

Appendix I Comments on the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment

Introduction

In January 2014, the California Department of Transportation (Department), in cooperation with the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC), circulated the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) for public review. Public outreach and the public meeting for the project are described in Section 3.2.

This appendix presents the public comments received on the IS/EA via e-mails, letters, and comment cards; and the responses to those comments. Comments were submitted by the following individuals:

- Val Menotti, Manager, Strategic and Policy Planning, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
- Matt Williams, Chair, Transportation and Compact Growth Committee, Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
- Jing Firmeza
- Katherine Stathis
- Robert Allen

The comments and responses begin on the next page.

Any text changes resulting from the comments are summarized in the responses and have been incorporated into the text of the IS/EA. Revisions made after the public review period are indicated by a vertical line in the margin of the IS/EA text, similar to the one shown to the left of this paragraph. Minor revisions to clarify the project description and to make editorial adjustments are denoted in the same manner.

Comment: Val Menotti, Manager, Strategic and Policy Planning, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District



SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

300 Lakeside Drive, P.O. Box 12688
Oakland, CA 94604-2688
(510) 464-6000

2014

February 5, 2014

Joel Keller
PRESIDENT

Thomas M. Blalock, P.E.
VICE PRESIDENT

Grace Crunican
GENERAL MANAGER

DIRECTORS

Gail Murray
1ST DISTRICT

Joel Keller
2ND DISTRICT

Rebecca Saltzman
3RD DISTRICT

Robert Raburn, Ph.D.
4TH DISTRICT

John McPartland
5TH DISTRICT

Thomas M. Blalock, P.E.
6TH DISTRICT

Zakhary Mallett, MCP
7TH DISTRICT

James Fang
8TH DISTRICT

Tom Radulovich
9TH DISTRICT

Ms. Valerie Shearer
Senior Environmental Planner
Caltrans District 4
Office of Environmental Analysis, MS 8-B
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Re: BART Comments on I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project IS/EA

Dear Ms. Shearer:

Thank you for the opportunity to comments on the Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) prepared for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project.

The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) has two specific comments on the IS/EA.

1. In Table 2.4.2-1, the table entry under "Location" for the BART to Livermore project is "I-580 and Camino Tassajara, Isabel Avenue, Livermore Avenue, Greenville Road." At this time, BART is developing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a BART extension only to Isabel Avenue. Whether the extension continues beyond Isabel Avenue is not yet determined. We suggest revising to "I-580 and Camino Tassajara, Isabel Avenue. Alignment east of Isabel Avenue not yet determined."
2. In Table 2.4.2-1, the table entry under "Anticipated Schedule" for the BART to Livermore project is "Technical studies in support of EIR under way from mid-2011 through mid-2012; construction scheduled for 2015 to 2040." The technical studies have been delayed. New dates have not yet been established. We suggest revising to "EIR commenced Aug 2012. Technical studies in support of EIR under way."

Valerie Shearer
February 5, 2014
Page 2

2

As Caltrans is aware, both of our agencies are pursuing projects to improve transportation in the I-580 corridor through Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore. In August 2012, BART issued a Notice of Preparation for a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the BART to Livermore Extension Project. The proposed project consists of extending BART in the middle of I-580 for approximately five miles to a station in the vicinity of the Isabel Avenue/I-580 interchange and would incorporate an efficient bus-to-BART transfer; and express bus services linking inter-regional rail service, Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in Livermore, and proposed offsite parking facilities.

BART expects our two agencies to work cooperatively as we develop our respective projects. If you would like to discuss further or require more information, please contact Andrew Tang, BART Principal Planner, at (510) 874-7327 or atang@bart.gov.

Sincerely,



Val Menotti
Manager, Strategic and Policy Planning

CC: N Lowenthal
N Carlin
J Ordway
D Dean

Responses to Comment: Val Menotti, Manager, Strategic and Policy Planning, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District

1. The revisions to Table 2.4.2-1 have been incorporated as recommended.
2. The Department and Alameda CTC are familiar with plans to extend of BART from the Dublin/Pleasanton station to Livermore and expect to work cooperatively with BART as the extension and the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project progress.

Comment: Matt Williams, Chair, Transportation and Compact Growth Committee, Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter



San Francisco Bay Chapter

Serving Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin and San Francisco counties

February 5, 2014

via email to valerie_shearer@dot.ca.gov

Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
P. O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Attn: Valerie Shearer, Branch Chief

re: I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project (dated December 2013)
Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA)
DISTRICT 4 – ALA – 580 (PM R7.8/19.9)
04-0G1900/0400000315

To Whom It May Concern:

1

The Sierra Club writes to express our concerns and objections to the subject document and proposed project. We do not believe that a Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental documentation. We also request additional documentation and/or explanation on several matters.

2

Because the project description includes statements such as “proposes to convert . . . to an express lane facility” and “would allow single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) to pay a toll to use the lanes,” it is clear that the project includes operation as well as construction of elements of the proposed Express Lane Network. The project is further described as “included in the 2013 Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP),” the EIR of which is the subject of several CEQA lawsuits, for one of which the Sierra Club is a Petitioner. Our comment letter on MTC’s DEIR for “Plan Bay Area” expressed specific concerns about the HOT/Express lanes network.

3

In particular, we are concerned the document regarding this project does not appear to take into account, or clearly identify the relationship to/of, at least two other projects with concurrent comment opportunities that address generally the same highway segment:

- Freeway Performance Initiative Interstate 580 in Alameda and San Joaquin Counties
District 4-ALA 580 (PM 0.0/8.1, 22.0/30.3)
EA 4G190/Project ID 0412000348
- Interstate 580 Roadway Rehabilitation Project
DISTRICT 4 – ALA – 580 (PM0.0/7.8)
3G590 EFIS #0412000115

2530 San Pablo Ave., Suite I Berkeley, CA 94702 Tel. (510) 848-0800 www.sfbay.sierraclub.org ☎

3, cont.	<p>The “Express Lanes” document under comment does not correlate this project to the others, and thus does not identify possible or potential impacts in any holistic or cumulative manner. The lengthy listing of “Improvements” in Section 2.4 does not clearly identify either of the related projects or provide any useful information about their impacts. Therefore the subject environmental document is flawed, and more analysis and documentation is required. Further, while this specific project is stated in part to “not require any roadway expansion,” it also will “use the pavement installed by the I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Project phases.” National Sierra Club Transportation Guidelines state, in relevant part:</p>
4	<p>“No limited access highways (“freeways”) should be built or widened, especially in urban-suburban areas or near threatened natural areas. High occupancy vehicle (HOV) and high occupancy vehicle/toll (HOT) lanes should come from converting existing highway lanes rather than constructing new lanes.” Sequencing and separating the steps does not comply with the intent of these policies.</p>
5	<p>There are numerous contradictory statements within the document, and a corresponding lack of substantiation. As just one example, Table S-1 states that the project “would not substantially change roadway capacity,” yet the “Purpose” statement for the project (Section 1.2) includes goals such as “expand the available capacity for HOVs” and Section 1.3.1.8 make a similar statement about “increase(ing) capacity for HOV users.” Another entry in Table S-1 states that “Operations in approximately half of all segments would improve compared to No Build.” The Summary justifies the project as “needed to address congestion in the I-580 corridor.”</p>
6	<p>Chapter 2 indicates that the CEQA baseline for traffic is 2005, and for air quality and noise the baseline “began in 2011 and used the 2005 baseline year for traffic.” Section 2.5 has a lengthy discourse about Greenhouse Gases (GHGs). We recognize that CEQA currently requires a determination of whether a project’s incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable,” but the goal of SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) is to actually <u>reduce</u> such emissions. The strategies in the document are characterized as admittedly speculative. We therefore believe that more thorough and substantive environmental analysis is required, particularly given the location of the project.</p>
7	<p>Section 1.3.5 states that “Air quality studies will be submitted for FHWA concurrence after public review of the IS/EA.” How will these be made available for actual public review as to actual outcomes?</p>
8	<p>We also believe that more substantive information is needed to identify and mitigate potential Environmental Justice (EJ) impacts. Chapter 2 states that “the corridor has a generally consistent ethnic and income profile; the population is predominantly white” which grossly ignores the traveling public who use the corridor, often because of lower housing prices towards the East.</p>
9	<p>And were any of the “feasible sound walls” that were determined not be “cost-effective” located adjacent to low-income and/or minority populations or communities? To what extent has MTC’s preliminary EJ analysis work regarding the “Express Lane Network” been incorporated into Caltrans’ review and planning? We also note that Environmental Justice is noticeably missing from the “Environmental Commitment Record” in Appendix E; what assurances are provided that these important civil rights will be appropriately protected?</p>
10	<p></p>

11

As an aside, we have also communicated concerns to Ms Sheryl Garcia (now Sablan) of District staff about problems with the transparency and usability of the website <http://dot.ca.gov/dist4/enydocs.htm>, which is provided as the single point of information for public notices, but which we have found to be either incomplete or very difficult to locate projects. We will document these in a separate correspondence.

We are available to discuss these and other concerns with you. If you have any questions or desire further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at mwillia@mac.com or via phone at 510-530-5259. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,



Matt Williams, Chair
Transportation & Compact Growth Committee
San Francisco Bay Chapter

cc: Chapter Chair
Chapter Director
Tri-Valley Group Chair
Three-Chapter SB375 Working Group
Earthjustice

Responses to Comment: Matt Williams, Chair, Transportation and Compact Growth Committee, Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

1. The commenter expresses the opinion that a Negative Declaration is not the appropriate environmental documentation for the project and requests additional documentation and/or explanation. Each of the points raised in the comment is addressed in more detail below.
2. As described in Section 1.1 of the IS/EA, the proposed project has been developed in response to California State Assembly Bills 2032 and 574, which authorize the Alameda CTC to implement express lanes in an HOV system in Alameda County. The project would ultimately become part of the Bay Area Express Lanes Network that would have 550 miles of combined HOV/express lanes at full buildout in 2035. The proposed project and the Bay Area Express Lanes Network have been included in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) since 2009.¹⁹

The comment refers to legal actions related to *Plan Bay Area*, the 2040 RTP. It is outside of the scope of the CEQA/NEPA process for this project to address specific complaints from legal actions against *Plan Bay Area*. Therefore, responses are limited to the comments provided in this letter.

¹⁹ The Transportation 2035 Plan and its final environmental impact report were adopted in April 2009. http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/.

3. The comment identifies two other projects in or near the project corridor that were not listed or described in the IS/EA: the Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI; 4-ALA 580, PM 0.0/8.1, 22.0/30.3; EA 4G190, Project ID 0412000348) and the Interstate 580 Roadway Rehabilitation Project (4-ALA-580, PM 0.0/7.8; EA 3G590, Project ID 0412000115). These projects are both scheduled to be constructed from July 2016 through October 2018, which is after the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project would be completed. The scope and purpose of the projects is separate from those of the Express Lanes Project. The projects are described further below.

The FPI project would install ramp metering and traffic operations system (TOS) equipment and widen interchange ramps along I-580 at various locations in Alameda and San Joaquin counties. The TOS equipment is not related to the electrical and communications equipment that would be installed as part of the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project. The only project element that would overlap with the Express Lanes Project would be the installation of one traffic monitoring station cabinet along eastbound I-580 at PM 8.06, within the State right-of-way. The cabinet would be protected by a metal beam guard rail. The Greenville Road interchange at the eastern end of the express lanes project limits would not be widened or have ramp metering installed as part of the FPI project. The November 2013 Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the FPI project identified potential biological impacts that would be fully offset by mitigation measures included in the project.

The I-580 Roadway Rehabilitation Project would replace roadway pavement and install rumble strips, metal beam guard rails, concrete barriers, overhead signage and lighting, flashing beacons, barrier markers, roadside delineators, and guard rail delineators. These project components are not related to those that would be installed as part of the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project. The project would take place on the I-580 mainline and ramps from 1 mile east of North Flynn Road to the San Joaquin County line in the eastbound direction and from the San Joaquin County line to 0.2 mile east of Greenville Road in the westbound direction. The Roadway Rehabilitation Project would not overlap with the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project. The November 2013 Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Roadway Rehabilitation Project identified potential biological impacts that would be fully offset by mitigation measures included in the project.

These projects have been added to Table 2.4.2-1. The projects would not result in net impacts to environmental resources; therefore, they would not contribute to cumulative impacts of the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project.

4. The comment cites the National Sierra Club Transportation Guidelines provision that HOV and high-occupancy toll lanes should come from existing highway lanes rather than constructing new lanes, and states that the proposed project's use of pavement from the I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Project phases does not comply with the intent of the guidelines. The opinion of the Sierra Club is noted. The proposed project's conversion of an HOV lane into an express lane and the addition of a second express lane are consistent with Federal Highway Administration and Department policies for managed lanes.

5. The comment states that the IS/EA contains numerous contradictory statements and lack of substantiation. The specific points made in this comment (shown in summary form in italics) are discussed further below.

Table S-1 states that the project would not substantially change roadway capacity, but the document states in the project purpose and elsewhere that the project aims to increase capacity for HOVs. The text cited in Table S-1 refers to roadway capacity as it would affect or induce growth. As stated at the beginning of Chapter 2, under “Growth”:

The project would convert the existing HOV lane within the 12.1-mile project limits to accommodate both HOVs and toll-paying SOVs. The project would also introduce a second express lane between the Fallon Road/El Charro Road and North First Street interchanges, a distance of approximately 6 miles. During the express lane hours of operation, the additional capacity from the project would be limited to the 12.1-mile project corridor and restricted to HOVs and toll-paying SOVs. During other periods when the express lanes are open to all traffic, the only project-related change in capacity from the existing condition would be the new second lane between the Fallon Road/El Charro Road and North First Street interchanges (the other lane already exists as the HOV lane). The addition of one lane for approximately 6 miles of eastbound I-580 would not create substantial new capacity that could foster growth beyond that which is already planned.

The project would primarily increase roadway capacity through the addition of the second HOV/express lane from the Fallon Road/El Charro Road interchange to the North First Street interchange. The second HOV/express lane has been included because the Department’s traffic projections and the project’s traffic analyses show that by 2015, the existing single HOV lane will have segments with high density and impaired traffic flow during the PM peak hour (5 PM to 6 PM; Section 2.1.2.2).

Table S-1 states that operations in approximately half of all segments would improve compared to No Build, and the summary states the project is needed to address congestion in the I-580 corridor. The text cited in Table S-1 refers to traffic level of service conditions in the project horizon year of 2035, which are provided in Table 2.1.2-6. The apparent implication of the comment is that the project does not provide the intended congestion relief.

As noted in Table S-1, the Build Alternative would improve year 2035 levels of service in six of the 12 general purpose lane segments (Table 2.1.2-6). All general purpose lane and HOV/express lane segments within the project limits (beginning with the Hopyard Road/Dougherty Road to Hacienda Drive segment) would operate at acceptable levels of service. This would be an improvement over the No Build condition, in which two general purpose lane segments and three HOV/express lane segments would operate at unacceptable LOS E or F. West of the project limits, the project would also improve levels of service compared with No Build. Moreover, travel time through the study corridor would decrease by 4 minutes in the general purpose lanes and almost 10 minutes in the express lanes compared with the No Build condition (Table 2.1.2-7).

The information provided in Section 2.1.2 demonstrates that the Build Alternative would satisfy the project purpose of providing congestion relief.

6. The CEQA baseline for the project is discussed at the beginning of Chapter 2 of the IS/EA as well as in Section 2.1.2.1. The CEQA baseline varies somewhat among resource areas based on the availability of complete data at the times when the technical studies commenced.

As shown in Table 2.5.1-1, GHG emissions (modeled as carbon dioxide) would be lower in both 2015 and 2035, with or without the project, than the existing/baseline condition. Moreover, in 2035, the analysis results show that GHG emissions with the project would be nearly 35,000 tonnes per year lower than with the No Build condition. These findings are consistent with the goal of SB 375 to reduce GHG emissions.

The comment states that the IS/EA characterizes the strategies to reduce GHG emissions as speculative. The text cited in the comment (Section 2.5.1.2, under “CEQA Conclusion”) does not indicate that the emissions reduction strategies are speculative, but rather that “in the absence of further regulatory or scientific information related to GHG emissions and CEQA significance, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding the project’s direct impact and its contribution on the cumulative scale to climate change.” Section 2.5.1.3 describes a number of ongoing initiatives as well as specific project components intended to achieve GHG reductions. These initiatives and project components are expected to provide incremental improvements in GHG emissions. As shown in Table 2.5.1-2, some emissions reductions cannot be readily quantified, but that does not render all proposed measures speculative.

The comment does not specify how the GHG analysis is inadequate or why a more thorough and substantive environmental analysis of GHG emissions is required. The analysis described in Section 2.5.1.2 was performed in accordance with Department standards using EMFAC2011, the most current model for this type of analysis.

7. The results of the air quality studies are described in detail in Section 2.2.3 of the IS/EA. The results discussed in the IS/EA are the same as those in the air quality studies that will be given to FHWA. Appendix D includes the FHWA conformity determination issued for the project.

The copies of the IS/EA that were made available for public inspection at Caltrans District 4, Alameda CTC, and the Dublin, Livermore, and Pleasanton public libraries included CDs with copies of the air quality studies and other technical reports. In addition, copies of the air quality studies were available for public review if requested from Caltrans.

8. The comment states that more substantive information is needed to identify and mitigate potential environmental justice (EJ) impacts, and that the discussion of EJ in Chapter 2 ignores the traveling public who use the I-580 corridor. Additional information about EJ communities in the region that may use the I-580 corridor is provided below to augment the EJ information in Chapter 2. The following information does not constitute significant new information about a substantial adverse environmental effect or feasible mitigation.

Environmental Justice Communities

Minority persons are defined by the 2010 U.S. Census as all individuals not identified as “White only,” including those identified as Hispanic or Latino. Low-income persons were defined as those individuals with household incomes below the Census poverty threshold,

which is a ratio of income to poverty level in the past 12 months that is below 1.0.²⁰ EJ communities are traditionally defined as a Census block group population that meets either or both of the following criteria:

- The Census block group contains 50 percent or more minority persons, and/or the block group contains 25 percent or more low-income persons.
- The percentage of minority and/or low-income persons in any Census block group is substantially (e.g., more than 10 percentage points) greater than the average of the surrounding region (e.g., the counties overlapping the study area).

Based on the 2010 Census and 2012 American Community Survey, the percentage of the population that is a minority in Alameda County and in San Joaquin County (immediately to the east) exceeds 50 percent (65.9 percent and 64.1 percent, respectively). Therefore, these counties can be assumed to be EJ communities for minority populations.

The percentages of low-income persons in Alameda County and San Joaquin County are 12.0 percent and 17.5 percent, respectively. These percentages are both below 25 percent, so the counties would not be considered EJ communities for low-income populations. However, it is reasonable to assume that areas of these counties contain Census block groups that would satisfy the second bulleted criteria listed above, even though none of the Census block groups along the project corridor fall into this category.

Environmental Justice Implications of the Project

Construction is planned in the existing State right-of-way. Minor construction impacts from the project would include noise, dust, and visual effects from installation of signs, toll structures, lighting, and utility equipment. During construction, temporary lane closures could be required, but full highway closures are not expected to be necessary. In the segment of I-580 between Fallon Road/El Charro Road and the North First Street, a second express lane would be added in the median. As construction would occur primarily in the median and potential impacts would be minimal and temporary, construction impacts are not expected to adversely affect adjacent and surrounding communities, or EJ communities traveling through the project corridor.

Once in operation, the express lanes would result in minor changes to the visual setting, air quality, and noise levels, which are evaluated in detail in Sections 2.1.3, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4, respectively. In general, those impacts would affect all communities along the project corridor at similar levels, as well as all those traveling through the project corridor.

Use of the express lanes requires the ability to obtain a FasTrak toll tag, as described in Section 1.3.1.3. With the number of options available, persons of all income levels would have similar access to a FasTrak account. The initial cost to establish an account is less when paid with a credit card than with cash or check (\$25 versus \$70, although \$20 of the \$70 is refunded when the account is closed). The higher initial cost for cash or check

²⁰ The Census assigns each person or family one of 48 possible poverty thresholds, which vary according to the size of the family and the age of the members. The 2010 weighted average threshold for a family of four is \$22,314. The 2010 Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines for a family of four is similar, at \$22,050; the 2013 guideline is \$23,550.

accounts could be considered an additional economic burden to those who do not pay by credit card, a portion of whom could be low-income or minority persons. However, as the choice to use the express lanes (and establish the necessary FasTrak account) is voluntary, the higher initial costs for cash or check accounts do not constitute a disproportionately high and adverse effect to EJ communities.

Use of the express lanes also requires the ability to pay tolls, which will vary based on traffic conditions. The issue of equity or fairness in charging tolls and whether this practice has a disproportionately high and adverse effect on any minority or low-income populations has been studied by the FHWA, MTC, and county congestion management agencies throughout the State. More than 10 years of data are available in California for express lanes in Southern California, where FasTrak is also used. Both high- and low-income drivers use express lanes during periods of traffic congestion. A study of the SR 91 Express Lanes in Orange County found that roughly one-quarter of the motorists who elect to use the toll lanes at any given time are in the high-income bracket, but the majority are low- and middle-income motorists (FHWA 2013). In San Diego, 80 percent of the lowest-income motorists using the I-15 corridor agreed that people who drive alone should be able to use the I-15 express lanes for a fee (FHWA 2013).

Factors other than income alone appear to influence drivers' decisions to use express lanes. On SR 91 in Orange County, most drivers use the express lanes infrequently but strategically, when they stand to benefit most (Weinstein and Sciara 2004). When toll prices in the SR 91 express lanes increased, people in the lowest income group did not reduce their travel, but people of moderate income did. This suggests that people with lower incomes have less travel time flexibility than higher-income drivers and/or that low-income drivers place a very high value on reliable travel times (FHWA 2013). Reliable travel times may particularly benefit low-income drivers in situations where being late due to traffic congestion has high economic or convenience costs, such as being late to work or to pick up a child at a day care facility.

Although express lane tolls would represent a different economic choice to low-income drivers versus middle- and high-income drivers, the choice does not represent a disproportionate burden because express lane use is voluntary. Drivers may either choose to pay a toll when being late is costly or inconvenient or continue to use the general purpose lanes. Drivers are not denied a mobility option they previously had; rather, the option of paying a toll to obtain travel time savings would be available to drivers of all income groups. Unlike sales taxes for transportation measures, express lane tolls do not affect non-users and non-drivers.

The proposed project would have other potential benefits to drivers of all income levels. By converting the HOV lanes to express lanes and adding a second express lane to part of the corridor, traffic in the general purpose lanes would improve, directly benefiting all drivers in those lanes (Section 2.1.2). As required by the authorizing legislation (AB 2032 and AB 574), tolls collected from the express lanes would be used for other transportation and transit improvements in the project corridor, providing direct benefits to both drivers and transit customers whose trips include I-580. These improvements would benefit all users of the local transportation and public transit system, regardless of race and income, even those who do not use the express lanes.

Based on the above discussion and analysis, the Build Alternative will not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation is needed.

9. As noted in Section 2.2.4.4, the noise analysis identified 12 new or modified sound walls that would meet the “feasible” standard, meaning that they would provide a 7 dBA noise reduction for one or more location. None of the walls were found to provide noise reduction for a sufficient number of residences or other noise-sensitive receptors to meet the “reasonable” standard (construction cost is near or less than the cost per benefited receptor, with an allowance of \$55,000 per benefited receptor).

None of the Census block groups near the evaluated sound wall locations would meet the definition of EJ communities for low income, based on the criteria described above in the Response to Comment 5. Of these Census block groups, two of 12 have populations that are more than 50 percent minority, but none have minority populations that are more 10 percentage points greater than Alameda County.

It should be noted that for purposes of determining whether sound walls are feasible and reasonable, receptors are counted the same way regardless of socioeconomic considerations. In addition, as discussed in Section 2.2.4.5, the project would result in traffic noise level increases of 0 to 2 dBA, which is considered to be barely perceptible to the human ear. Therefore, project-related noise will not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations.

10. The Department and Alameda CTC are working closely with MTC on its ongoing analysis work regarding income equity of express lanes. Environmental justice is not included in the Environmental Commitment Record (now in Appendix F) because the proposed project would have no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations; therefore, no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation is needed. However, all considerations under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes have been included in this project, and the Department’s commitment to upholding the mandates of Title VI is demonstrated by its Title VI Policy Statement, signed by the Director, which can be found in Appendix E of the IS/EA.
11. The comment about the Caltrans District 4 environmental documents website is noted.

Comment: Jing Firmeza

Subject:	FW: Meeting 1/22 re HOV lane on 580
<p>Name – Jing Firmeza Affiliation – Dublin Resident Address 7749 Crossridge Rd. Dublin, CA 94568 Email – jaef0730@yahoo.com</p>	
1	<p>This project will not fix I580 congestion. It will add more congestion to already more congested freeway. Expressway will end at Greenville. If the Altamont Pass is congested, express lane motorist will veer to the right and exit at Greenville to take Patterson Pass (side street along I580). Lane changing and local traffic is the primary culprit in this stretch of the freeway. Motorist from the farthest most left lane of the Express lane will change lane to the farthest right lane to exit Greenville. If you restrict it for cars to exit Greenville, you will find rampant violators that will cause accidents. At the workshop last night, I interviewed a URS consultant. </p>
2	<p>The original proposal was scrubbed by some local politicians (18 mil funding from local funds). That proposal was a big winner. It was exactly my idea of the project. I like express lanes except that lane must be dedicated, no lane changes allowed and will begin from Hacienda and end at the top of Altamont Pass (beginning of downhill grade). This lane will eliminate a lot of Central Valley commuters who are the major commuters in rush hour gridlock. Even with the status quo lanes and no additions to current lanes, this idea is a sure winner. I estimate about 65% of gridlock commuters are Central Valley motorist. Just look at the sheer number of cars coming down Altamont in the morning commute. If you eliminate even just 50% out of the 65% commuters the other remaining lanes for trucks and local traffic will keep the traffic going.</p> <p>The original URS proposal is the sure winner except some or all local politicians in Livermore, Pleasanton and Dublin don't want to take the risk of failing with a sure winner idea. They want to keep their local residents happy. Guess what, if this project goes through it will double the delay in this stretch of the freeway. That is for sure. Taking out the option to go to Patterson Pass will even exacerbate the problem. No one will use the express lane and use the other lanes to have the option to go to Patterson Pass. The non express lanes will be clogged up. You also need to limit trucks to the farthest right lane only during commute hours from Hacienda to the Truck weigh checkpoint.</p>

Responses to Comment: Jing Firmeza

1. Traffic conditions with and without the project for the opening year (2015) and horizon year (2035) were analyzed in accordance with Department and Federal Highway Administration standards. As described in Section 2.1.2, the analysis found that the project would reduce overall congestion in the I-580 eastbound corridor compared with the No Project condition.

In particular, the traffic analysis indicates that the project would not degrade traffic conditions either approaching the end of the express lane west of Greenville Road or to the east of Greenville Road. In the PM peak hour in 2015 and 2035, eastbound I-580 from Vasco Road to Greenville Road would operate at acceptable LOS B and C in the HOV/express lane and general purpose lanes with both the Build and No Build scenarios (Tables 2.1.2-3 and 2.1.2-6). Eastbound I-580 to the east of Greenville Road would operate at LOS B in 2015 and LOS C in 2035, with both the Build and No Build scenarios (Tables 2.1.2-3 and 2.1.2-6). LOS B and C represent free-flowing conditions that would not be expected to cause drivers to divert to Patterson Pass Road or other alternative surface streets to avoid traffic congestion.

The express lane would end in generally the same place as the HOV lane that has been in operation since October 2009 and would include features to increase safety such as additional signage and CHP enforcement. Therefore, the end of the express lane would not be expected to increase accident rates.

2. The commenter expressed a preference for an express lane access configuration that does not allow for lane changes. As the commenter is likely aware, HOV lane and express lane projects throughout the Bay Area, California, and the U.S. vary in their access configurations, with some using barriers or striped buffers to limit lane changes. The specific circumstances of the proposed I-580 eastbound express lanes—including roadway geometry and availability of space—led the Department and Alameda CTC to choose continuous access. The proposed configuration is generally consistent with the current HOV lane striping as well as with the “open access” striping already in use on the southbound I-680 express lane in the Sunol Grade area and several other express lanes in the Bay Area proposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

The comments about extending the express lane to the east of Greenville Road to the top of the Altamont Pass and limiting trucks to the farthest right lane only during commute hours are noted. The limits of the proposed project are at Greenville Road, and funds are not available to extend the express lane past the limits of the existing HOV lane.

Comment: Katherine Stathis

From: Stathis Katherine [<mailto:kathystathis@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, January 19, 2014 12:47 PM
To: Shearer, Valerie@DOT
Subject: Meeting 1/22 re HOV lane on 580

We are unable to attend the January 22 meeting, so we're sending these comments:

1 **We are NOT in favor of converting the 580 HOV lane to an express lane.**

Reason #1: this would discourage people who are now carpooling; they have nothing to gain and would have to pay for something that is now free.

2 **Reason #2: we are familiar with the express lane on 680 in Fremont, and we have consistently noticed it is sparsely used.**

3 **Reason #3: keeping the HOV lane encourages commuters to carpool, and this is a very important consideration for the environment.**

This change is not a good idea.

Responses to Comment: Katherine Stathis

1. The commenter's preference for the No Build Alternative is noted.

Carpools and other HOVs would continue to use the express lanes for free. This is an essential feature of the express lane concept. Electronic sensors in the roadway will continually monitor traffic in the express lanes, and as described in Section 1.3.1.2, tolls will be adjusted on a real-time basis to keep traffic flowing smoothly (45 mph or higher). If the lanes become congested, tolls will be increased to deter solo drivers from entering the lanes, or the toll signs will be changed to read "HOVs only" and only HOVs will be allowed in the lanes. Regardless of the level of congestion, HOV drivers will always be able to use the express lanes for free.

In addition, the project would increase capacity for HOVs by adding a second express lane on eastbound I-580 from the Fallon Road/El Charro Road interchange to the North First Street interchange.

2. The comment about the I-680 southbound express lane in Fremont is noted. Despite the commenter's observation, over one million solo drivers have paid tolls to use the lane since it opened in September 2010. In addition, the I-680 express lane and other proposed express lanes in the Bay Area are intended to provide both short-term and long-term congestion relief, to accommodate planned regional growth in housing and jobs over the next 20 years or more. Use is expected to increase in the future as congestion increases from that planned regional growth, as described in Section 1.2.2.1.
3. The Department and Alameda CTC agree that carpooling and other forms of HOV use are an important consideration for the environment. HOV use will continue. As demonstrated in the IS/EA, the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project would improve traffic in both the HOV/express and general purpose lanes, which is expected reduce vehicle emissions from idling and other environmental effects related to congestion.

Comment: Robert Allen (1 of 3)



I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project Public Information Meeting

January 22, 2014

COMMENT FORM

Name: Robert S Allen Date: 22 Jan 2014

Affiliation (if applicable): BART Director, District 5, (1974-1988)

Address: 223 Donner Avenue, Livermore, CA 94551-0250

E-mail: robertseeallen@gmail.com (925) 449-1387

1 **Comment/Question:** ⁽¹⁾ Plan an eastbound ramp down from Hacienda Drive to the HOV lane alongside the BART rail tracks. This would let buses from the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station go via Owens Drive and Hacienda Drive enter the freeway HOV lane without merging through the traffic on eastbound I-580. Much safer.

⁽²⁾ Plan a direct exit lane from westbound I-580 HOV for buses into the Dublin/Pleasanton station. Take advantage of the wide shoulder on westbound I-580 westbound into the busway under I-580.

(over)

Please continue on back if necessary.

Need a little more time? You can also e-mail your comment to valerie_shearer@dot.ca.gov or mail it to: Department of Transportation, District 4 Attn: Valerie Shearer, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660 by February 5, 2014.

- (continued) -

1,
cont.

3) Note Section 2. (3). Assure that Plan Lines are adequate along I-580 to include BART and HOV lanes as well as the freeway.
(See attached initiative petition)

2

Hopefully there will be enough right of way protected to allow for two very-heavy-duty truck lanes along both eastbound and westbound I-580 just outside the existing truck lanes. This would allow shifting other traffic to the right and free space for BART at grade in the I-580 median. East of Greenville Road future BART could pass under Westbound I-580 and ascend into the former SP Congressional Grant 400-foot right of way and to a joint station with ACE.

3

I look for BART ultimately to go over the Altamont generally along the former SP to a station near I-580/Greenville Road -- still in Alameda County. Massive parking there would serve Central Valley commuters well ^{enough} via I-205 and I-580. Charges for parking could be high enough to pay much of the cost. Of course it would crowd BART trains; ~~it~~ probably BART would need to add direct service from the L line to the R line to handle the added patronage.

Thank you for your participation.

Need a little more time? You can also e-mail your comment to valerie_shearer@dot.ca.gov or mail it to: Department of Transportation, District 4 Attn: Valerie Shearer, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660 by February 5, 2014.

This initiative petition qualified with over 8400 valid Livermore signatures for the November 2011 Municipal Ballot and was adopted by the Livermore City Council instead of going on the Initiative Measure To Be Submitted Directly To The Voters ballot.

The City Attorney has prepared the following ballot title and summary of the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure:

TITLE: Initiative Measure to Amend Livermore's General Plan to Adopt an Objective that the City Advocate for a BART Extension on I-580 to an Isabel Station.

SUMMARY OF CHIEF PURPOSE AND POINTS OF PROPOSED MEASURE:

Livermore's General Plan contains Objectives, Actions, and Goals to implement that Plan. In short, the General Plan is organized so that Policies and Actions support Goals, which in turn further the Elements of the overall General Plan. Thus, in the General Plan's Circulation Element, the Objectives, Actions, and Goals describe how Livermore proposes to use its land use policies to balance the movement of people and goods in the City with existing and future development. One Goal furthering the Circulation Element is to promote alternative transportation, with the related Objective to provide alternatives to single occupancy vehicles.

Likewise, actions that support the Objectives and Goals of the Circulation Element now include: preserving a right-of-way adjacent to I-580 for BART; advocating for a BART extension along I-580 to Greenville Road; and establishing plan lines along I-580 to support regional transportation, including BART.

This Initiative does not amend or delete those existing provisions. Instead, it expressly affirms support for them in the General Plan. However, the Initiative *would* amend the General Plan by adding a new Action Item to the Goal of providing alternatives to single-occupancy vehicular travel. That new Action item would be that the City should advocate a preference for a BART extension along I-580 to a station at Isabel, with a later extension to a Greenville/I-580 station.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO CIRCULATE PETITION

Notice is hereby given by the persons whose names appear hereon of their intention to circulate an Initiative Petition within the City of Livermore for the purpose of amending the General Plan to more fully reflect the community's desire that any future BART Extension to Livermore shall be on or adjacent to the I-580 freeway with stations at Isabel Avenue/I-580 and Greenville Road/I-580. A statement of reasons for the proposed action contemplated in the Petition is as follows:

Livermore residents have long desired to maintain our small-town character, and, for many years, have anticipated the eventual extension of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District's (BART) rail line to Livermore. Various studies and public meetings have affirmed Livermore residents' desire to route this extension in the median of, or adjacent to, the I-580 freeway. BART has purchased the necessary land for stations at Isabel Avenue/I-580 and Greenville Road/I-580. The General Plan of the City of Livermore (adopted February 2004) contains several references affirming the City's desire for a freeway alignment, and supporting a transit-oriented development (TOD) at the Greenville station location. Studies conducted recently as part of a Program Environmental Impact Report undertaken by the BART District showed that this freeway alignment was the shortest route, had nearly the most ridership, and cost much less.

In May 2010 the Livermore City Council ignored the City's General Plan by supporting a non-freeway route that would go underground along Portola and Junction Avenues to a station at the edge of Downtown Livermore and then continue at grade beside the Union Pacific Railroad to a station at Vasco Road. The Livermore City Council's action was taken despite the significant additional cost (over three times more expensive than a one-station freeway alternative), traffic congestion on Livermore streets, and disruption created by this choice with many homes and businesses required to be demolished, and numerous other homes adversely affected by the noise and vibration of a BART rail line. This Downtown alignment requires significant amounts of dense urban development and substantial parking in Downtown Livermore, thereby changing the City's small-town character.

Accordingly, this initiative seeks to strengthen and enhance language in the General Plan to make it unequivocally clear that the citizens of Livermore want any BART rail extension to Livermore to be on or adjacent to the I-580 freeway with a first stage station at Isabel Avenue/I-580 and eventual extension to a station at Greenville Road/I-580. This alignment would be the least disruptive to existing and future Livermore residents and would most effectively meet their needs. Our initiative would also establish that a vote of Livermore residents would be required to amend the provisions of this initiative. Please join us in supporting this Initiative.

Signed By: Robert S. Allen Peggy M. McLain Linda Jeffery Sailors January 20, 2011

We, the People of the City of Livermore, do hereby find, determine, resolve, and ordain as follows:

Section 1. Purpose and Intent.

The citizens of Livermore have a longstanding interest in a BART rail extension to Livermore along the I-580 freeway. Numerous studies have validated that desire, which is reflected in the City of Livermore's current General Plan.

In response to a recent (completed in 2010) Program Environmental Impact Report* (PEIR) conducted by the BART District, more than three-quarters of the hundreds of people who made written comments on the draft PEIR were opposed to any Downtown alignment and supportive of maintaining a BART extension along I-580. The Livermore City Council ignored its own General Plan by supporting a Downtown alignment. It is the intent of this Initiative to make it clear that the citizens of Livermore desire that any future BART extension shall be along the I-580 freeway.

*BART To Livermore Program EIR

Section 2. General Plan Amendment.

We the People of the City of Livermore, do hereby amend the City of Livermore General Plan, as set forth in this Section 2. This Initiative neither amends nor deletes existing General Plan text by implication; our amendment is made expressly by the following method: when new text is added to the Livermore General Plan by this Initiative, that new text is shown as underscored (new text). Additionally, amendments to the Livermore General Plan effected by this Initiative are cited by Element, and then the particular Exhibits, Figures, Objectives, Goals, Policies and/or Actions that are being added or revised, and the approximate page in the existing Livermore General Plan where text before revision resides. Inaccuracies in citation shall not nullify the amendment effected by this Initiative.

The following amendment is hereby made to the Livermore General Plan:

- (1) Circulation Element, Goal CIR-3, Objective CIR-3.1 at page 5-21, is hereby amended to add new Action item 8 as follows:
A8. Advocate for a first-stage extension of BART along the I-580 freeway to a station at Isabel Avenue/I-580 with an eventual extension to a station at Greenville Road/I-580 as the City's preference.

Additionally, We, the People of the City of Livermore, do hereby affirm our support for the following items in the Livermore General Plan.

- (1) Circulation Element, Goal CIR-3, Objective CIR-3.1 Action 3 at page 5-21.
 A3. Advocate the extension of BART to Greenville Road in the I-580 median as the City's preference.
- (2) Circulation Element, Goal CIR-3, Objective CIR-3.1, Action 5 at page 5-21.
 A5. Preserve right-of-way adjacent to I-580 to allow widening for HOV lanes, auxiliary lanes, and BART.
- (3) Circulation Element, Goal CIR-7, Objective CIR-7.1, Policy 4 at page 5-29.
 P4. Establish Plan Lines that identify the right-of-way along I-580 freeway to support regional transportation improvements, including Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extensions and high

occupancy vehicle lanes. Infrastructure improvements (e.g. frontage road and utility relocations) necessary solely for the I-580 regional transportation improvements will be the responsibility of the implementing agency. Such improvements will be coordinated with adjacent development (Reso.2008-232)

Section 3. Implementation.

No part of this Initiative may be amended or repealed except by a subsequent majority vote of the electors of the City of Livermore unless expressly allowed otherwise by this Initiative.

Section 4. Miscellaneous.

- (a) This Initiative shall be liberally construed to effectuate its purposes, which make explicit the community's support for any future extension of BART rail to be routed along the I-580 freeway.
- (b) This Initiative shall be interpreted so as to be consistent with all federal and state laws, rules and regulations. We, the drafters of this Initiative have endeavored to be consistent with the Livermore General Plan. The People of the City of Livermore therefore find that the General Plan amendments adopted through this Initiative do not themselves create any internal inconsistencies within the General Plan (as amended by this Initiative).
- (c) If any portion of this Initiative is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, then that portion shall be considered severed from this Initiative and the remaining portions of this Initiative shall remain in legal force and effect. We, the People of the City of Livermore, declare that we would have adopted this Initiative, and each portion of it, irrespective of the fact that any other portion or application to a situation, be held invalid.
- (d) If any portion of this Initiative is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, We the People indicate our strong desire that: (1) the City Council shall use its best efforts to sustain and reenact that portion; and (2) the City Council shall implement this Initiative by taking all steps possible to cure any inadequacies or deficiencies identified by the court in a manner consistent with the express and implied intent of this Initiative, and then adopting or reenacting such portion as necessary or desirable to be consistent with the intent of the voters of Livermore in passing this Initiative.
- (e) If any other General Plan Amendments contrary to the Intent of this Initiative are adopted by the Livermore City Council between the date of submittal to the City of the Notice of Intent to Circulate this Initiative and the date on which it is voted on by the Livermore electorate, these Amendment(s) shall, upon passage of this Initiative, be declared Null and Void.
- (f) This Initiative shall be considered as adopted and effective upon the earliest date legally possible after the vote on the Initiative by the voters of the City of Livermore is certified to the City by the Elections Official. Any action or proceeding challenging all or any part of this Initiative shall be commenced, and service made on the City, pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 65009.

Initiative Measure To Be Submitted Directly To The Voters

The City Attorney has prepared the following ballot title and summary of the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure:

TITLE: Initiative Measure to Amend Livermore's General Plan to Adopt an Objective that the City Advocate for a BART Extension on I-580 to an Isabel Station.

SUMMARY OF CHIEF PURPOSE AND POINTS OF PROPOSED MEASURE:

Livermore's General Plan contains Objectives, Actions, and Goals to implement that Plan. In short, the General Plan is organized so that Policies and Actions support Goals, which in turn further the Elements of the overall General Plan. Thus, in the General Plan's Circulation Element, the Objectives, Actions, and Goals describe how Livermore proposes to use its land use policies to balance the movement of people and goods in the City with existing and future development. One Goal furthering the Circulation Element is to promote alternative transportation, with the related Objective to provide alternatives to single occupancy vehicles.

Likewise, actions that support the Objectives and Goals of the Circulation Element now include: preserving a right-of-way adjacent to I-580 for BART; advocating for a BART extension along I-580 to Greenville Road; and establishing plan lines along I-580 to support regional transportation, including BART.

This Initiative does not amend or delete those existing provisions. Instead, it expressly affirms support for them in the General Plan. However, the Initiative *would* amend the General Plan by adding a new Action item to the Goal of providing alternatives to single-occupancy vehicular travel. That new Action item would be that the City should advocate a preference for a BART extension along I-580 to a station at Isabel, with a later extension to a Greenville/I-580 station.

CITY OF LIVERMORE REGISTERED VOTERS ONLY	NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: THIS PETITION MAY BE CIRCULATED BY A PAID SIGNATURE GATHERER OR A VOLUNTEER. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO ASK. THE USE OF YOUR SIGNATURE FOR ANY PURPOSE OTHER THAN QUALIFICATION OF THIS MEASURE FOR THE BALLOT IS A MISDEMEANOR. COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE MIS-USE OF YOUR SIGNATURE MAY BE MADE TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE.		THIS COLUMN FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
1.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
2.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
3.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
4.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
5.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
6.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
7.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
8.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
9.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
10.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
11.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	
12.	(Print Name) (Signature—as registered to vote)	(Residence Address ONLY—Street and Number—as registered) (City)	

Declaration of Circulator
(To be completed in the circulator's own hand after above signatures have been obtained)

I am a voter or I am qualified to register as a voter of the City of Livermore. I circulated this petition and witnessed each of the appended signatures being written. Each signature on this petition is, to the best of my information and belief, the genuine signature of the person whose name it purports to be.

All signatures to this document were obtained between _____/_____/_____, and _____/_____/_____,
month day year month day year

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this entire declaration is true and correct.

Executed at _____, CA on _____/_____/_____. Signed: _____
(city where signed) month day year (complete signature of circulator: first, middle name or initial, last)

(printed name) (residence address only) (city)

Responses to Comment: Robert Allen (1 of 3)

1. A dedicated HOV eastbound on-ramp from Hacienda Drive and westbound off-ramp to the Dublin-Pleasanton BART station would have the benefits described in the comment. Additional ramps are not within the scope of the proposed project but can be considered in future transportation planning.

The I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project has been designed to expand HOV capacity and provide additional congestion relief within the existing right-of-way. The project would not preclude the proposed future extension of BART to Livermore or east of the Altamont Pass. The petition provided as part of the comment is noted.

At present, without the project, the current space in the median of I-580 would not be sufficient to accommodate an eastward extension of BART. The freeway interchanges east of the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station would have to be reconstructed to accommodate the BART trackway and other facilities. The lanes and shoulders of I-580 would also have to be pushed outward (away from the median), and additional land (right-of-way) would have to be purchased along the BART extension to accommodate the changes.

2. Dedicated lanes for heavy-duty trucks would also require additional right-of-way for the same reasons described above. However, the project would not preclude future consideration of truck lanes or other enhancements on I-580.
3. The commenter's support for extending BART over the Altamont Pass is noted.

Comment: Robert Allen (2 of 3)



I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project Public Information Meeting

January 22, 2014

COMMENT FORM

Name: Robert S. Allen Date: 22 January 2014

Affiliation (if applicable): BART Director, District 5, 1974-1988

Address: 223 Pioneer Avenue, Livermore, CA 94551-0240

E-mail: robertsallen@gmail.com (925)444-1387

Comment/Question: _____

1 [Get BART to add bus stops along the ^{westerly} ~~east~~ side of the busway going south under I-580 in front of the Dublin/Pleasanton station entrances. Close to the station, ^{cut} ~~the~~ pedestrian traffic across roadways. Tie in with my other suggestions for avoiding bus merging across traffic lanes on I-580 to enter/exit the HOV lanes east of the station

Please continue on back if necessary.

Need a little more time? You can also e-mail your comment to valerie_shearer@dot.ca.gov or mail it to: Department of Transportation, District 4 Attn: Valerie Shearer, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660 by February 5, 2014.

Responses to Comment: Robert Allen (2 of 3)

1. The recommendation about bus stop locations at the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station is noted. The project would not preclude the implementation of these recommendations by BART.

Comment: Robert Allen (3 of 3)



I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project Public Information Meeting

January 22, 2014

COMMENT FORM

Name: Robert S Allen Date: 22 Jan 2014

Affiliation (if applicable): BART Director, District 5, (1974-1988)

Address: 223 Donner Avenue, Livermore, CA 94551-1240

E-mail: robert.s.allen@gmail.com

Comment/Question: Why scrounge for money?

1 [Half a century ago three counties voted bonds that brought us BART. Let's plan a five-county agency and let the voters decide on BART around the Bay, to the Golden Gate and Conquistador Bridges, to Brentwood, and to Livermore and over the Altamonts. I realize this is beyond the scope of this one project, but it is something our Bay Area should bring to pass.

Please continue on back if necessary.

Need a little more time? You can also e-mail your comment to valerie_shearer@dot.ca.gov or mail it to: Department of Transportation, District 4 Attn: Valerie Shearer, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660 by February 5, 2014.

Responses to Comment: Robert Allen (3 of 3)

1. The comment recommends formation of a five-county agency to facilitate regional ballot initiatives for BART extensions. At present, representatives from the Alameda CTC and other county congestion management agencies work together as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to plan, coordinate, and finance transportation and transit projects for the nine-county Bay Area. Tax measures such as Alameda County Measure B in 2000 have been and will continue to be developed to allow voters to decide on BART extensions and other transportation improvements.