILSON: Time, please.

25 MR. MASON: -- do that. These are my initial

17

1 comments.

2 MS. WILSON: Thank you very much.

3 Okay. Bob Van Cleef, coming back up.

4 MR. VAN CLEEF: I just have to add my support
5 to Danny Garza's comment earlier about the traffic
6 issues. We would like to see the traffic diverted on
7 Taylor Street over to the Milpitas station. The
8 problem with Five Wounds -- the station at Alum Rock is
9 the traffic there is already overburdened. 101 is
10 overburdened, and we do not want to see a kiss and ride
11 station at Alum Rock whatsoever. The only parking we
12 want to see there is parking for the services that are
13 there, not all day parking for people to drive in from
14 everywhere else, because 101 can't take it and neither
15 can the streets and the schools that are adjacent to
16 it.

17 MS. WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

18 We've still got time. I'll take some more
19 blue cards. If you've already spoken, that's fine,
20 just raise your hand and we'll get you a blue card.

21 MR. GARZA: I want to make a correction.
22 That's Mabury, for me and Bob. That's the Mabury stop.
23 Not the --

24 MS. WILSON: Put your name on the record.

25 MR. GARZA: Danny Garza. Just making a

T2.29

T2.30

18

1 correction on my last statement that I inadvertently
2 said Taylor when I meant the Mabury stop or the flea
3 market stop.

T2.30
cont.

4 MS. WILSON: Thanks for the correction.

5 MR. GARZA: Thank you.

6 MS. WILSON: How about some more comments
7 particularly those of you that stayed through the
8 break. Don't you want to come on up and give us some
9 input? Anybody? We've got time. Going, going.
10 Anybody? Okay. Well, it looks like we've exhausted
11 your comments. Last call. Okay. Let me make a few
12 summary comments then.

13 First off, thank you again for coming. We
14 really appreciate it. Someone noted that it was tax
15 night -- or night before tax day, so we do appreciate
16 you coming out.

17 I would like to announce that of the four
18 hearings we have two more coming up. One will be
19 Monday, April 19th, in Milpitas. It will be at the
20 Joseph Weller Elementary School, which is 345 Boulder
21 Street in Milpitas. And our fourth and last public
22 hearing will be right back here in this room in San
23 Jose on Monday, May 10th. And both of those will be
24 from 6:00 to 8:00.

25 And as we've emphasized before, in addition

19

1 to the hearings, we welcome written comments through
2 May 14th at 5:00 o'clock.

3 So thank you so much and maybe we'll see you
4 again.

5 (Whereupon, the public comments were
6 concluded at 7:27 p.m.)

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing hearing was taken down by me in shorthand at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction.

And I hereby certify the foregoing transcript is a full, true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.

I further certify that I am not interested in the outcome of this hearing.

Dated: April 14, 2014 
NOELIA ESPINOLA, CSR #8060

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing hearing was taken down by me in shorthand at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction.

And I hereby certify the foregoing transcript is a full, true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.

I further certify that I am not interested in the outcome of this hearing.

Dated: April 14, 2014 
NOELIA ESPINOLA, CSR #8060

RESPONSE TO TRANSCRIPT T2

Henry Bender

T2.1 *The Major Investment Study/Alternatives Analysis (MIS/AA) thoroughly evaluated 11 alternatives for the corridor including the possible use of express bus, busway, commuter rail, diesel light rail, light rail, and BART. These alternatives were consistent with the goals of the MIS/AA. After an extensive public outreach process, the VTA Board of Directors determined that the benefits of the BART Alternative were far greater than those of any of the other alternatives and selected it as the Locally Preferred Alternative in November 2001. Although there are those that say we should stop the project in Milpitas or Northeast San Jose, dividing the project into segments would substantially increase the total project costs with no real advantage. The current BART maintenance facilities cannot handle even a small extension into Santa Clara County. This project requires a new maintenance facility preferable located at the end of the extension, since midline maintenance facilities result in significant increases in annual operating costs associated with "deadheading" trains at the start and end of service. Terminating the project before Santa Clara results in the expenditure of funds for significant maintenance capacity improvements that would be throw-away costs once the extension is completed to Santa Clara. In addition, expanded parking and access improvements to the Montague/Capitol and Berryessa Stations would also be wasted improvements once the remainder of the extension is completed.*

Boris Landa

T2.2 *As described in Section 4.13, Noise and Vibration, noise impacts for this project are based on both Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and BART criteria. FTA criteria are defined in the FTA guidance manual, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (FTA Report DOT-T-95-16, April 1995). The FTA Noise Impact Criteria are founded on well-documented research on community reaction to noise and are based on change in noise exposure using a sliding scale. The criteria are summarized in Table 4.13-1, FTA Noise Impact Criteria. BART's operational noise criteria are based on the criteria adopted in the 1992 BART Extensions Program System Design Criteria (BART Design Criteria [Report]). Table 4.13-3, BART Design Criteria for Operational Noise, presents BART Design Criteria for project-induced noise levels.*

As stated in Section 4.13.3.3, Mitigation Measures, under the subheading, BART Alternative, the primary mitigation measure for noise impacts would be the construction of sound walls along the BART Alternative alignment where impacts are projected. Table 4.13-12, BART Alternative Noise Barrier Mitigation Treatment for Residential Areas, indicates the approximate noise barrier locations, lengths, heights, and side of track, as well as the number of moderate impacts and severe impacts that would be reduced to below the FTA and BART criteria thresholds. With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed in Section 4.13.3.3, all potential noise impacts will be reduced to below the FTA and BART criteria thresholds. The frequency of BART trains was one of the key parameters used in the noise analysis.

Also, refer to written comment letter P51 from the commentor and the responses.

Boris Landa

T2.3 *Two minutes is the typical time VTA allows for interested citizens to comment on environmental documents at public hearings. However, individuals were allowed to speak again after all others in attendance had an opportunity to express their comments for the first time. Also, refer to written comment letter P51 from the commentor and the responses.*

Boris Landa

T2.4 *Contrary to the comment, UPRR does currently operate approximately once a week along the SVRTC in the vicinity of the commentor's residence. At other locations to the north UPRR operates on a much more frequent level. However, UPRR does have full rights in this corridor to operate trains at any time, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. Also, the current operating schedule can change at any time. As the environmental document states, there are many fences on both sides of the tracks along the entire length of the SVRTC. While this is not a comment that addresses an environmental issue, the comment is noted and included in the record for consideration by the decision-makers.*

Boris Landa

T2.5 *Reduction in property value is not considered a significant effect on the environment for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Protection Act.*

Boris Landa

T2.6 *Most heavy rail systems (including WMATA and New York MTA) have subways in downtown areas but are at-grade or elevated or in a retained trench as they move away from downtown areas. This is similar to the BART system where major portions of the system are above ground, while portions in San Francisco and Oakland are underground.*

Danny Garza

T2.7 *Properties within 1,000 feet on either side of the BART alignment and within one-half mile of the stations were notified of any public meetings. This included the Scoping Meetings, four meeting on the Minimum Operating Segment, and four public hearings on the Draft EIS/EIR. They will also be notified when the Final EIS/EIR will be presented to the VTA Board of Directors.*

The vibration impact assessment was conducted using both FTA and BART vibration criteria. The assessment procedures meet with both National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for assessing vibration impact from transit operations. Both the BART and FTA vibration criteria are based on human response and perception to vibration. The vibration impact criteria are well below the thresholds for even minor cosmetic damage to residences. The strictest damage criteria are around 100 VdB for historic buildings that are typically more sensitive to vibration damage than homes because of construction techniques and materials. Tables 4.13-17, BART Alternative Residential Vibration Impacts Without Mitigation Using

FTA Criteria, and 4.13-18, BART Alternative Residential Vibration Impact Without Mitigation Using BART Design Criteria, provide the projected vibration levels for sensitive uses along the BART alignment. The highest vibration level is 85 VdB at 26 feet from the near track. This is well below the 100 VdB damage criteria. However, the analysis did conclude that 12 residences located adjacent to the alignment and north of Berryessa Road would experience vibration levels that exceeded the annoyance criteria. These residences were considered to have significant and unavoidable vibration impacts because mitigation measures have not yet been identified that could guarantee the impacts would be reduced to levels below the criteria.

Danny Garza

T2.8 *The BART Police Department's goal is to build a more community-oriented police force that is tough on crime and strong on customer service. Zone commanders and their personnel form working partnerships with BART riders, fellow employees, community groups, schools, and business owners. Together the goal is to ensure that personal safety, quality of life, and the protection of property remain among BART's top priorities. The BART Police Department's officers have full police powers that extend throughout the state, have exclusive jurisdiction over all BART stations and facilities and provide the full range of law enforcement services. The BART Police Department is also signatory to the Bay Area's mutual-aid pacts that can draw upon county and city support. The BART Police Department service area will extend to the BART Alternative facilities. Therefore, security measures will be in place to ensure a safe environment around station locations.*

Margaret Okuzumi

T2.9 *The Public Hearing presentation was uploaded to the project website upon receipt of this comment.*

Margaret Okuzumi

T2.10 *Construction of the BART Alternative will continue for up to three and a half years as described in Section 4.19.3.1, Vehicular Traffic Impacts, under the subheading, Station and Cut-and-Cover Impacts within Downtown San Jose. For the tunnel, the use of tunnel-boring machines rather than cut-and-cover techniques will reduce construction impacts on business and residential communities. However, construction of the stations and the crossover in downtown using cut-and-cover techniques will impact vehicular traffic and parking, as well as pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus service. For example, construction of the Civic Plaza/SJSU and Market Street stations will require the closure of certain travel lanes along East Santa Clara Street and associated cross streets (1st, 5th, 6th, 7th, Market, San Pedro, and Almaden). Details of lane closures, as well as other impacts to vehicular traffic and parking, pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus service during construction of the BART Alternative are described in Section 4.19.3.1, Vehicular Traffic Impacts.*

To manage traffic during overall project construction, including utility relocation, detailed traffic control plans (TCPs) will be prepared addressing traffic control, detours, and overall traffic management. TCPs are implemented during all phases of site preparation, grading, construction, materials delivery, and waste hauling (such as excavated material [muck] resulting from the use of tunnel-boring machines). In addition, VTA and the City of San Jose are working cooperatively to develop a Construction Impact Mitigation Plan

prior to construction. This plan will also address the temporary relocation of displaced parking and loading zones along East/West Santa Clara Street. Details of this plan are provided in Section 4.19.2.1, Pre-construction Activities. VTA will also notify property owners, local residents (renters), and businesses in advance of construction activity.

Access plans for pedestrians and bicyclists will also be implemented during construction. Pedestrian movement will be separated from both vehicle traffic and construction activity. Signage will be used to direct pedestrians to safe and convenient pathways along existing sidewalks or alternate access routes. Construction contractors will be required to maintain adequate pedestrians and bicyclists access in construction areas and to provide signs to indicate routes of access to businesses and other activities where normal access is obscured or impaired.

Section 4.19.2.8, Construction Staging Sites, discusses and provides figures of potential staging sites. Impacts from the construction staging sites are addressed in Section 4.19, Construction.

A complete discussion of construction impacts related vehicular traffic and parking, as well as pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus service, and measures to avoid or minimize impacts is found in Construction, Section 4.19.3, Transportation and Transit.

Margaret Okuzumi

T2.11 Refer to response T2.10.

Margaret Okuzumi

T2.12 The noise impact assessment was conducted using both FTA and BART noise criteria. The assessment procedures meet with both NEPA and CEQA guidelines for assessing noise impact from transit operations. The FTA noise criteria are based on the existing noise levels in determining impact and take into account changes in noise level due to the introduction of the project. Where noise impact has been identified, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise levels to within the appropriate criteria. Both the FTA and BART noise criteria are expressed in terms of "A" weighted sound levels, which take into account human perception of noise levels at various frequencies. The frequencies at which human hearing is most sensitive are emphasized with the "A" weighting.

Margaret Okuzumi

T2.13 Refer to response T2.10.

Bob Van Cleef

T2.14 On May 26, 2004, the Policy Advisory Board (PAB) recommended the U.S. 101 Diagonal Option for inclusion in the locally preferred project. This decision considered the public opposition to the Railroad/28th Street Option. However, the noise and vibration impacts for the Railroad/28th Street Option that was not selected by the PAB were addressed in Section 4.13, Noise and Vibration.

Grant Bentley

- T2.15** *Section 3.4.7, BART Alternative Operating Plan, discusses the BART Alternative service plan. A critical factor is integrating the BART Alternative with the existing regional BART service in a cost-effective efficient manner. The plan includes 12-minute headways on the Richmond-Fremont-San Jose line and 12 minute headways on the San Francisco-Fremont-San Jose line. This results in an overall six-minute headway, or in other words, BART trains passing through each station every six minutes in each direction. Thirty-minute headways would result in Santa Clara County receiving less frequent service than the BART system causing scheduling problems. Noise concerns under the recommended operating plan are addressed in Section 4.13, Noise and Vibration. With the proposed sound walls, noise impacts have been reduced to below the FTA and BART criteria.*

Grant Bentley

- T2.16** *The support for BART and compatible land development is noted and included in the record for consideration by the decision-makers.*

Denise Hohman

- T2.17** *Since residential areas are a major element of the downtown area and the planned alignment, it will not be possible to entirely prohibit construction vehicles from passing through the residential neighborhoods. VTA will attempt to limit their intrusiveness and limit the hours in which construction vehicles will be used. Section 4.19, Construction, provides a discussion of the construction techniques and detour plans.*

Denise Hohman

- T2.18** *The State Route (SR) 87 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Project involves the construction of HOV lanes in both the northbound and southbound directions on SR 87 between Chynoweth Avenue and just north of Julian Street in the City of San Jose. The purpose of the project is to increase the capacity of SR 87 and to alleviate existing congestion.*

The HOV lane construction is divided into two projects: the SR 87 HOV Lane North project, which is being constructed by VTA, includes the construction of HOV lanes from Julian Street to just north of Virginia Street; and the SR 87 HOV Lane South project, which is being constructed by Caltrans, includes the construction of HOV lanes between Chynoweth Avenue and just north of Virginia Street. Construction of the SR 87 HOV Lane North project is scheduled to begin in October 2004 and be completed in late 2006. Construction of the SR 87 HOV Lane South project is scheduled to begin in early 2005 and end in late 2006. Utility relocation for the BART Alternative project is scheduled to begin in mid-2007 and will continue for 2½ years (see Figure 4.19-30, Project Schedule for the BART Alternative). Construction of the full-build BART Alternative or the MOS scenarios will follow. Therefore, no overlap of construction activities would occur.

The Initial Study/Environmental Assessment for the SR 87 HOV Lane Project (November 2003) states that the SR 87 HOV Lane Project is not expected to divert any traffic to the residential streets. In addition, during final design of the project, detailed traffic control plans (TCPs) will be prepared addressing traffic control, detours, and management

during all phases of site preparation, grading, construction, materials delivery, and waste hauling, resulting in less than adverse effects. Similarly, work on the BART Alternative project will require TCPs. For the BART Alternative project, VTA and the City of San Jose will work cooperatively to develop a Construction Impact Mitigation Plan prior to construction. Details of this plan are provided in Section 4.19.2.1, Pre-construction Activities. VTA will also notify property owners, local residents (renters), and businesses in advance of construction activity.

Danny Garza

T2.19 *The support for the Berryessa Station is noted and included in the record for consideration by the decision-makers.*

Edward Mason

T2.20 *The ridership models for the SVRTC EIS/EIR were developed using industry standard methodologies and are based on the regional travel demand models developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The forecasts also use the regionally adopted growth forecasts prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) for the forecast year 2025. One way the models are tested to ensure that they are producing reasonable forecasts is that the models are first calibrated to existing traffic and transit travel and conditions for a base year, with the model results being compared to actual counts of vehicle traffic and transit boardings by operator. Once the model has been properly validated, then the model is ready to produce future forecasts. All input assumptions regarding growth and the costs of transportation (i.e., gasoline, transit fares, tolls) are consistent with values used by MTC in that agency's long range forecast models. The BART SFO extension ridership forecasts were made several years ago and since that time FTA has undertaken greater scrutiny of the assumptions going into the modeling efforts. In addition, updated ABAG population projections have been used in the SVRTC Project. As a result the forecasts are more conservative than they had been previously.*

Edward Mason

T2.21 *The air quality analysis addresses criteria pollutants that are regulated by the state and federal governments. The air quality analysis looks at how the proposed project would increase or decrease air pollution in the region, as well as in the local area. As trees would not emit air pollution that would adversely affect the environment, the air quality analysis does not discuss pollens that are released by male trees. However, this comment will be forwarded to the Preliminary Engineering teams for their consideration.*

Edward Mason

T2.22 *The noise impact assessment was conducted using both FTA and BART noise criteria. The assessment procedures meet with both NEPA and CEQA guidelines for assessing noise impact from transit operations. The FTA noise criteria are based on the existing noise levels in determining impact and take into account changes in noise level at nearby land uses due to the introduction of the project. Where noise impact has been identified, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise levels to within the appropriate criteria. Noise in tunnels does not affect the surrounding community, as it is*

reduced by the tunnel structure and ground. Noise inside the trains is not included in a noise impact assessment. However, the BART train passenger noise levels would need to comply with any federal and state regulations pertaining to passenger noise exposure.

Edward Mason

T2.23 *The BART Alternative, as well as the MOS scenarios, is a transportation improvement project, not a redevelopment project. However, any environmental impacts due to the redevelopment of an area by the City of San Jose or a private developer would be addressed under separate environmental review. It should be noted that redevelopment must be consistent with the San Jose 2020 General Plan (as amended through May 6, 2004). For example, Chapter 4 of the General Plan discusses the goals and policies related to sanitary sewer systems and sewage treatment demand and capacity. The adequacy of water supply and quality of water resources are also addressed in this chapter. The San Jose 2020 General Plan is available for viewing at the following URL:*

http://www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/planning/sjplan/gp/2020_text/index_pdf.htm

The goals and policies of the General Plan are applicable to construction and operation of the BART Alternative and MOS scenarios. The BART Alternative is also consistent with the General Plan in that it promotes transit-oriented development around station locations. Transit-oriented development associated with BART is covered in Chapter 5 of the General Plan. This type of intensive development must also meet the goals and policies of the general plan related to sanitary sewer systems and sewage treatment demand and the adequacy of water supply and quality of water resources.

The BART Alternative and the MOS scenarios do not place substantial demands on sewage treatment since the primary sources would be restrooms at stations. Design requirements, best management practices, and mitigation measures are included to ensure that groundwater and surface water are protected. These are described in Section 4.18, Water Resources, Water Quality and Floodplains, and Section 4.19 Construction (for the construction phase). With implementation of these requirements, the BART Alternative is not expected result in any detectable changes to groundwater supply or surface water quality.

It should be noted that the commentor may refer to the Santa Clara Valley Water District's website for additional information on water resources at:

http://www.heynoah.com/Water/Where_Your_Water_Comes_From/index.shtm

Edward Mason

T2.24 *Section 4.8, Energy, provides a detailed analysis of the present-day setting for energy and the long-term energy requirements of the BART Alternative. The analysis includes the existing and future electricity generation and demand in California, the existing and future outlook for transmission capacity, and the existing and future setting for natural gas and other petroleum-based fuels.*

The BART Alternative includes electrically powered, multiple-car trains, which draw electric power from the third rail for both traction motors and auxiliary power needs (lighting, heating/air conditioning, communications, etc.). BART's administrative and

related facilities would also use electric power as the main form of energy. As explained in Section 4.8.3.1, Impacts, under the subheading, Electricity Generation Capacity, the rate of electricity use by the BART Alternative during peak-periods of electricity demand (3:00 to 7:00 p.m.) would be on the order of 11 MW. By comparison, this is a rate equivalent of approximately 11,000 homes. As a percentage of the furthest available projection of surplus, 11 MW is on the order of 0.2% of the 2008 surplus. In terms of the percentage of expected demand rates, 11 MW is on the order of 0.001% of the projected total 2025 California electricity demand. The MOS scenarios would use slightly less peak period energy since the number of cars per train would be less than for the BART Alternative. Therefore, while the BART Alternative would increase the peak demand on the power generation system, the impact would be limited due to surplus capacity and the relatively small percentage of that surplus that the additional load from the BART Alternative represents. In terms of transmission capacity, improvements are underway or planned. Therefore, the increased demand on the electrical transmission grid in the future due to the BART Alternative would not be adverse.

It should also be noted that for the BART Alternative, as well as the MOS scenarios, facilities and equipment will be designed and specified to ensure energy efficiency, thereby helping to reduce long-term energy requirements.

Edward Mason

T2.25 *The fare box recovery ratio is defined as the fare revenue divided by the operating costs. The fare revenue for the BART Alternative was derived from the travel demand model. The travel demand model generated daily fare revenue for each mode in each alternative based on actual data from the models base year (1990). The base year included actual trip length and distance based fare schedules. The fare revenue was discounted by 25% to account for passes and other discounted fares. The daily fare revenue was annualized using a factor of 291 (provided by BART) and inflated to 2003 dollars. In FY2003, the fare box recovery ratio for BART was 59%.*

Edward Mason

T2.26 *The number of parking spaces for each of the BART Alternative stations is provided in Table 4.2.14, 2025 Park-and-Ride Space Requirements. These parking spaces are included in the cost projections. Table 4.2.8, Mode of Access at BART Alternative Stations, indicates that over 50% of the riders, except for the Alum Rock Station, will access BART by another transit mode besides auto.*

Edward Mason

T2.27 *Each station for the BART Alternative will be designed to include passenger amenities, such as bicycle lockers, park-and-ride parking spaces, and kiss-and-ride and bus passenger drop-off locations. In addition, as quantified in Table 4.2.14, 2025 Park-and-Ride Space Requirements, a 10% contingency has been added to ensure adequate parking spaces at each station. Transit ridership will be encouraged through supporting bus connections and transit-oriented development at the stations.*

Edward Mason

T2.28 *Table 8.4-1, Cost Effectiveness of Alternatives, 2025, quantifies performance measures. The cost per new rider is \$32.83 compared to the No-Action Alternative. Capitol construction costs for the project are not included in annual operating and maintenance costs. As described in Section 3.4.7, BART Alternative Operating Plan, BART service would operate on the weekends at an average headway of 10 minutes (20 minutes per route) from 4:00 am to 1:00 am.*

Bob Van Cleef

T2.29 *Section 4.2.6.6, 2025 BART Alternative Traffic Level of Service, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, addresses traffic impacts for each station and provides mitigation measures where feasible. Table 4.2-7, BART Alternative Average Weekday Boardings and Alightings in 2025, provides ridership projections for each of the stations. Table 4.2-8, Mode of Access at BART Alternative Stations, identifies the mode of travel used to access these stations. The modeling shows 52% of the Alum Rock Station ridership arriving by automobile and 19% by kiss-and-ride. To accommodate this demand, drop-off areas and parking are required. However, as stated in Table 4.2-14, 2025 Park-and-Ride Space Requirements, 1,000 parking spaces were shifted from the Alum Rock Station to the Berryessa Station to decrease traffic in the Alum Rock area. Diverting traffic off Taylor (Mabury) from the Berryessa Station to the Montague/Capitol Station would result in longer travel distances by BART ridership from South County and increased traffic on U.S. 101 and I-880 and Montague Expressway, roadways that are already congested. For these reasons, parking needs to be shared among the three stations. Mitigation measures are proposed for the intersections of Julian Street and U.S. 101 and for Julian Street and 28th Street. A significant unavoidable impact was identified at McKee Road and King Road. Right-of-way constraints prohibit the widening to four lanes in each direction to mitigate this impact.*

Danny Garza

T2.30 *The clarification of his earlier comment is acknowledged.*

This page intentionally left blank.

T3

SAN JOSE PUBLIC
HEARING ON THE DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT

**CERTIFIED
ORIGINAL**

Joseph Weller Elementary School

345 Boulder Street

Milpitas, California

Taken on

Monday, April 19, 2004

At

6:45 p.m.

#15488

Advantage *ARCS* Reporting
Services, LLC

1083 Lincoln Avenue, San Jose, California 95125, Telephone (408) 920-0222, Fax (408) 920-0188

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

Tom Fitzwater, Environmental Planner

Ann Jamison, Deputy Project Manager

Kay Wilson, Moderator

The Reporter: ADVANTAGE REPORTING SERVICES
BY: NOELIA ESPINOLA,
 CSR #8060
1083 Lincoln Avenue
San Jose, CA 95125
(408) 920-0222

--o0o--

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S :

MS. WILSON: So without any further ado, it would be great to get some public comment. We'll start with Jeff Gao. My first card. Please come on up.

MR. GAO: Here.

MS. WILSON: Right there. And Noel is right there, she's going to record your comment.

MR. GAO: Okay. So can I just introduce myself.

My name is Jeff Gao. My wife and I happen to live in a house where the backyard is right next to the track. So at the moment we have three major concerns. One is the quality of life. That is the noise and the vibration impact to our house. As I understand it, trying to shuffle through a thousand pages of the environmental study, the mitigation measure at this point is to build sound walls. However, I think the sound wall is only about ten feet tall. And all the houses in our neighborhood are basically two stories, so we're deeply concerned with the noise impact to the second level, which is where the bedrooms are located.

The second concern is basically the safety issue. The derailling of the trains happens all the time, and the track and the space around the track is

T3.1
T3.2

1 very narrow. So what happens if there's a derailling of
2 the train and how is that going to impact the safety of
3 the neighborhood?

T3.2
cont.

4 And the final concern basically is the
5 potentially plummeting value of the house that we
6 bought. I think like many of the residents in this
7 county, we have a significant investment in those
8 houses. I'm not sure with BART going through the
9 backyard, which will be the impact of the housing value
10 and how. In some ways, I think, if there's a
11 plummeting in the housing value, then the residents in
12 the area are actually being unfairly punished for being
13 in close proximity to the BART train.

T3.3

14 So thank you. That's my comment.

15 MS. WILSON: Thank you very much.

16 Next speaker, please. Love to get some more
17 blue cards. Come on, some of you usually speak up at
18 our meetings.

19 MR. BRITTON: Does that mean we'll get more
20 than three minutes?

21 MS. WILSON: No. We're going to go through
22 everybody. Take your first three, anyway. Good way to
23 get started. Raise your hand if you'd like a blue
24 card. We've got people circulating. Molly has got a
25 couple. Thank you. Any more?

4

1 feet above the ground is the fact that once your ground
2 you're up to 5 miles an hour. This system can run at a
3 speed at a maximum of 2 and 300 miles an hour or
4 excess. But at this specific point in time we're
5 looking at a people mover only running at about 60 to
6 80 miles an hour.

7 Actually, I've got a copy of a people mover
8 here. I'll pass this around. You can look at it.

9 I would just like to read the bottom of this.
10 Magna force of adjustable speed control technology was
11 chosen technology of the year of 2001 in the Industry
12 Week magazine's 9th annual technology and innovations
13 award program. So the man already has one program out
14 there and running, one completely company. This is his
15 second one. This is on transportation.

16 Now, the one bill that is pending in the
17 state of Washington is where they pick up a semi at one
18 end of the state and run it clear down to the port
19 because they have the large port for Portland. So the
20 object is this: You can put a whole semi on this, put
21 a whole semi right to the port above the ground, no
22 overhead, and it takes it off the freeway. That's one
23 specific system.

24 There are others. I'll be speaking later on
25 those. But, anyway, I'm trying to keep it down to

T3.4
cont.

6

1 three minutes for you. Okay. But I'll pass this
2 around and you can see it. And we'll take it from
3 there.

4 MS. WILSON: Thank you very much. Rudy Metz
5 next, please.

6 MR. METZ: Just a question, really. I would
7 just like to know if the neighbors in the vicinity of
8 the right-of-way within two or three blocks -- I don't
9 know what the guideline is -- have been informed about
10 exits, entrances, parking lots and just the
11 right-of-way. Is everybody aware of this right-of-way?

12 Historically about 1996 or before residents
13 nearby had leaflets and pamphlets put, I believe, on
14 their front door, below their front door informing them
15 about the possible right-of-way for the BART connection
16 down in San Jose. So this has all happened before.
17 I'm just wondering, are people informed? Thank you.

18 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Rajeev -- and you'll
19 have to help me with your last name, please.

20 MR. BALLA: Balla.

21 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

22 MR. BALLA: Hi. My name is Rajeev Balla. I
23 have a couple of questions on the noise and vibration
24 impact study that was conducted. I live in a house
25 that actually currently looks to the side of the

T3.5

T3.6

7

1 tracks. I'm probably less than a hundred feet away.
2 So what I'd like to know is, as the tracks get built in
3 areas that have not -- at least from what's been
4 presented, have not been identified as noise and impact
5 areas, what recourse do I have to have you guys
6 reassess that?

T3.6
cont.

7 And then, two, my second question was related
8 -- actually, I wrote it down. Related to the overall
9 impact of the sixth station -- or the fifth station,
10 which is future impact for the Calaveras station.
11 There is no date assigned to that. And if that does
12 happen, when would that occur?

T3.7

13 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

14 MR. BALLA: Thanks.

15 MS. WILSON: Our next speaker is Megan
16 Thompson, please. Good evening.

17 MS. THOMPSON: Good evening. I have two
18 concerns. I live in a mobile home park by the tracks.
19 We know how the train goes by and rattles our house
20 dozens of times a day. Is the vibration of this new
21 BART going to be as bad or not as bad as the train that
22 comes down from Muni now?

T3.8

23 And the other thing is, being a renter in a
24 mobile home park, we do run the risk of the owners just
25 selling the land out from under us. So we'd like to

T3.9

1 know as to -- if the property values are going to be
2 going up because of this or if they're maybe expected
3 to go down because of it.

T3.9
cont.

4 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

5 How about some more blue cards, please.

6 MS. BRITTON: Name is Monty Britton. I'm a
7 north Milpitas resident just a few hundred yards from
8 the Dixon Landing -- you guys are going to call it the
9 Dixon Landing Road alignment. I'm a little bit
10 concerned here because you guys are pushing the same
11 thing you pushed a few years ago and that was the nice
12 high noisy bridge.

13 Our city has already spent millions of
14 dollars putting sound walls in on these rails over
15 here, and we'd like to use the money that we've already
16 spent on these sound walls to either run BART at grade
17 or below grade.

T3.10

18 And what I'm totally perplexed on is the city
19 residents talked about this a few years ago when you
20 had one of these hearings again, and we said, look,
21 we're in north Milpitas. We want at grade or below
22 grade. We went tromping down to City Hall. Here you
23 guys are again. You're showing us the same thing you
24 showed us last time. I don't understand this.

25 What do we have to do? Do we have to go to

9

1 the VTA convention or something to let you guys know,
2 hey, we're going to lose the quality of life in the
3 northern part of town here. There are senior mobile
4 home parks, Pioneer Park and Mobile Lodge are senior
5 parks, Friendly Village is a family park. It will ruin
6 them if we have noisy trains going way up into the sky
7 when they don't need to. We already have an existing
8 structure of walls.

9 And sure it's going to be a little more
10 expensive. But what about the quality of life in town? T3.10
11 We don't want BART to ruin the northern part of cont.
12 Milpitas like some of the other people here said.
13 What's going to happen to property values if the
14 monorail -- if the BART train is going to do a
15 Disneyland monorail like it does in San Leandro, and
16 we're going to hear noisy trains.

17 I mean, we want it to be just like it is over
18 at the Great Mall. At the Great Mall they're going to
19 have trenched cut. I mean, what is up with that? I
20 mean, a shopping mall -- you know, did the owner of the
21 shopping mall -- do they have more clout so they can
22 have a trench cut train; whereas, the northern part of
23 town, we're not a million dollar shopping mall, so we
24 don't get trench cut? You guys are used to digging
25 tunnels. BART digs tunnels all the time. How hard can

1 it be for you to dig a little tunnel underneath Dixon
2 Landing Road?

3 So that's my concern is that you haven't
4 changed -- you haven't said, Well, VTA realizes that
5 the northern residents of Milpitas would prefer a
6 trench. It's not mentioned in here at all. You're
7 just saying, "Well, this is the cheapest option."
8 Well, cheap isn't always the best. You need quality of
9 life. We don't want Milpitas, especially in the
10 northern part of town to get ruined because you want to
11 do a saving cut. You'll go in, you'll build it. In a
12 few years you'll be gone, and then what happens to the
13 northern end of town?

14 These people are going to say the same thing,
15 renters, the landowners. That's very true. Pioneer
16 Park, Friendly Village, Mobile Lodge, the owners, the
17 La Pina family that owns Mobile Lodge, they can say
18 we're fed up with this. They're already under Milpitas
19 rent control right now. BART can be the final straw.
20 If they can't get good rent on top of the rent control,
21 they're just going to bug out and sell it as a strip
22 mall or something. That's my client. You guys need to
23 fix that.

24 MS. WILSON: Thank you very much. Rob Means.

25 MR. MEANS: I just handed in a card because I

T3.10
cont.

11

1 like to talk, you know, but this guy has a point. He's
2 talking about quality of life issues. And my
3 understanding is that the BART is going to be sucking
4 up huge amounts of money. And so the quality of our
5 transportation system is actually going to fall as has
6 happened with a lot of LRT systems across the country.

7 Put in an LRT system, how can the
8 transportation system get worse after you put in LRT?

T3.11

9 Well, the way it gets worse is that it cost money to
10 continue running that LRT system.

11 Where does the money come from? Usually from
12 the bus system.

13 Here we've got -- this is the question that I
14 want to ask while I'm making some comments. It looks
15 like you're going to get from the fair box 71 percent
16 recovery of ONM costs. That seems rather high compared
17 to what BART is currently experiencing. They're
18 talking about getting 40 percent recovery. Of course
19 that doesn't -- there is some funny accounting in there
20 also concerning parking lot.

21 But if we really are talking quality of life
22 issues, the VTA ought to be looking at PRT, Personal
23 Rapid Transit or LEV X or some other modern technology
24 that does not cause the vibrations, does not cause the
25 noise, does not cause you to dislocate -- what was

T3.12

12

1 that, 150 businesses.

2 All the environmental impacts that you're
3 looking at here are far, far less with the PRT type
4 technology. And yet the VTA board refuses to even
5 discuss it. They don't ask questions. They don't
6 investigate it. They don't even correct their
7 documents that are wrong about it. You issued an MIS a
8 couple of years ago that said we can't use PRT because
9 it doesn't carry enough people. We can't use PRT
10 because it doesn't go fast enough. Well, it does carry
11 enough people, and it does go fast enough.

12 And I've talked to -- you know, actually done
13 my two-minute spiel in front of the VTA with a web
14 site, with a handout, and they never come back to ask
15 any further questions. And that's my issue. It's not
16 about a specific project anymore. Now it's about
17 process. Why isn't the VTA taking a serious look at
18 this new technology? Thank you.

19 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Next speaker is
20 Zachary Cribari, please.

21 MR. CRIBARI: I have throughout this process
22 explained my opposition of the current BART to San Jose
23 routing and planning. Currently your financial picture
24 is so terrible that this project needs to have a no
25 action stance as we speak. Until you can prove to me

T3.12
cont.

T3.13

13

1 that you're able to hold to providing your current
2 transportation system, your primaries, the light rail
3 and the buses especially, I'm not going to support this
4 action.

5 I do not want to pay more and lose service in
6 order for something that is several years beyond us
7 that you cannot even pay for. Okay? We're looking at
8 2030, not 2016. This has been exploited to the public
9 through newspapers. Okay?

10 I also -- as a conclusion, you need to wait.
11 If you don't have enough money, simply wait. That's
12 what we've got to do.

13 And as far as my opposition to your routing,
14 this routing that you have set up, it will provide more
15 of a means for transportation within Santa Clara
16 County. Such as -- let's say I want to go from
17 downtown to The Great Mall. That's what this routing
18 will allow me to do. I want business travel. That is
19 what BART is meant for. BART needs to service north
20 San Jose.

21 And you want money. You want politics. Why
22 not just move -- maneuver BART into the international
23 airport such as my proposal suggests. From the
24 Montague station traveling via Montague Expressway
25 veering on to Trimble, servicing north San Jose.

T3.13
cont.

T3.14

T3.15

1 Veering into the airport, servicing both terminals,
2 servicing Santa Clara County Civic Center and then
3 terminating at San Jose Diridon station. This will
4 bring money to you. This will bring competition
5 between San Jose Norman Mineta International Airport
6 and SFO. This will also have a potential of saving
7 money, though I do not have numbers for you. It
8 consolidates two to three expensive projects such as
9 your people mover into one project, BART only. BART
10 would service the airport.

T3.15
cont.

11 That's pretty much all I have to say for now.
12 I'm very displeased with this planning.

13 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

14 MR. CRIBARI: Thank you.

15 MS. WILSON: Is there anybody else that would
16 like to submit a blue card and come up? We've gotten
17 some good comments.

18 We'd also like to hear if you have any
19 comments on the environmental document, any aspects of
20 it that you'd like to call to our attention, this would
21 be a good time to do that as well.

22 Kevin Kim. Good evening.

23 MR. KIM: My name is Kevin Kim. And good
24 luck with your sound wall. I don't think you're going
25 to get it. And I know you're not going to get it.

T3.16

15

1 Currently right now -- I don't know, VTA and Caltrans
2 is performing an I-680 expansion project in the Sunol
3 grade and sound wall somehow just dissipated and just
4 got taken away due to some politics, or I don't know
5 what it was. But we contacted VTA and not very
6 supportive. And obviously the money got awarded, and
7 we're not getting a sound wall. So that's just info
8 that, you know, you might want to know.

T3.16
cont.

9 As of -- I've been seeing environmental
10 documents and so forth, but I haven't seen like any
11 crime rate info as to how that's going to progress
12 later on. I lived in Fremont for 15 years, and I know
13 that it got stopped there right on Lake Elizabeth
14 beforehand by a group of neighbors in Fremont. And
15 ever since it got stopped there, I know at the end of
16 that Fremont station, crime rate seemed to go up
17 drastically. I don't have the numbers. This is my
18 first meeting. So you might want to look into that.
19 I'll look at that as well. But that actually went up.
20 The crime rate, car theft around that area. People
21 traveling from Oakland. Just drastically went up. I
22 don't know if that's going to have impact over here,
23 where the stations are, where the -- well, yeah.

T3.17

24 I also have a property in Santa Clara and
25 that kind of caused a conflict because that's by the El

T3.18

16

1 Camino and San Tomas intersection. So I'm kind of
2 flipping back and forth to see what kind of benefits
3 that will have for me, but I'm also a resident of
4 Milpitas. So that's just a general comment that I just
5 want to let you guys know in case you might want to
6 look into that.

T3.18
cont.

7 MS. WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

8 Okay. Any other blue cards, please. Anybody
9 else want to come up and address the group? Anybody
10 who has been up want to come back?

11 Mr. Connor is coming back.

12 MR. CONNOR: Yes, real quickly --

13 MS. WILSON: Please say your name.

14 THE WITNESS: Okay. William Connor. This is
15 the copy of the LEV X system. I don't know if you can
16 see it.

17 I passed a piece of paper around earlier.
18 What it is is a magnetic platform. Platform weighs
19 about 2500 pounds. The car on top of it weighs 2500
20 pounds. The first time I saw it I looked at the man I
21 said, "What is it?"

T3.19

22 The man explained it to me. And I can reach
23 over with one finger, take the car platform, 5,000
24 pounds, push it forward, bring it back and back to
25 where it was. I'm saying it's here. Okay?

17

1 I want to also say this -- if you have a
2 piece of paper, Google -- go to Google and look up LEV
3 X. Okay? That will have everything on it that you
4 need, including the legislation now going through the
5 state of Washington. And we're going to try to get it
6 through the state of California and through Washington,
7 D.C.

T3.19
cont.

8 The other thing was I just heard the other
9 day that there's a baby bullet that is supposed to run
10 from downtown San Francisco -- or downtown San Jose to
11 downtown San Francisco in 45 minutes. I don't know if
12 you heard of it or not. But I do plan to ride it in
13 the very, very near future.

T3.20

14 I think that's about it. Thank you very
15 much. Look up LEV X.

16 MS. WILSON: Okay. Anybody new that would
17 like to come up and make some comments. We've got
18 plenty of time. If you'd like to make some comments,
19 we'd be glad to hear them.

20 Okay. What I think we'll do is what we've
21 done at some of the other hearings is we'll suspend our
22 formal part of our meeting until about 7:30. That's
23 about 20 minutes. And we'll give you a chance to look
24 at the maps in more detail. Talk to staff. Get any of
25 your questions answered. And then if you'd like to

18

1 come back, we'll open up. If you have new comments you
2 want to put on the record we'll be glad to hear them.

3 If you don't want to wait for that part,
4 you're free to do go home. Sometimes people have
5 enjoyed chatting with staff and getting some of your
6 informal questions answered.

7 We'll take a break and let you look at the
8 maps and talk with us and we'll come back at 7:30. If
9 you'd like to make any more formal comments at that
10 time that would be great. Thank you.

11 (Whereupon, a break was taken.)

12 MS. WILSON: Our next speaker will be
13 Frabrizio Corno.

14 MR. CORNO: Corno (pronunciation), yes.

15 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

16 MR. CORNO: Good. Thank you for giving me
17 the opportunity to talk about the project.

18 Generally speaking, I'm very in favor of
19 public transportation. Coming from Europe, we have a
20 beautiful system of public transportation compared with
21 here. But anyway, like a resident in BART
22 metropolitan, which is a community of townhomes located
23 very near The Great Mall, I need to remark that the
24 picture that has been used in order to define the
25 project are at least five years old. And due to that,

T3.21

19

1 our townhome complex doesn't exist at all in the
2 picture. And this can lead to some very bad mistakes
3 in planning.

4 What I think is that this part of the
5 planning should be based on updated pictures and
6 That will show the fact that there are a lot of houses
7 located in the nearby of the proposal new traffic, and
8 may be even in the same place of the proposed new
9 track.

10 In order to fix this, for instance, a
11 possibility would be to anticipate the place in which
12 the track goes under the level of the ground or to take
13 other corrective action. Probably you can get some
14 updated picture would be pretty easy to understand what
15 can be done in order to improve this situation.

16 Thank you very much.

17 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

18 Did you want to turn in your card? Change
19 your mind? Okay. What about somebody else then?
20 Anybody else want to make some comments now that you've
21 got a chance to look at the map some more? Does
22 anybody want to come back up?

23 MR. MEANS: Don't give me an opportunity.

24 MS. WILSON: I know. I'm like, here comes,
25 Rob. No, seriously, would you like to come back up?

T3.21
cont.

20

1 Up to you.

2 MR. MEANS: Actually, yeah. But I'm not
3 going to be talking so much about BART, no. I'd be
4 talking about the Personal Rapid Transit stuff.

5 MS. WILSON: Same thing.

6 MR. MEANS: My name is Rob Means. And one of
7 the reasons that I'm campaigning against BART, you
8 know, publicly is that it just seems to be a real sink
9 hole for money. And that the service that we can
10 expect to get from it compared to what service we could
11 get with another technology like PRT is just kind of
12 miles apart.

13 For example, with an automated system like
14 Personal Rapid Transit, it's actually all controlled.
15 It's an elevated system. You may not like elevated
16 systems.

T3.22

17 MR. BRITTON: Put it underground.

18 MR. MEANS: You want it underground. But I
19 thought you were mainly concerned about the sound, the
20 noise that you'd be hearing from that. Is it really
21 you just don't even want to see it ever or -- MR.

22 BRITTON: It's an elegant solution.

23 MS. WILSON: Please just make your comments.

24 MR. MEANS: Okay. So if it was the sound
25 that is the issue, that's not going to be a problem

21

1 with a Personal Rapid Transit technology. It will run
2 24/7 because it's actually controlled by computers, all
3 the little cabs that you get into, and they're small.
4 You and I can get into one, but we couldn't get four or
5 five people into one. They're pretty small. They're
6 all controlled by computers.

7 All the stations are off-line. So when I get
8 in at one end I can go to my destination without having
9 to stop and stop and stop at the next station. All of
10 those stations are off-line. I just roll passed them
11 on the way to my destination. And when I get there,
12 the doors open automatically and I can get out.

13 It's actually much more effective in moving
14 people around. And in fact, we could get 12 times the
15 coverage for the same amount of money if we were using
16 PRT. Go out there and spend \$4 billion, you get 12
17 times the amount of coverage, meaning that you've got
18 12 times as many stations scattered around. So now we
19 don't just have one station in Milpitas, we've got 12
20 stations in Milpitas. That's a heck of a lot of
21 difference. And it would make a big difference in
22 ridership and convenience.

23 Have I exhausted my three minutes? Thank you
24 very much.

25 MS. WILSON: Okay. Is there anybody that

T3.22
cont.

1 hasn't spoke? Anybody that wants to address comments
2 on the draft environmental document? Please come up.

3 MR. STEWART: I don't have comments on the
4 document.

5 MS. WILSON: We'll still take your comments.
6 I was just trying to focus the comments. We'd love to
7 have comments on those, too. But we'll take any of
8 your comments.

9 MR. STEWART: My name is Donald Stewart, and
10 I just moved here recently from Montana. And so it's
11 kind of a neat, I guess, fresh picture on what's going
12 on here and it's -- and I was renting a place in
13 Fremont right near the BART station. I did choose to
14 live near the BART station because my wife was going to
15 a certain school at Hayward. And so I chose a nice
16 cheap single room apartment, basically a studio
17 apartment near the BART in order to kind of try to get
18 her there. And then I would drive south and go to
19 work.

20 Well, we started looking at how BART works
21 and how it, you know, put us here. And we're just
22 learning all that stuff about living in a big city.

23 We started to realize BART really doesn't
24 make sense for us. Maybe for someone else. But the
25 fact that we have to get up, drive to the place, get

1 out of our car, walk over to the little station, wait
2 so many minutes for the thing, take off and then it
3 stops at, like you say, each stop. It also stops at a
4 place that is quite a ways away from where you're
5 getting. So you get out and then try to arrange
6 transportation from the BART station up to Hayward, and
7 there is buses. Ultimately it takes about twice as
8 long as driving. And we don't want to do it.

9 We don't want -- there is people that maybe
10 live right around there -- right around the station and
11 then work right around the station, it works -- it may
12 work for them. But that's a few people that -- I don't
13 know, I see.

14 So then we decided to move to Milpitas. My
15 wife transfers to San Jose State to get the teacher's
16 credential. And I noticed that there's a light rail
17 system right there. So I said, It's got to work if I
18 live near the station, the light rail station.

19 So we ended up -- saved up enough money from
20 and borrowed some money to do the big thing and
21 purchase a house. We purchased a house in Milpitas,
22 doing the big commitment. Was in debt. Amazed to see
23 what the prices were here. Learned a lot. Made an
24 offer on the house right near one of the new light rail
25 stations that's coming in so many years. And ended

T3.23

24

1 up -- didn't fall through. We ended up getting another
2 place right at the end of the station now. And I tried
3 to take it a couple of times, and it takes three times
4 as long then to drive to where I'm going. And I live
5 right next to the light rail station, and I work right
6 next to a light rail station. So it's three times as
7 long as to drive. So it doesn't make sense even though
8 I live right next to the station there.

T3.23
cont

9 Luckily there's an express bus that is right
10 there. It takes basically a little bit longer, a few
11 more minutes than driving.

12 So basically what I learned by moving here is
13 that these things don't work. There's got to be
14 something better than riding the trains. Thanks.

15 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Some people filling
16 out some more cards? Zachary.

17 MR. CRIBARI: Based on what the gentleman
18 just tried to explain to you, I'd like to offer an
19 equation. I cannot determine statistically whether a
20 positive or negative is the better outcome. The
21 numbers do not go together. What you should
22 investigate is the following: Convenience plus time,
23 plus cost, plus reliability.

T3.24

24 I will use San Francisco Muni as an example
25 of this equation. It is much more convenient to use

25

1 Muni than to drive my car. If I drive my car, I'll
2 have to walk a thousand miles to get to my destination
3 because there's no parking. Muni will drop me off
4 right there, no questions asked.

5 It goes everywhere on the grid of the map.
6 Reliability, Muni, hell, it runs every six minutes.
7 Some buses every four minutes. I can always rely on
8 it. It's much more rapid. Various parts of town buses T3.24
9 have their own lanes. Lights are synchronized to cont.
10 assist in the buses more so than that of driving my
11 car.

12 As far as cost goes, it's obviously much more
13 cheaper. And the speed of it is reliable enough.

14 In the end of this equation, again, with Muni
15 as the example, everything -- though it might be
16 slower, everything else outweighs that and cancels that
17 factor out. That's what you guys should invest in
18 finding out about this BART extension to Milpitas, San
19 Jose and Santa Clara. Will it be convenient for me to
20 utilize it to get to work? Will it be reliable enough?
21 Will it be cost effective? Will all of that together
22 come out to a better sum than that of driving my car?

23 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

24 MR. CRIBARI: Figure it out.

25 MS. WILSON: Thank you. Okay. Last call.

1 Does anybody have any -- want to make any additional
2 comments?

3 MR. BRITTON: I guess I can speak for another
4 minute.

5 MS. WILSON: Feel free.

6 MR. BRITTON: My concern would be --

7 MS. WILSON: Please state your name again.

8 MR. BRITTON: Monty Britton. Resident of
9 northern Milpitas. An addendum, just want to know if
10 VTA can maybe send me an e-mail back and let me know
11 what north Milpitas residents need to do to get it so
12 that you will change your preferred option from the
13 overcrossing to either at grade or below grade. T3.25
14 Obviously other residents of other cities have been
15 successful in getting you to change your mind or
16 getting the committee to change their mind, and we'd
17 like to do the same thing.

18 As I mentioned before, it would be a more
19 elegant solution than to just have this ugly bridge
20 sitting up in the sky with noise and everything like
21 that, so...

22 MS. WILSON: Thank you. But three times is
23 starting to push it. I'm just teasing. Please state
24 your name again.

25 MR. CONNOR: That one gentleman just came

27

1 from Cal Poly and graduated, and they were doing a
2 travel study of all over the state of California. And
3 I was hoping that he would say something about Cal Poly
4 and what the results were. Anyhow, that's all I wanted
5 to mention.

6 MS. WILSON: Okay.

7 MR. CONNOR: And the fact that he's kind of
8 in favor of what Rob and I have in mind. The important
9 thing is that the specific system I have, doesn't
10 require electricity. So when the power is down in the
11 Bay Area, the transportation continues to run. It's
12 not like in New York City when the park is out,
13 everything gets shut out. So that's one quick feature
14 of it. Thank you very much.

T3.26

15 MS. WILSON: Thank you. And that was
16 Mr. Connor. Okay.

17 I think we're about done. Does anybody else
18 want to raise their hand and speak? Okay.

19 Well, I'd like to thank you all for your
20 comments. Half of you have left us, but for those of
21 you who have stayed, we appreciate your time and all of
22 your comments. As we mentioned, all of the comments
23 that have been raised will be addressed in the final
24 environmental impact statement and report which VTA
25 will be preparing.

28

1 I'd like to announce that we do have one more
2 public hearing, and that is slated for Monday, May
3 10th. It's in San Jose at 24 North Fifth Street at the
4 First United Methodist Church from 6:00 to 8:00. And
5 also as we've mentioned several times, all comments are
6 due by 5:00 o'clock on May 14th.

7 Thank you very much.

8 (Whereupon, the public comments were
9 concluded at 7:45 p.m.)

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

29

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing hearing was taken down by me in shorthand at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction.

And I hereby certify the foregoing transcript is a full, true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.

I further certify that I am not interested in the outcome of this hearing.

Dated: April 19, 2007 Noelia Espinola
NOELIA ESPINOLA, CSR #8060

RESPONSE TO TRANSCRIPT T3

Jeff Gao

T3.1 *The noise and vibration impact assessment was conducted using both FTA and BART noise and vibration criteria for impact. The assessment procedures meet with both National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for assessing noise and vibration impact from transit operations. The FTA noise criteria are based on the existing noise levels in determining impact and take into account changes in noise level due to the introduction of the project. Where noise impact has been identified, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise levels to within the appropriate criteria. Since an address was not provided, the mitigation requirements for the commentator's location cannot be specifically identified. However, Figures 4.13-4c through 4.13-4h identify the locations of sound walls that would reduce noise impacts to acceptable levels. For vibration impact assessment, both the BART and FTA vibration criteria are based on human response and perception to vibration. The vibration impact criteria are well below the thresholds for even minor cosmetic damage to residences. Where vibration impact has been identified, mitigation measures have been identified. Figures 4.13-4c through 4.13-4h also identify the locations of vibration mitigation that would reduce vibration impacts to acceptable levels. Both the noise and vibration mitigation measures identified will be refined during Preliminary Engineering.*

Jeff Gao

T3.2 *Train derailment is not a common occurrence. The UPRR, as all railroad operators, are subject to federal safety requirements to reduce safety hazards outside their right-of-way. BART is also concerned about train derailments and the potential for injuries. Potential causes of BART train derailments include:*

- 1. Broken rail,*
- 2. Misaligned track switch points, and*
- 3. Improper maintenance of vehicle undercarriage.*

The BART train control system can automatically detect broken rail and misaligned track switch points. When these events occur, the train control system will safely stop the vehicle well short of the problem area. BART also applies "best management practices" when maintaining their vehicles. These proactive measures reduce the potential for BART train derailments. Additional discussion regarding safety issues is provided in Section 4.14, Security and System Safety, where a list of additional federal and state safety codes is provided along with BART programs and criteria.

Jeff Gao

T3.3 *Reduction in property value is not considered a significant effect on the environment for purposes of the CEQA and NEPA.*

William Connor

T3.4 *The Major Investment Study/Alternatives Analysis (MIS/AA) thoroughly evaluated 11 alternatives for the corridor including the possible use of express bus, busway, commuter rail, diesel light rail, light rail, and BART. After an extensive public outreach process, the VTA Board of Directors determined that the benefits of the BART Alternative were far greater than those of any of the other alternatives and selected it as the Locally Preferred Alternative in November 2001. Early on in the determination of alternatives to evaluate, LEV X was reviewed and not considered a viable option since the technology has not been proven by a transit agency in the United States. A high degree of risk and potential costs would be a burden of the first application. Because of this and VTA's funding ability, this alternative was determined not to be fiscally responsible and the alternative was eliminated from further consideration.*

Rudy Metz

T3.5 *The notification process for the public was extensive. Approximately 55,000 properties and business owners (including mobile home parks) within 1000 feet from the proposed centerline alignment and one-half mile around the station areas were notified of the public release of the Draft EIS/EIR and the public hearings. Also refer to Section 9.4, Summary of Public Outreach, for a discussion of the public involvement process.*

Rajeev Balla

T3.6 *The noise and vibration impact assessment was conducted using both FTA and BART noise and vibration criteria. The assessment procedures meet with both NEPA and CEQA guidelines for assessing noise and vibration impact from transit operations. The FTA noise criteria are based on the existing noise levels in determining impact and take into account changes in noise level due to the introduction of the project. Where noise impact has been identified, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise levels to within the appropriate criteria. Should a property owner believe that the projected noise impacts do not accurately reflect the noise levels that occur when the system is in operation, they can request VTA to reassess the noise impact analysis and mitigation measures. If the noise levels were to exceed the criteria, VTA would be required to mitigate the noise levels or prepare subsequent environmental documentation that supported a conclusion that it was not feasible to mitigate the impact.*

Rajeev Balla

T3.7 *The Future South Calaveras Station is currently unfunded. That station would be completed when funding is available. The EIS/EIR does address the environmental impacts from the future station. The impacts are discussed in Section 4.2.6.6, 2025 BART Alternative Traffic Level of Service, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, under the subheading, City of Milpitas, and shown in Figure 4.17-21, BART South Calaveras Future Station (visual simulation). Depending on length of time and project changes between the approval of this EIS/EIR and the decision to go forward with the future station, additional environmental evaluation may be needed to supplement the existing studies.*

Megan Thompson

T3.8 *Typical transit operations, such as BART, have vibration levels well below that of freight and commuter trains, even when the transit is traveling at higher speeds. The BART vehicles have a smaller mass and better suspension and the wheels and tracks are kept in much better condition than for freight operations. This results in less vibration than with freight trains. As compared to MUNI, the BART trains are much longer and travel faster. Therefore, the noise levels would be greater but for a shorter duration.*

Megan Thompson

T3.9 *Reduction in property value is not considered a significant effect on the environment for purposes of CEQA and NEPA.*

T3.10 *The Policy Advisory Board recommended the BART Retained Cut Option at Dixon Landing Road at their May 26, 2004 meeting. That is the preferred alignment alternative included in the Final EIS/EIR and will result in less noise than the At-Grade or Aerial options. The trench in the vicinity of the Great Mall is necessary to pass under Montague Expressway to the south.*

Rob Means

T3.11 *Decreases in local bus services are not proposed as a part of the implementation of the BART Alternative service. As demonstrated in Table 3.4-1, 2025 Fleet Requirements for Baseline and BART Alternatives, the VTA bus fleet under the BART Alternative includes 642 vehicles, an increase over the No-Action Alternative and a significant increase over current service levels. Bus service under the BART Alternative, utilizing that fleet, is described in Section 3.4.7, BART Alternative Operating Plan, and in the Travel Demand Forecast Report, 2003.*

The fare box recovery ratio is defined as the fare revenue divided by the operating costs. For the EIS/EIR, fare revenue for BART was derived from the travel demand model. The travel demand model generated daily fare revenue for each mode in each alternative based on actual data from the models base year (1990). The base year included actual trip length and distance based fare schedules. The fare revenue was discounted by 25% to account for passes and other discounted fares. The daily fare revenue was annualized using a factor of 291 (provided by BART), and inflated to 2003 dollars. In FY2003 the fare box recovery ratio for BART was 54.8% only accounting for fare revenues, not other rail system revenues.

Rob Means

T3.12 *The MIS/AA thoroughly evaluated 11 alternatives for the corridor including the possible use of express bus, busway, commuter rail, diesel light rail, light rail, and BART. After an extensive public outreach process, the VTA Board of Directors determined that the benefits of the BART Alternative were far greater than those of any of the other alternatives and selected it as the Locally Preferred Alternative in November 2001. Early on in the determination of alternatives to evaluate, PRT and LEV X were not considered viable options that would best serve ridership in this corridor.*

The major advantage of the BART Alternative is that it enables a rider to travel long distances without transferring from one transit mode to another. For example, a PRT trip from Oakland to San Jose would involve a transfer, Oakland to Montague/Capitol on BART and then PRT for the segment to San Jose. This would result in longer travel times and inconveniences to the rider that would not be consistent with the project's purpose to "maximize transit usage and ridership" nor would it facilitate regional connectivity. With 12 times the number of stations, PRT would not be consistent with the project's purpose to "support local economic and land use plans and goals" that include high density transit oriented developments at station locations with concentrations of riders. The 91 miles of elevated structure would also require substantial right-of-way, result in land use and visual impacts, and have a substantial cost.

Also refer to response T3.4 regarding LEV X.

Zachary Cribari

T3.13 *The recent economic decline presents challenges to the financing of this project. VTA staff continues to work with the VTA Board, the State of California, and the Federal Transit Administration to resolve the details of the funding plan for this project. As stated in the EIS/EIR "a feasible financial plan will need to be prepared to advance the project into Final Design." Chapter 8, Financial Considerations, accurately represents the funding picture for the project in combination with the Final EIS/EIR Recommended Project description.*

Zachary Cribari

T3.14 *The MIS/AA thoroughly evaluated 11 alternatives for the corridor including the possible use of express bus, busway, commuter rail, diesel light rail, light rail, and BART. After an extensive public outreach process, the VTA Board of Directors determined that the benefits of the BART Alternative were far greater than those of any of the other alternatives and selected it as the Locally Preferred Alternative in November 2001. The BART Alternative services north San Jose at the Montague/Capitol Station. From this station, connections are provided to light rail and bus service.*

Zachary Cribari

T3.15 *The Automated People Mover (APM) at the proposed BART Santa Clara Station would have a number of advantages over a direct BART connection to Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport (SJIA):*

- 1. The cost for the APM is much lower (\$250 million) compared to BART (\$650 million);*
- 2. The weekday ridership is higher for the APM (7,400) compared to BART (4,700);*
- 3. The APM would provide more frequent service (3 to 5 minute headways) compared to BART (6 to 12 minutes);*
- 4. Funding has been identified for the APM through the 2000 Measure A Program, but not for a direct BART to the Airport;*
- 5. Spatial constraints at the airport would make BART difficult and costly to accommodate;*

6. Finally, a direct BART connection would make only one airport stop, so a passenger transfer is still required on the APM to other parts of the airport. Meanwhile, the APM would serve multiple stops along its route.

Kevin Kim

- T3.16** Caltrans is the lead agency for the I-680 project and they should be contacted regarding any questions concerning that project. VTA has committed to constructing any sound walls identified in the EIS/EIR. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan will be prepared as part of the environmental documentation. This is a requirement of CEQA and is a tracking mechanism to ensure that mitigation measures such as sound walls are constructed.

Kevin Kim

- T3.17** Judging from the BART crime statistics from the last three years, crime has not risen significantly at the Fremont BART Station (BART, Commander Gibson email of June 17, 2004). The City of Fremont was not able to provide crime statistics that would enable a comparison of crime in the vicinity of the Fremont Station versus other locations within the City. Section 4.14, Security and System Safety, discusses the security and safety measures that have been applied throughout the BART system and that will be applied to the BART Alternative.

Kevin Kim

- T3.18** The BART Alternative has stations in both the Cities of Milpitas and Santa Clara. The comment does not raise an environmental issue that needs to be addressed.

William Connor

- T3.19** The MIS/AA thoroughly evaluated 11 alternatives for the corridor including the possible use of express bus, busway, commuter rail, diesel light rail, light rail, and BART. After an extensive public outreach process, the VTA Board of Directors determined that the benefits of the BART Alternative were far greater than those of any of the other alternatives and selected it as the Locally Preferred Alternative in November 2001. Early on in the determination of alternatives to evaluate, LEV X was not considered a viable option that would best serve ridership in this corridor. Also refer to response T3.4.

William Connor

- T3.20** The baby bullet would provide express Caltrain service between San Francisco and Gilroy. While this is a much-needed service, it does not serve many of the purposes of the BART Alternative including "alleviate severe and ever-increasing traffic congestion on I-880 and I-680 between Alameda County and Silicon Valley" and "maximize transit usage and ridership".

Frabrizio Corno

- T3.21** The photographs were taken during the summer of 2002 when baseline environmental

studies were being conducted. Since that time redevelopment of the areas around the Great Mall has continued, changing areas from a primarily industrial and warehousing aesthetic to residential and mixed use. However, this redevelopment has not occurred within the proposed BART Alternative corridor and was anticipated in the EIS/EIR analysis. As discussed in Section 4.12, Land Use, subsection 4.12.2.1, Existing Setting, the Milpitas General Plan contains policies that are supportive of the proposed BART Alternative and construction of a station in the Montague Expressway area.

Rob Means

T3.22 *Refer to response T3.12.*

Donald Stewart

T3.23 *As quantified in Table 4.2-5, Average Weekday Transit Trips Served by BART Alternative in 2025, almost 84,000 trips would be taken on BART each weekday. The comment about not serving your needs is noted and included in the record for review and consideration by the decision-makers.*

Zachary Cribari

T3.24 *As quantified in Table 4.2-5, Average Weekday Transit Trips Served by BART Alternative in 2025, almost 84,000 trips would be taken on BART each weekday. The comment is noted and included in the record for review and consideration by the decision-makers.*

Monty Britton

T3.25 *At their May 26, 2004 meeting, the Policy Advisory Board recommended the BART Retained Cut Option at Dixon Landing Road and not the At-Grade or Aerial options. Therefore, the recommended option reduces visual and noise impact to north Milpitas residents.*

William Connor

T3.26 *Refer to response T3.4.*

This page intentionally left blank.

T4

Community Outreach “Day After” Report
BART to Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara
Draft EIS/EIR Public Hearing

Description: BART Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) Public Hearing

Location: First United Methodist Church
24 North 5th Street, San Jose

Date and Time: Monday, May 10, 2004, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Staff in Attendance: Planning and Programming: Ann Jamison (Presenter), Tim Chan, Mike Tasosa
Environmental Planning: Tom Fitzwater (Presenter)
Real Estate: Juanita Villemaire, Irene Wang
Marketing and Customer Service: Anne-Catherine Vinickas, Miriam Ayllon, Shawnora Weddles, Lupe Solis

Other Attendees: 13 members of the general public
City of San Jose: Ben Tripousis, Ray Salvano, Johnathan Noble

Consultants: Public Affairs Management: Kay Wilson (Moderator), Molly Graham

Media: Channel 4

Public Hearing Summary:

Before the public presentation began, meeting attendees were given time to view the plan and profile drawings for the entire 16.3-mile BART corridor from Warm Springs to the tail-tracks in Santa Clara. The display also included specific information about the 15 alignment and station design options throughout the corridor. VTA staff was present to answer questions about the corridor and design options before the public hearing was called to order.

The formal presentation began with basic information about the proposed BART Extension project, including project characteristics, background on how the BART Extension was selected as the preferred alternative for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor, and the alternatives to which the proposed extension is compared in the Draft EIS/EIR.

Staff provided an overview of the Draft EIS/EIR and specific long-term and short-term impacts in 17 environmental topics. The presentation also included discussion of specific environmental impacts in Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara as related to the BART project. Specifically, long-term impacts to intersections due to traffic into the proposed BART stations and unavoidable vibration impacts to 12 residences in San Jose were discussed.

Staff then opened the meeting to public comments about the Draft EIS/EIR. Attendees were given “blue cards” to submit to staff to be acknowledged during the public comment period of the hearing. Each speaker was allowed three minutes to address VTA staff and ask questions regarding the Draft EIS/EIR. VTA staff will address questions and comments in the Final EIS/EIR, which is anticipated to be completed at the end of this year.

Approximately 45 minutes into the public comment period, attendees were given another opportunity to review the display of the entire corridor and the 15 alignment and station design options. Then the public comment period was reconvened to take more questions and comments about the Draft EIS/EIR and the design options.

Transcript of Public Comment Period:

MS. WILSON: Okay. We're ready for the public comment process. For those of you who came in a little bit late, if you didn't get a blue card, raise your hand and staff will bring one to you. We'd ask that you turn in the blue cards, and we'll call on you in the order that we get them. We're going to have a three-minute time limit tonight, and we can circle back through if we need to. It looks like I've got some blue cards and we'll get started. Eugene Bradley, please. Hi.

MR. BRADLEY: Good evening, staff members. My name is Eugene Bradley. I'm the town representative for the Santa Clara VTA Riders Union. Our group has a lot of concerns regarding these draft EIS and EIR, specifically the section on the actual costs of BART to San Jose. I don't know if anyone has ever realized it, but the VTA has already borrowed \$700 million worth of our tax dollars against the Measure A anticipated funding to try and get started. We were never told about the borrowing nor the interest costs back in 2000. So we're concerned that VTA isn't really telling the voters everything about what BART actually costs. And speaking of which, the documents do not note the history of VTA -- of BART's costs which historically have always been a hundred percent over, even the airport extension, the one to SFO, had almost doubled in price from the original \$700 million. And with the \$700 million VTA had to borrow just to get started on the process that we have here, we were never told of this borrowing, and now we'll be paying the interest for it later on. Also, the one concern that I have that I personally voted against Measure A, just for the cost. There's another concern that we have, which is basically the tunneling that you'll be doing underneath downtown San Jose. Our question is, where will all of the dirt from the digging go? We're concerned that it's going to go into the bay and mess up the ground water. So we end up with a BART extension, but we can't even drink the water. So our group has just numerous concerns about this BART extension. And also one more question, the ridership numbers. How is it that a transit quota that only gets a thousand bus riders a day from Fremont to San Jose suddenly gets up to 88,000. I'm think it would disturb me as a taxpayer, and I'm sure these people out here to find out that so few people even use public transit in that corridor in the first place. I have to wonder if the ridership numbers were politically motivated somehow. If this is the case, we will end up wasting a minimum of \$4 billion to

T4.1

T4.2

T4.3

do nothing for traffic. I'll reserve all my future comments in writing, which I will deliver to you. Thank you.

T4.3
(cont.)

MS. WILSON: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Ryan Leaderman. Please.

MR. LEADERMAN: Hi, good evening. My name is Ryan Leaderman. I'm from the law firm Pipez Rudnick, and we represent The Great Mall in Milpitas. I just want to incorporate my reference. The letter that I delivered earlier this evening to Tom Fitzwater, and we do have a number of concerns. Primarily regarding the use and interference with Great Mall property. Also the Montague/Capitol train station. The location of the Y and analysis of cumulative impacts. And I'll just defer to that letter which states all our comments. And we look forward to working with you with this project in the future. Thank you.

T4.4

MS. WILSON: Thank you. Okay. Love to have some more blue cards and some more comments tonight. Is there anybody else that would like to comment on the presentation, which was the summary of the document or the actual document that Tom held up? We welcome your comments on the alternatives, the impacts, mitigation measures, assumptions in the document. Anybody else want to address us here? Anybody there in the back? I'm begging for some additional comments. Okay. Well, what -- anybody? Are you sure? What we'll do is -- oh, yes, great. Wonderful. Please come up.

MR. STEWART: Good afternoon. My name is Donald Stewart, and I just -- recently we just moved here, and my wife is a junior high teacher. We just learned something that was kind of interesting. We learned about a guy named Tuckerville (phonetic). He was a French guy that came over here early when America was starting, and he basically noticed -- with fresh eyes from Europe, he noticed that the American enterprise system was far exceeding European systems, and that was because of our ability -- people's ability to look at something and make it more efficient. He noticed that we can take something and make it more efficient and be able to take a little risk to be able to make things more efficient. People want to improve their surroundings. On just moving here, I've been using public transportation like just recently, and I've noticed a couple of things like -- thank you, first of all, for the bike path that you guys put in around San Jose. They are just excellent. I can get to where I'm going -- I live right along 237, so I could get to where I need to go faster than I can with -- twice as fast than the light rail and about equal to what the express bus can do. So thank you for the express bus and the bike paths that you guys put in. Basically back home we used to -- basically -- I think there is some ideas that -- let me go back, I guess. There is some ideas that I think we can use that basically will improve the system better than BART. 30 years from now the technology of enterprising things, things that can improve technology will far exceed the BART system. If you look back 30 years ago, the vehicles of 1974 are a far cry from what we have today. The enterprising system can produce is going to far exceed what the BART system will ever exceed. Right now there's a month long wait for the hybrid cars that are coming out. Yeah. So

T4.5

there's going to be some great ideas. I just want to say I hope that you guys will be able to take wisdom to look at the systems that are there and know whether or not they're good. And also to be -- to take courage, to take risks to go for some of those plans and look at what they are. Thanks.

T4.5
(cont.)

MS. WILSON: Thank you. And thanks for coming back. You were at one of our other meetings. Thank you. Please come up. Eric England.

MR. ENGLAND: Yeah, my name is Eric England. Gosh, I'm not used to a microphone. I just came here as a concerned citizen, mass transit user. Without a driver's license, San Jose could be a pretty big place. And, you know, missing a bus when trying to get here didn't help things any. But that said, I really appreciate the BART extension going on for all of the mishaps that might happen along the way. BART was -- when I was going to school in Berkeley, BART was still the most timely form of transportation I had. You can guarantee BART to show up almost on the dot. That said, I know there have been significant upgrades in transportation technology. Just looking at the rest of the world, looking at Japan's rail system, looking at the types of transportation systems that you have in Europe, and I was wondering if any consideration was made towards not eliminating the old system, because obviously that's incredibly costly. And the system is working, but considering putting in the newer technology sort of like having a transfer point of Fremont -- well, Fremont has some stuff around it. But it's not so crowded around Fremont. Maybe having a transfer station from one type of train to a more efficient, faster type of train or something of that nature. You know, that wouldn't come -- I would think that would come at roughly an equivalent cost because they've been doing so much work with technologies, and so it wouldn't end up being that much of an increase to the end user of BART, and it would still go to the increase use of mass transit. In fact, greater increase of mass transit because you would be able to get to where you wanted to go even faster than BART, which is also faster than your standard highway car during rush hour. And that pretty much concludes my remarks. I would like to thank the Board for having this meeting in the first place.

T4.6

MS. WILSON: Thank you. Thank you for coming. Okay. Anybody else like to give us some thoughts? That's why we're here tonight. Any more blue cards like to come up? Does anybody need a blue card? Going once. Okay. What we'll do is take little bit of a break. We're going to be here until 8:00 o'clock. So we'll take a little bit of a break and let you walk around the room and look at the exhibits, talk to the people from staff and answer any questions. Maybe by looking at maps it will stir up some more comments of things you'd like to say on the record. We hope you do. And we'll get back together, let's say, 7:20 and take some more comments if you have them at that time. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a break was taken.)

MS. WILSON: We are not answering questions tonight, but we want to get as many

questions and comments we can on the record so that it can be considered in preparation for decisions that will be made in the future, as well as preparation for the final environmental impact statement. I do know we have one person who came in who said they heard about it on TV. I don't know if he wants to speak. But is there anybody that would like to speak, or if you've spoken before we're happy to hear from you a second time if you bring up a blue card. In your break did you get any comments or anything you want to put on the record about the environmental document? Tonight is your time or also we'll be taking written comments. I know some of you told me that you submitted written comments, and we're taking those until close of business on Friday. Anybody else want to come up and address us? Okay. Well, we'll be here until 8:00. So if you have any additional comments, we can write them down or take them down. You can submit your letters in writing. Let's take a look at my last slide here. I think I've already covered all that. And we'll take letters, written comments or any -- or by e-mail that we provided you earlier. If you have any additional comments we need to have them by Friday, May 14th at 5:00 o'clock. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public comments were concluded at 7:25 p.m.)

VTA will continue to receive comments on the BART Draft EIS/EIR before the 60-day public comment period ends on Friday, May 14, 2004 at 5:00 p.m.

RESPONSE TO TRANSCRIPT T4

Eugene Bradley

- T4.1** *The VTA Board, at a noticed public meeting on August 7, 2003, authorized the sale of up to \$550 million in bonds against future Measure A revenues to be used for the Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases of the project and for Right-of Way acquisition. To date only \$170 million has been allocated, with only a portion of that actually bonded to date. VTA is confident in the cost estimates as prepared for the 10% Conceptual Engineering phase of the project.*

Eugene Bradley

- T4.2** *The closed-face tunnel boring machine, as described in Section 4.19.2.3, Location and Construction of Guideway Types, Stations, and Other Facilities, used to advance and line the BART Alternative tunnel segment will be limited to a small volume at the head of the tunnel, as shown in Figure 4.19-8, Earth Pressure Balance Tunnel-Boring Machine. The tunnel will be lined using precast concrete segments with gasketed joints that provide a watertight lining both during construction and permanently during operation of the BART Alternative. Muck produced during tunneling will be generally captured, although some fine materials may mobilize to the aquifer. Because of the soft alluvial nature of the soils around the tunnel, the mobilized fine materials will be quickly filtered out by the downgradient alluvial materials.*

If not reused within the construction site, all project-excavated materials will be delivered to approved disposal sites following all applicable regulatory requirements.

Eugene Bradley

- T4.3** *Existing transit ridership in the corridor is well over a thousand bus riders a day. Total daily transit ridership on the VTA Route 180 alone was approximately 1,700 daily boardings in FY2004. If ACE train ridership of 2,700 daily boardings is added, existing corridor ridership is approaching 4,500 boardings per day. This does not include trips made on the Capitols or other express and local bus services in the corridor. In addition, the project will tap into a significant regional transit system (BART) that serves San Francisco, northern San Mateo, and the entire East Bay providing a new rail transit market that was previously served by local and express bus service.*

The ridership numbers were estimated using a regional travel demand model developed using industry standard methodologies and, as such, are not politically motivated. The regional travel models were based on the models used by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and refined to reflect updated year 2000 conditions in the project corridor and use the most currently available socioeconomic forecasts provided by Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Continued growth in population and employment from the year 2000 and 2025 would indicate that already congested roadway facilities would continue to be congested, which in turn would impact bus operating speeds. Transit travel for trips in the corridor under current and future conditions under the No-Action and Baseline Alternative conditions are not optimal for longer distanced travel, as travelers have to transfer to travel on buses operating in congested traffic conditions. The BART Alternative, due to operation in an exclusive

right-of-way that is grade-separated at intersections, would provide a reliable alternative to auto and bus travel for trips made in the project corridor.

Ryan Leaderman

T4.4 *Refer to responses to P30.1 through P30.41 regarding the letter that was delivered to VTA staff.*

Donald Stewart

T4.5 *The Major Investment Study/Alternatives Analysis (MIS/AA) thoroughly evaluated 11 alternatives for the corridor including the possible use of express bus, busway, commuter rail, diesel light rail, light rail, and BART. These alternatives were consistent with the goals of the MIS/AA. After an extensive public outreach process, the VTA Board of Directors determined that the benefits of the BART Alternative were far greater than those of any of the other alternatives and selected it as the Locally Preferred Alternative in November 2001. Several other alternatives have been considered either during the MIS/AA or following the MIS/AA including 25 KV electric standard gauge railroad (refer to response P32.1), Personal Rapid Transit (refer to response P43.1), and LEV X (refer to response T3.4). All of these alternatives were eliminated from further consideration because they did not achieve the project's purpose to the same degree as the BART Alternative, and/or involved undue schedule and cost risk because they were untested by a public transit agency in the United States.*

Eric England

T4.6 *Refer to response T4.5.*

This page intentionally left blank.