



Community Dialogues – BART to Livermore Workshop 1 of 3

The Shrine Event Center | 170 Lindbergh Avenue, Livermore
Thursday, November 12, 2009 | 6:30 pm – 9:30 pm

MEETING SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

On November 12, 2009, the City of Livermore hosted the first of a three part series of community dialogues to discuss Station Area Planning for BART stations proposed in Livermore. The purpose of the meeting was:

- To educate participants about the components of BART Station Area Planning, including: BART alignments, system imperatives, station place types and sites, as well as transit area transportation, economics, and placemaking.
- To facilitate discussion and collect input about participants' priorities related to BART station place types.
- To get community input regarding the important qualities and features for proposed BART station types in Livermore.

Background

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

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

Meeting Agenda and Format

Mayor Marshall Kamena and Vice Mayor Doug Horner of the City of Livermore provided opening remarks and shared their enthusiasm about BART coming to Livermore. Mayor Kamena then introduced Gregory Tung of Freedman Tung & Sasaki of the project

consulting team. Mr. Tung described the team's approach to station area planning and introduced the informational presentations that would be shared with the group. He was followed by Bonnie Nelson of Nelson/Nygaard and Abby Thorne-Lyman of Strategic Economics. Joan Chaplick of MIG, Inc. served as the meeting facilitator. Additional elected officials in attendance included BART Director John McPartland, Council Member John Marchard, Council Member Marj Leider, and Council Member Jeff Williams. Also in attendance from the City of Livermore project team were Linda Barton, Steve Sweeney, Marc Roberts, Cheri Sheets, Susan Frost, Bob Vinn, and Debbie Bell. Other project team members in attendance included Erik Calloway of Freedman Tung & Sasaki, Malcolm Quinn and of BART, and Beth Walukas of Alameda County Congestion Management Agency. An additional 20 city staff members attended to provide facilitation and recording assistance for the small group discussions.

Mr. Tung reviewed the project purpose and history, as well as the workshop schedule and BART EIR process. Afterwards, Mr. Tung, Ms. Nelson, and Ms. Thorne-Lyman gave a comprehensive presentation on the project's background, transit area transportation, economics, and placemaking. The presentations provided detailed information which is not summarized in this report. The power point presentation and other meeting materials can be found on the website at:

http://www.ci.livermore.ca.us/eng/BART_docs/BARTworkshops.html#1

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

II. GROUP DISCUSSION

After a brief break, Ms. Chaplick provided instructions for the group to start the discussion portion of the meeting. Participants were first encouraged to complete an individual worksheet that asked them to make choices regarding specific features for three distinct station types. The choices were framed as "trade-offs" with participants being asked to identify their highest priorities and lowest priorities within a pairing of features. Once completed, they were asked to discuss these results as a group at their table. A staff facilitator and recorder helped keep the discussion on track and record the group results on a worksheet. Members of the consulting team were available to answer questions during the discussion period.

A total of thirteen small groups, with 8-10 participants each, completed this exercise. A sampling of five groups shared their findings with many speakers commenting on the similarities between their group's discussions and what had been reported out.

The following is a summary of groups' comments from this discussion. While groups were asked to identify their two highest and two lowest priorities for each station type, some groups provided a variety of responses to indicate the priorities agreed upon. We have quantified the results as much as possible. The number of groups who agreed on a specific priority is identified in parentheses. Written comment cards received at the Community Workshop are attached as an Appendix to this summary.

Station Type #1. Downtown Station

Highest Priorities

- Context (12 tables)
 - Underground (2 of 12 tables)
 - Compatible with Downtown Plan (1 of 12)
- Pairing (8 tables)
 - Pairing with freeway intercept (2 of 6 tables)
 - Needs to be paired for maximum community/regional benefit (1 of 6)
- Bike, Pedestrian, Bus, ACE Development Arrival Mode (4 tables)
 - Walkability (1 of 4 tables)
- Parking (1)
- Station Area Development (1)
- Noise control (1)

Lowest Priorities

- Parking (7 tables)
 - Parking with the stipulation that there is a freeway parking station (1 of 6 tables)
- Auto Dominant (6 tables)
- Stand Alone (3 tables)
- Bike, Pedestrian, Bus, ACE Development Arrival Mode (1 table)
- Accommodating freeway commuters (1 table)

Station Type #2. Freeway Intercept Station

Highest Priorities

- Parking (12 tables)
 - Maximum parking (7 of 12 tables)
 - Livermore resident-only parking (1 of 12)
- Pairing (6 tables)
 - Pairing with College (1 of 6 tables)
 - Pairing with Greenville/Vasco (1 of 6 tables)
- Auto Dominant (4 tables)
- Location at College (1 table)
- Context (1 table)

- Arrival mode – no preference type (1 table)

Lowest Priorities

- Context (8 tables)
- Pairing (4 tables)
- Bike, Pedestrian, Bus, ACE Development Arrival Mode (2 tables)
- Station area development (1 table)
- Stand alone (1 table)

Station Type #3. Infill Station Highest Priorities

Highest Priorities

- Pairing (5 tables)
 - Paired with freeway intercept (1 of 5 tables)
- Station Area Development (5 tables)
 - Access to jobs – potential development of transit-oriented development (1 of 5 tables)
 - Local population – jobs (1 of 5 tables)
- Location (3 tables)
 - Location at Vasco (2 of 3 tables)
 - Not Isabel Stanley (1 of 3 tables)
- Context (3 tables)
 - Balance between development and parking (1 of 3 tables)
- Parking (3 tables)
 - Balance between development and parking (1 of 3 tables)
 - Maximum parking (1 of 3 tables)
- Auto Dominant (2 tables)
 - Local auto component (1 table)
- Bike, Pedestrian, Bus, ACE Development Arrival Mode (2 tables)
- Arrival mode (1 table)
 - Balance all types
- Rider Access (1 table)
- Congestion (1 table)

Lowest Priorities

- Stand Alone (5 tables)
- Context (3 tables)
- Parking (2 tables)
 - Lots of parking (2 tables)
- Bike, Pedestrian, Bus, ACE Development Arrival Mode (1 table)
- Accommodating freeway commuters (1 table)

Greatest Benefits

- Convenience for Livermore residents and employees (15 tables)
 - Reduces trips to Pleasanton/Dublin
 - Enables easier travel and commute
 - Serves multi-family residential development
 - Promotes mobility and access to the Bay Area and San Francisco
 - Provides conduit for employees
 - Vasco Station option serves eastern commercial area
- Increased transit opportunities (13 tables)
 - Increases ridership
 - Provides transportation opportunities
- Economic development (10 tables)
 - Encourage business
 - Attract regional pedestrian traffic
 - Builds jobs and entertainment options
 - Enables the vitality of the College, Downtown, and regional theater
 - Benefits downtown and local businesses
 - Supports local population and jobs
 - Promotes tourism
 - Brings people to Livermore
- Smart Growth and Transit-oriented Development (8 tables)
 - Supports residential and commercial development
 - Supports redevelopment
 - Improved infrastructure with new parking, enhanced circulation and accessibility to Downtown Livermore
- Air Quality and Congestion (5 tables)
 - Reduces vehicle trips
 - Enhances air quality
 - Lessen traffic on 580
 - Helps keep cars out

- Decreases auto congestion
- Lessens freeway traffic
- Better parking

Biggest Concerns

- Context and aesthetics (7 tables)
 - Underground station
 - Lack of compatibility with community
 - Stand alone station
 - Visual impacts of aerial structures
 - Build it right
 - Needs to be contextualized
- Noise (7 tables)
- Crime and security (7 tables)
 - Changing crime patterns
 - Increases security costs
 - Increased security requirements
- Infill Station concerns (5 tables)
 - Impacts local autos component
 - Infill Station - Lack of raison d'être - reason to be
- Impact on urban development and existing residents (5 tables)
 - Overdevelopment - urban sprawl
 - Eminent domain issues
- Stanley/Isabel Station concerns (3 tables)
 - Is not a preferred for Infill Station
 - Isabel/580 station serves same population as Stanley Station
 - Isabel Stanley is lousy location for Infill Station, there is nothing there
- Downtown development (2 tables)
 - Temporary construction impacts on local businesses
- Feasibility (2 tables)
 - Build the cheapest, fastest BART line/station
 - Chain of Lakes lawsuit, which reduced motor traffic in environmentally sensitive areas.
- Freeway Intercept Station concerns (2 tables)
 - Does not serve Livermore citizens
 - Building a nice Livermore station that will primarily be used by Tracy commuters

- Pairings (1 table)
 - Lousy to pair Freeway Intercept Station with Isabel
- Traffic and Congestion (1 table)
 - Increased traffic and parking Downtown
- Station development timeframe (1 table)
 - Build in our lifetime
- Parking (1 table)
 - Serving as a parking lot for others

III. Report Backs and Next Steps

Upon completion of the group interactive exercise, Ms. Chaplick invited a sampling of group member representatives to share their group's key findings and points of discussion.

The results of this meeting will be used to help shape and focus the discussion for the next community meeting which will be held in this same location on December 10th at 6:30pm.

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

BART IS COMING TO LIVERMORE!

COMMUNITY MEETING

Thursday, November 12, 2009

Comment Card Results

- Finally! Personally the stations that should be considered will be "Vasco" or by Isabel or even by the "Valley Las Positas." I haven't heard or wasn't even mentioned being the fact that "Vasco" would be the last part/spot of Alameda County and the beginning of "San Joaquin." What about "funds" to provide from San Joaquin to Alameda. Great first presentation.
- I believe the single most important route for BART now is to merely extend the tracks that currently stop at Dublin/Pleasanton further along to the 580/Greenville interchange. Parking at the Greenville Station must be sufficient for 10,000 cars. I believe the need for parking at the station would not undermine the purpose of the Greenbelt border if it is necessary to intrude into it. The downtown station and alignment could come later, and blend into or join the track at 580 at a convenient location, this could just be a junction, not necessarily a station.
- 1) How much of BART development will be addressed towards alleviating the commute traffic from Tracy, Mountain House, Brentwood and much of the SJV (Newman, Modesto, Patterson, Manteca, etc.)? Livermore is situated on the main throughway into and out of the Bay Area. Much of the commute traffic is not from Livermore. If BART cannot address that, it may not help Livermore. 2) Has BART also done a study of who commutes where either from or through Livermore? For me, I cannot see BART being an alternative until BART-to-San-Jose is addressed. 3) In developing the proposed routes, what kind of studies has BART and/or its consultants conducted thus far? Junction Avenue (part of the "Portola corridor") is a concern. If it is chosen, how much time will I have to move? 4) Other problems I see will be parking around the stations, especially neighborhood parking around the stations. Rockridge comes to mind. How much of that Rockridge "foot traffic" is actually from people parking on Manila or Hudson or Lockesley Avenues? I used to live in Oakland during the late 1990's and that was a problem for that neighborhood until the City of Oakland instituted "B" permits for the Rockridge residents. We could have that problem in the neighborhoods around downtown Livermore as well as any station built along Isabel (either at Stanley or at Los Positas College). 5) Any considerations given for building around LLNL? The land out there may need soil remediation as at one time industries used that area as a dumping ground. Some of the *hill* areas may also be prohibited because the local Ohlone tribe consider parts of those lands as "sacred ground." 6) Other problem will be Pleasanton. Depending on the route chosen, can BART convince Pleasanton that this is the right route?

- There was a major emphasis on TOD (transit oriented development). It was emphasized so strongly that I felt that this philosophy was being pressed upon the group without any reservation. The presentation started with the implied threat: if we don't comply with TOD, the project won't be funded. I suggest that you craft your message so that TOD looks more like Switzerland and less like Russia.
- BART should be about lessening traffic congestion on I-580 and not creating congestion on Livermore streets. Livermore general plan can be changed if needed to maximize ridership at a Greenville BART station. Noise and aesthetics should be part of the discussion.
- You need to provide better maps. Larger print, more streets identified.
- A downtown station should be underground to minimize noise.
- Greenville serves SJC more than Livermore by intercepting 580 traffic better to intercept traffic in Tracy via CE, 580 – Isabel better serves Livermore auto to BART as well as from Brentwood. Isabel/Stanley will put BART traffic right into the middle of heaviest commute traffic from Livermore to points east. Downtown: what is the volume of out-of-area BART riders to downtown Livermore – is it sufficient to make downtown an end of line destination for BART? Does not serve parts of Livermore away from downtown very well. VASCO would serve the eastern commercial industrial area similar to Isabel/580 serving the western commercial industrial area. Also provides ACE/580/local access. Local traffic throughout Livermore may be best served with Vasco because destination is far away from commutes to west and away from Isabel/580.
- 1) UGB extension and Greenville station can bring more revenue to Livermore. 2) Greenville Station will reduce 580 congestion. 3) Lower speed going through Livermore. We should be a destination not a pass through town.
- Please simplify the individual worksheets!
- Should be 2 stations – Downtown and Greenville. Downtown – because of the housing and activities (theaters, restaurants, shopping) this there; good access with ACE and bus. Greenville – get the freeway traffic before it comes through the valley. Bad choice is 580/Isabel for out by self and auto traffic still comes through valley.
- Pairing with a Downtown Station is important – access is 50/50 with parking and walking, ped and bus and ACE. Greenville or Vasco is an important pairing with Downtown. Underground for Downtown! (not Portola)
- No matter where you put the station it needs to be paired to be successful. Parking must be at a maximum to accommodate the Livermore residents now using this Livermore station plus all the people from the other counties now. All stations must have maximum parking. It does no good to have a downtown station if it can't accommodate the Livermore commuters. The Downtown station is the most important out of all the stations. BART is for commuters and to get traffic on the freeway lighter. Pairing stations must be built and functioning at the same time. In your decisions you must put the mind of the commuter in the fore front, not the concerns of the elderly, retired person who takes buses. Who takes buses, not commuters, not young families, or young adults.

- Parking is very important in any of the stations. Downtown station would promote the theatre, shops and restaurants. With the police annex possibility would deter crime that BART might bring to the area.
- My choice is the 580 Isabel station to serve traffic from the east. A second station downtown served by the Portola subway is the best location for the second station – lots of benefits to a downtown station, but it should be routed by the Portola subway.
- Change the urban growth boundary to open all options.
- Glad to see the public has come out in order to express their needs and concerns. The attendance was great! Every one at our table spoke freely!
- Very nice to have BART coming to Livermore.
- Isabel and Stanley is a very poor choice; no ACE, no jobs, no nothing. Vasco Road is excellent for future science park campus. BART needs to do much better to eliminate screeching wheel noise. Should pair Vasco with downtown. Big plus for downtown: cut down on cars to entertainment. Freeways alone would not be “bringing BART to Livermore.” If “context” means the science campus, then it really matters.
- Why Stanley/Isabel? There’s “no there, there.”
- Need to allow all groups to be heard!
- Thank you for this opportunity. I have learned a great deal and am glad to be a part of this. I wish more younger people knew of these meetings or a wider variety of people from Livermore knew about these meetings. Everyone needs to know and have input. I’m excited to see where we will be putting our BART station.
- An underground station downtown, paired with a station at the freeway/Isabel would be the best pairing. Thank you all for a great opportunity to be heard.
- BART owns 140 acres at Greenville. What is the cost of constructing a surface parking space exclusive of land? What is the minimum radius curve that allows full speed BART service? Where would soundwalls be required for the various routes? Does BART have any agreements with Union Pacific for the right of way through Livermore? What is the minimum size Downtown site? How many existing homes would be affected by BART noise for the various routes? How might the Isabel alignment affect airport operation? How long will it take to get from the existing Pleasanton station to Greenville for the various alignments? What might the time to construct a line to Greenville be under the various scenarios? Why is the Greenville south of I-580 when the 140-acre BART site is to the north? Why are we discussing Urban Planning in isolation from environmental issues? The best option would seem to be an underground route through the downtown to a Greenville station with 5,000-10,000 parking spaces.
- I believe a contextually designed, downtown station (with extensive sound control within ½ mile of the station...such as an underground track) is the highest priority, in order to maximize benefit to our community. Parking towers might be needed, yet a second station at freeway could be designed to accommodate maximal parking and central valley commuters. An ACE station could be co-located downtown. A freeway station near Las Positas College (Isabel) would be super.

- 1) I'm not sure I understand "station pairing" in the sense that I've never heard of BART closing a station. 2) If we only get one station location it should be downtown. 3) BART transit through downtown should be underground to minimize noise and grade crossing issues. 4) Retro architecture for the downtown station would be great.
- BART must connect with ACE/railroad right of way. Either bring BART to ACE (better) or move ACE to BART (likely less desirable). It is important to provide transportation choices and options. This is connected to land use and urban sprawl. A station Downtown discourages urban sprawl; a station on the edge of town will encourage urban sprawl. Also – consider that we could have Amtrak/California trains from Central Valley/Bakersfield routes through here; a BART connection to ACE/railroad will tend to draw that and be good synergy.
- Without a BART representative present it sure seems like these meetings are for "buy in" only – I sure hope we're being heard. Many of these options are difficult to discuss without knowing the dollars and cents behind it – obviously, BART's going to have to do what makes the most financial sense to them.
- I am very concerned about bringing BART into town and feel we should leave this on 580. I work in Pleasanton at an office next to BART. Our company has had to increase security to the point that a guard watches each person swipe in. This is due to the increase in homeless people (that they have found walking our halls). They have also increased security in the parking lot. They have had people attempt to break in cars. BART brings these folks in. (This comment card was accompanied by a page from the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan showing 2007 statistics for Reported Crimes at BART Stations.)
- When will BART come to Livermore? I have praying for it from the beginning. We have been promised.