

## 4. PREFERENCES FOR ALTERNATIVES

---

The following comments are statements of preference for or against the Proposed Project and its various alternatives.

*Comment P-1 (AC): AC Transit strongly supports the Proposed Alternative and those alternatives that have a station at Irvington. This site is a natural location for a major bus and rail transit hub, based upon street layout. The combination of a BART extension with a station at Irvington and a bus route network designed around this station site, will provide an efficient multi-modal transit system designed to attract new riders to both BART and AC Transit, thereby reducing automobile traffic in the Irvington area and on Bay Area freeways.*

**Response P-1:** Comment noted. See also response T-25.

*Comment P-2 (Caltrans): We continue to support a three station option which is consistent with Caltrans policy to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) on State Highways.*

**Response P-2:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-3 (Fremont): Fremont General Plan Conformance: The proposed project with either Design Option 1 (subway) or 2S (subway) in Central Park and Alternatives 4 or 5 with either Design Options 1 (subway) or 2S (subway) are the only alternatives which conform to the Fremont General Plan. It is especially important for the Irvington Station to be included as part of the extension because the station is a cornerstone of the Irvington redevelopment plan.*

**Response P-3:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-4 (Keenly): I reviewed the Draft EIR for the BART Warm Springs Extension in depth and came to the conclusion that the Proposed Project as outlined was fairly good.*

**Response P-4:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-5 (Keenly): Do not construct the Warm Springs Station at this time.*

*As of the construction completion date, I do not see a need for a Warm Springs Station, as most of the businesses located along the proposed BART Extension are adjacent to the Irvington Station (the Irvington District) and the South Warm Springs Station. Much of the land near the Warm Springs Station is still agricultural in nature, thereby negating the need for a station. I would still recommend that preliminary engineering be completed in anticipation of the need for a future Warm Springs Station.*

**Response P-5:** Comment noted. Alternative 11 does not call for the construction of a station at the Warm Springs site.

**Comment P-6 (Keenly):** *Choose Design Option 3 through Central Park.*

*I prefer that an aerial alignment be chosen over a subway alignment through Central Park for mainly two reasons: cost and view. Why should the transit rider be relegated to looking at the dark walls of a tunnel for an added cost to the project of \$60 million? The view of Central Park from the aerial trackway will be spectacular. It should in no way detract from the activities that occur in the Park. (Incidentally, most activities in the park occur on the west side of Lake Elizabeth; only bikers and walkers will need to pass near the aerial structure when traveling on the east side of the lake). The view of the aerial trackway from the west side of Lake Elizabeth should be minimal under Option 3 (see Figure 3.8-6B in the Draft EIR).*

*Option 3 is superior to the other aerial options proposed due to the fact that Option 3 would completely avoid crossing Lake Elizabeth and the riparian forest area. These two benefits outweigh the 70 mph speed restriction of Option 3 over the other aerial alignments.*

**Response P-6:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-7 (IBA):** *Irvington Station. The Irvington Station is an extremely valuable link for the transportation needs of the surrounding residential areas. This station will mitigate current and future vehicular impacts by improving the intersections at Osgood, Driscoll and Washington Blvd.*

**Response P-7:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-8 (IBA):** *BART Extension Aerial Route. We cannot support an aerial route from the Central Park area to the Irvington Station and beyond. The same significant unavoidable impacts occur as with the park. A depressed route is the best solution and will mitigate the noise, visual, traffic and related environmental impacts to an acceptable level.*

**Response P-8:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-9 (Kliment):** *If we are forced to accept BART's Warm Springs Extension the alignment Option #1 (subway) is the only one that is the least detrimental to us and the neighborhood.*

**Response P-9:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-10 (MSJCC):**

1. *The extension should pass under Lake Elizabeth to preserve its beauty as a community resource.*

**Response P-10:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-11 (MSJCC):**

2. *We support each of the three stations planned in the proposed project. All three stations are vital to the community and will decrease the environmental impact of vehicular pollution.*

**Response P-11:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-12 (MSJCC):**

3. *The Mission San Jose Chamber of Commerce would like to see the BART Extension depressed as it transverses the Irvington area. This revitalized business district would be adversely affected by a raised line.*

**Response P-12:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-13 (SCCTA):** *As stated previously we prefer those alternatives that extend BART service from the current BART Fremont terminus station to the future South Warm Springs station, further extended by tail tracks to the County line. These alternatives are Alternatives 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11.*

**Response P-13:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-14 (FCC):** *Central Park (Lake Elizabeth) is an important community resource that must be protected for the enjoyment of present and future generations. An aerial structure through Central Park is totally unacceptable due to the visual and noise impacts on the park and the surrounding residential areas. In addition, the aerial route would degrade the many activities available in the park, including walking, picnicking, bicycling, boating, soccer, softball and other pursuits.*

**Response P-14:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-15 (FCC):** *Each of the three stations planned in the proposed project is vital to the community. Each station will serve a different major residential and/or commercial/industrial area, and will lighten environmental impacts of vehicular congestion and air pollution by reducing the number of vehicles transporting residents and workers to and from these areas.*

**Response P-15:** Comment noted.

**Comment P-16 (Aihara 1):** *The Irvington Station should be eliminated. It will bring crime into our community, not the prosperity suggested by the Irvington businessmen. Look at the Emporium*

*Clearance Center--this center has been dying a slow death for years! (Conveniently located next to the "end of the line" existing Fremont Station.) We homeowners do not want Irvington Station. We want Alternative 8: BART away from our homes!*

**Response P-16:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-17 (Snow 1): In a separate matter, I believe that the cost of building three more stations in Fremont is a luxury we cannot afford. Furthermore, the taxpayers of the present BART district should not be expected to carry the burden of extending the line to the Alameda County border just for the convenience of Santa Clara County residents. Alternate #9 (5.4 miles) is my preference with only one new station at Warm Springs. The proposed Irvington station is too close to the present Fremont station. An Irvington BART station would create further traffic congestion in an area that is already overused. The money saved by adopting alternate #9 could be applied to undergrounding the track from the present Fremont station to a point just beyond Washington Blvd. and Osgood Road. That way you would preserve the beauty and usefulness of Central Park.*

**Response P-17:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-18 (UPRR): Union Pacific Railroad Company opposes project alternatives which include a BART station at Irvington (Washington Boulevard). One of the Irvington station alternatives calls for Union Pacific Railroad and Southern Pacific Railroad to be placed side-by-side in a long subway under the proposed station area. Union Pacific Railroad opposes this alternative for a number of environmental reasons.*

**Response P-18:** Comment noted. See also responses PD-24, AQ-2, HM-10, SS-7, and N-7.

*Comment P-19 (UPRR): Therefore, due to problems anticipated with train handling, derailments, exhaust smoke buildup, vibration, safety and security, and derailment cleanup, Union Pacific Railroad opposes the Irvington Station alternatives. Union Pacific Railroad supports Project Alternatives 6, 7, 9 and 10, which do not include a station at Irvington.*

**Response P-19:** Comment noted. See also responses PD-24, AQ-2, HM-10, SS-7, and N-7.

*Comment P-20 (Petterson): The purpose of my letter is to go on record against Alternative 8: A 7.8-mile BART extension along Osgood Road and Warm Springs Boulevard with two extensions.*

**Response P-20:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-21 (Lane): We have lived in this area over thirty years and used to be very supportive and enthusiastic of BART. We are very much in favor of mass transit. However, the Warm Springs Extension project is very troubling. It doesn't seem to us that the "ring around the bay" concept is ever going to happen. Santa Clara and San Mateo do not seem to be willing to help pay for it. They have other transit alternatives. It seems better then to spend the money to*

*Alternative 2 or Alternative 3 and strengthen other transportation than to pay this much to bring BART closer to Santa Clara. We are very concerned about the impact on Central Park in Fremont. There seems no way to save it if BART goes through. We are also very concerned about the impact on the birds and other wildlife in the area.*

**Response P-21:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-22 (Waugh): I think that the tunnel should be built back like it was planned with the modification that the train be tunneled thru Lake Elizabeth.*

**Response P-22:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-23 (Greene): Thanks for sending the E.I.R. We have read a lot of it, and wish to express our objections to Alternative 8. Is this a seriously considered alternative? We think it is the least desirable (39 residences disrupted 22 more than the proposed project, alternative 4, 5, and 11. 83 businesses same as proposed project and Alternative 11. Only Alternative 7 has more). We think the proposed project would be the ideal extension.*

**Response P-23:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-24 (Olson): The homeowners along the Union Pacific Railroad (on the east side) would be severely impacted in terms of noise, vibration (substantially higher level and certainly far more frequently than currently exists), view obstruction and deterioration and loss of property value for any optional route that approaches or straddles the UPRR.*

*Mr. Priestly, a consultant retained to photograph elevation and obstructions, photographed potential views from our backyard which should illustrate just one aspect of the problem posed by BART project alignments 2 and 3 through Central Park. We strongly request that BART retain the option 1 routing through Central Park.*

**Response P-24:** Comment noted. See Figures 3.8-7A and 3.8-7B on page 3.8-14 of the Draft EIR for the photo simulation referred to in the comment.

*Comment P-25 (PH-UPRR): I would like to say, however, the Union Pacific Railroad is not really comfortable with the proposals for the Irvington Station, primarily. Alternative number 4 is the one that we were talking about last years, and we had a lot of problems with that, and it's still one that we cannot live with from an environmental standpoint.*

**Response P-25:** Comment noted. See also response P-18.

*Comment P-26 (PH-UPRR): The Alternative Number 4 alignment was unacceptable because it pushed us too close to the Southern Pacific, and it blocked us from the east side. The proposed alignment is better, south of Irvington, and that's satisfactory.*

**Response P-26:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-27 (PH-UPRR): I would say, to close up--and I have to get my score card out here. Alternatives 4, 5 and 11 are not acceptable, from Union Pacific's point of view. And 6, 7, 9 and 10 would seem to us to be appropriate.*

**Response P-27:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-28 (PH-O'Connor): Lake Elizabeth is a jewel to the City of Fremont. It is the diamond in the center. And I think BART would simply be a blight, to be an aerial tramway or bridge across the lake, and I would like to see--more than I like. I don't know how to stress this--almost demand that we have a subway. I think we were promised one years ago. Every problem has a solution. The alternatives we have been shown are not it. I believe that every solution can be improved.*

**Response P-28:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-29 (PH-O'Conner): Furthermore, I would like to see the subway continue under the lake and continue under Paseo Padre, under Washington Boulevard and then to the station which would be underground because we also have great problems with the trains. I'd like to mention that to the railroad lawyer right now. The trains are getting longer and they're getting slower. And I'm sure anyone that's driven down Paseo Padre--they also seem to time them for the commute. I've been stuck there at 8:00 in the morning and 5:00 in the evening, and the trains are just barely moving.*

**Response P-29:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-30 (PH-O'Conner): I was told that the Warm Springs yard--and I think this was for Southern Pacific--is now their main yard in Northern California, that the impact is just too great with the railroads. And I do like the one part of the alternatives where they would put both the railroad tracks underground. I think that's a great idea. The lawyer said he doesn't like them close together. There's another alternative where they can spread them further apart. That's fine.*

**Response P-30:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-31 (PH-O'Conner): I had another thought, that BART's response to the subway has been that the money's not there. I was thinking that we could eliminate the South Warm Springs Station. I didn't see that on any alternatives when he mentioned them eliminating a different station. Every one of them kept the South Warm Springs unless they got rid of both the stations.*

**Response P-31:** Comment noted. Alternatives 4 and 5 include Irvington and Warm Springs stations, but do not include a South Warm Springs Station.

*Comment P-32 (PH-Hirsch): I'm a member of the Irvington Business Association. I've lived here all my life. For many of us in Irvington, we believe the Irvington Station is critical for a number of reasons.*

**Response P-32:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-33 (PH-Pease/IBA): I'm currently president of the Irvington Business Association. I'm here this evening to convey our support for an Irvington Station. A station as proposed by BART with depressed tracks and depressed BART through the station utilizes the land to its optimum and allows for the best solution of traffic and the visual impacts.*

**Response P-33:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-34 (Pease/IBA): As was mentioned earlier by a spokesman for the railroad, they don't seem to want to have a little incline or something going through the station. I think mathematically that can be corrected very easily with a depressed route going from Paseo Padre all the way through the station so there's very little incline going in and out.*

**Response P-34:** Comment noted. See also response PD-24.

*Comment P-35 (Pease/IBA): As far as security goes, railroad tracks have been there a hundred and something years. I think BART has an excellent security record, and between the two of you, you should be able to figure that out.*

**Response P-35:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-36 (Pease/IBA): As far as the lake and the problems that we have either over or under, personally, I'm not opposed to the visual aspects. I have been in the Orlando area and you could use Epcot as, say, a model if you will, but I came to the conclusion after attending the workshop and the community meetings, et cetera, that visually, that's one aspect.*

**Response P-36:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-37 (PH-Pease/IBA): The other major problem is the noise, and that's an impact that can't be mitigated. So therefore, we believe that a subway route or depressed route through the lake should be the alternative.*

**Response P-37:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-38 (PH-Journey): I think we need 7.8 miles more of track. I really question whether we need three stations to do that. I think Rapid Transit would be served by two stations eliminating an Irvington Station. Just an outsider's view, it seems we're really posturing about*

*subway or aerial around the lake. It's very silly, any other option, besides subway. These hard right-hand turns around the lake are silly, and Design Option 8 is really silly, a right-hand turn at Osgood Road.*

**Response P-38:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-39 (PH-Susoev): So as long as it does cost our taxpayers, I say above and around like you say because--and three stations I cannot go for. It's one in Warm Springs. Like I said, I am confused between the Warm Springs and South Warm Springs. I have to decide which is the best area so I might have to talk to BART officials a little bit later.*

**Response P-39:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-40 (PH-Singh): If we can keep away from the fault line and the BART engineers can come up with a foolproof system that can withstand a magnitude of 8.5, then I think it will be worthwhile first putting our eyes down to saving the lake and the park.*

**Response P-40:** Comment noted. See also responses G-3 and G-9.

*Comment P-41 (PH-Singh): I suggest we only aim for one station, that is the crossing of Grimmer and Durham. There is plenty of space available over there. It will serve the guys living up in the hills. Irvington District will be happy. It's pretty close to them. And the population density here, the traffic generated by Irvington District alone, I do not think this justifies having a station so close to Fremont Station. And if other supervisors can get along on friendly terms with Santa Clara, if they can chip in some money, okay, then let's build one on the North Warm Springs so San Jose can be served and other citizens can also be served who go to those industrial areas.*

**Response P-41:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-42 (PH-Lieb): A couple of comments, the proposed route to me seems reasonable. I believe it's 2-A. The one that doesn't go quite out of the way elevated is also reasonable. And it's reasonable to me for one reason, is that for many years I was a soccer referee, and the biggest impact there other than the sailing--I don't know what the wind currents are like out there. I know they're pretty strong on soccer balls--but the Union Pacific and Southern Pacific railroads generate far more noise with their SD60s and whatever trying to drag things up the hill than BART can ever do.*

*\$50,000,000 is a lot of money. In many respects we in Fremont knew that that was going to eventually be an extension through there and we went and built the lake anyway, and we went and built the other areas, like the softball fields, anyway. So as a taxpayer and as a person who extensively uses the park, \$50,000,000 is a pretty high price to pay given the noise levels in comparison to the noise levels that are already there.*

**Response P-42:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-43 (PH-Norman): As far as where the station should be, I believe three stations along that 7.8 miles is excessive also, but I was glad to see that Option 11 has come about. I believe that the station is important to the Irvington District and that one should be preserved. And if we're going to eliminate a station somewhere, Warm Springs seems to be as likely a candidate as anything.*

**Response P-43:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-44 (PH-Norman): I believe we should extend to South Warm Springs if we possibly can. I know they're grumbling about this being a gift to those evil hordes in Santa Clara County, but we can look at it this way, too, the station is built to South Warm Springs then we keep those invaders off our Fremont streets and highways and that they can just funnel whatever evil-doing they have in mind into the South Warm Springs station.*

**Response P-44:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-45 (PH-Norman): And finally, as far as the Lake Elizabeth issue is concerned, I think I would prefer to see the line go underground or at least depressed at Lake Elizabeth, too, and the apology of something that I had mentioned back at the March 20th meeting, but I'll try to remove the self-congratulatory element of it is that I don't want to wake up in the year 2015 or 2020, read in the newspaper that the City of Fremont and BART have come to an agreement to share funding for a subway under Lake Elizabeth, but at this point, it now costs \$150,000,000 instead of the \$50,000,000 that we're talking about now. So please, BART, City of Fremont and maybe Santa Clara County, if you're feeling generous too, find some way to share the cost of this thing. For heaven's sake, split it or something, but don't let it sit and inflate. That's my point on the issue.*

**Response P-45:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-46 (PH-Zager): And what I would like to state is that the Chamber of Commerce would like to reiterate the support for the completion of a BART Warm Springs extension. We have been very patient. We have supported an extension since BART's conception. And we now feel it is time that an extension be completed.*

**Response P-46:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-47 (PH-Kliment): And then I'm also concerned about, they also mentioned that, you know, the park is a beautiful, beautiful place. I was very impressed with it. And it's a wonderful place to walk. And people really use it. They were saying if they go aerial, that the people walking under there, every time a train goes by, they're going to have to stop talking. They're not going to*

be able to hear each other. Well, isn't it nice to have a beautiful park and you can't even talk to the person you're walking with.

**Response P-47:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-48 (PH-Forney): So our feeling is that an underground between the existing soccer fields and the end of the lake there would be preferable, possibly then we could use the area that would be above BART for play areas, grassy play areas, and we would still also maintain a habitat for the burrowing owls in some of those areas.*

**Response P-48:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-49 (PH-Forney): If BART is built, extended, I would prefer to see three stations. Certainly, if we're going to get people out of their cars, we have to have places where they can board these types of transportation modules. I'm sure things are going to change in the future, but we're not getting any better. We've got to do something.*

**Response P-49:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-50 (PH-Higgason): I do agree with Lake Elizabeth subway because my kids do play soccer, my husband is a soccer referee, and I feel it would impact them quite a bit.*

**Response P-50:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-51 (PH-Keenly): If I had to choose one of the design options through Central Park, it would probably be Design Option 3, aerial. I know a lot of people don't like aerial, but if we look around in this neighborhood, or any of the neighborhoods, we build all kinds of freeway structures, freeway overpasses, no one really gives them a second thought. This is okay. This is part of development. This is what happens. That's okay.*

**Response P-51:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-52 (PH-Keenly): I'd like to talk about the stations just for a couple of minutes, or a minute. The three stations are good. The Irvington Station looks like a good location. It's right in the middle of the Irvington District. The Warm Springs Station is probably a good station in the future. It's probably not now. It may be a good idea to do the preliminary engineering on it now and not actually build it. There's really nothing out there right now except for agricultural fields, and if development for some reason, I don't know why anything would stop it, but if it didn't occur at that point then we really wouldn't even need that station.*

**Response P-52:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-53 (PH-Hoch): My main interest on this is on Central Park and Lake Elizabeth. And my preference is for alternate 2-S, the subway. And some of the reasons that I'm in favor of having a subway instead of an aerial BART are, one, if you have this subway, after the construction, there will be much less destruction of habitat. With the aerial, you will lose lake habitat; you will lose forest habitat, and you will lose forest habitat, and you will lose grasslands. If it is a subway, you won't lose those things. Also, if it is a subway, you won't have the visual impact of the aerial structures, and you won't have as much of a, much noise problem.*

*And as somebody else mentioned, that path around the lake is used day and night early, late, rainy weather. I know that I like to walk around. I walk through Gomes Park, through the area between the tracks and then around the lake. If there is an aerial structure, I don't think I'll walk around the lake any more. I think, as somebody else said, the Central Park and that lake are the gem of Fremont, and to blight it, which I think an aerial structure would be blight on it, I think that's just foolish.*

**Response P-53:** Comment noted.

*Comment P-54 (PH-Singh): But if they don't, let's not think of that extension yet. Save our dollars and have a real good system going under the lake, save the lake, save the park, and have a good station as I said earlier either at Durham and Fremont Boulevard or Durham and Grimmer Boulevard which is still close to Irvington District.*

**Response P-54:** Comment noted.