

5. DRAFT EIR REVISIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

5.1 DRAFT EIR REVISIONS

The following revisions to the BART Warm Springs Extension Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), July 1991, include corrections and additional analysis prepared in response to specific comments made during the public review period. Some revisions were also made to clarify issues raised during the review period or identified by staff.

Page S-3, Table S-1:

Change the following (a revised page S-3 is attached):

CAPITAL COST (1991 \$ Millions)

to the following:

CAPITAL COST (Escalated to Time of Expenditure, \$ Millions)

Under "Ridership (Daily Entries and Exits)", delete "Daily Boardings."

Under Alternative 8, change Capital Cost for Project - Aerial from \$740 to \$620 and Project - Subway from \$780 to \$660.

Page S-9, Seventh Paragraph:

Replace the following paragraph:

- **Visual Quality.** Additional development will create an environment that is more built up which would allow the BART aerial structures less likely to contrast with or dominate their surroundings. Development and the maturation of plantings around Central Park will contribute to a visually complex environment capable of visually absorbing the BART structures.

With the following:

- **Visual Quality.** Now-vacant and underutilized areas along the project alignment are likely to be developed in the future. In general, the result of this additional development will create an environment that is more built up and, as a consequence the BART aerial structures are less likely to

Table S-1 (Revised)
Summary of Proposed Project and Alternative Characteristics

	Proposed Project	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6	Alt 7	Alt 8	Alt 9	Alt 10	Alt 11
ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS												
Length (miles)	7.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.4	5.4	7.8	7.8	7.8	5.4	7.8	7.8
Number of Stations	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
DISPLACEMENT EFFECTS												
Residential Properties	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	17	17	3	5	39	3	3	17
Business Properties	83	n/a	n/a	n/a	43	43	80	121	83	40	80	83
RIDERSHIP (Daily Entries & Exits) ¹ (Year 2010)	21,900	11,200	12,300	11,500	17,000	17,000	20,700	20,700	20,700	16,100	19,200	21,100
CAPITAL COST (Escalated to Time of Expenditure, \$ Millions)												
Project (w/out vehicles) - Aerial in Park	\$610	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$470	\$440	\$490	\$530	\$620	\$320	\$440	\$560
Project (w/out vehicles) - Subway in Park	\$670	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$510	\$500	\$550	\$570	\$660	\$380	\$500	\$620
Vehicles	\$80	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$55	\$55	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$55	\$80	\$80
Mitigations	\$32	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$29	\$29	\$31	\$27	\$46	\$29	\$32	\$32
ANNUAL OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE COSTS (1991 \$ Millions)	\$16.76	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$10.34	\$10.34	\$15.63	\$15.63	\$15.63	\$9.00	\$11.55	\$15.63

1. Includes Fremont BART Station plus proposed stations (if applicable)

Source: DKS Associates, 1991

contrast with or dominate their surroundings. Even in Central Park, new civic buildings proposed at the park's north end would create a setting in which the BART aerial structure would be less obtrusive. In other areas of the park new and maturing landscaping will create a more visually complex environment that would be more capable of absorbing the proposed BART structures.

Page S-17, Table S-2, under VISUAL AND AESTHETIC QUALITY:

Change "Proposed Project, Alternatives 9, 10 and 11" to "Proposed Project Alternatives 4 through 11"

Change first sentence of Net Impact After Mitigation to delete Paseo Padre Parkway

A revised page S-17 is attached.

Page S-18, Table S-2 continued under Central Park Design Option 2A, change Net Impact After Mitigation to delete Paseo Padre Parkway.

A revised page S-18 is attached.

Page S-23, Table S-2, under NOISE AND VIBRATION:

Description of impact change impact values as follows:

Alt 6 impacts from "148" to "106"

Alt 9 impacts from "132" to "90"

Alt 10 impacts from "149" to "107"

A revised page S-23 is attached.

Page 2-1, Last Paragraph, Third Sentence:

Delete sentence beginning on page 2-1 that is completed on page 2-4.

Page 2-4, Second Paragraph, Third Sentence:

Replace the existing parentheses:

(see Section 3.5 Ecosystems)

With the following:

Table S-2
Summary of Impacts (continued)

Environmental Area/ Extension Scenario	Description of Impact	Mitigation Measures	Net Impact After Mitigation
FREMONT CENTRAL PARK (continued)			
Design Options 1 and 2S	<i>Construction:</i> Similar impacts to Proposed Project but with more intensive construction activities. Impacts on softball fields and Lake Elizabeth would be less with Design Options 2S than with Design Option 1. Significant short term impacts.	For construction impacts, mitigations are the same as for Proposed Project, with existing ground and landscaping to be replaced following construction.	Less than significant short term impacts due to construction.
Central Park Design Options 2A and 3	<i>Direct:</i> Moderate impacts on three softball fields. Aerial structures through Central Park do not conform with the Fremont General Plan, and would be a significant adverse effect. (See Visual and Noise sections.)	Modify fencing and lighting systems of affected softball fields.	Non-conformance with General Plan is a significant effect.
Central Park Design Options 2A and 3	<i>Construction:</i> Significant short term impacts include loss of parking near ballfields, and temporary disruption of walking paths around Lake Elizabeth.	Modify ballfields in advance of construction. Provide for temporary replacement parking and walking paths. Maintain access from neighborhoods to the east.	Less than significant.
VISUAL AND AESTHETIC QUALITY			
Proposed Project, Alternatives 4 through 11	<i>Direct:</i> Aerial structures and embankments would create significant visual impacts between Fremont Station and Paseo Padre Parkway, including portions of Fremont Villas, along Stevenson Boulevard, and portions of Central Park including Lake Elizabeth. South of Paseo Padre Parkway, minor visual impacts would occur along the alignments and at proposed station sites.	Landscape plantings are suggested at key locations to limit views of the structures from key locations. Add plantings to screen views from residential areas. Collaborate with City of Fremont in design of Irvington Station.	Significant visual impacts would remain at Fremont Villas and Lake Elizabeth. No significant impacts south of Paseo Padre Parkway.
Proposed Project, Alternatives 4 thru 11	<i>Construction:</i> Significant short term impacts would occur in the Central Park and Irvington areas.	None proposed.	Short term significant impacts.

Table S-2
Summary of Impacts (continued)

Environmental Area/ Extension Scenario	Description of Impact	Mitigation Measures	Net Impact After Mitigation
VISUAL AND AESTHETIC QUALITY (continued)			
Central Park Design Options 1 and 2S	<i>Direct/Construction:</i> No direct impacts, but moderate construction impacts would occur in the Fremont Villas area. With Design Option 1, significant impacts in Central Park would occur in the area of riparian vegetation east of Lake Elizabeth.	Minimize vegetation removal in the riparian forest area. Replant after construction.	Not significant.
Central Park Design Option 2A	<i>Direct:</i> Aerial structures and embankments would cause significant impacts at Fremont Villas, Stevenson Boulevard, Paseo Padre Parkway and in Central Park. Relative to the Proposed Project, impacts at Lake Elizabeth would be reduced and impacts to the riparian area would be avoided.	Groups of strategically placed landscape plantings in Central Park would reduce structure's visibility.	Significant visual impacts would remain at Fremont Villas and Lake Elizabeth.
Central Park Design Option 3	<i>Direct:</i> Aerial structures and embankments would cause significant impacts at Fremont Villas, Stevenson Boulevard, Paseo Padre Parkway and moderate impacts in Central Park. Significant impacts on views from homes on western side of Valdez Way, Vaca Dr. and Valero Way.	Same as for Design Option 2A.	Significant visual impacts would remain at Fremont Villas, along Valdez Way, Vaca Drive and Valero Way and at the Paseo Padre Parkway overcrossing.
Paseo Padre Design Option	<i>Direct:</i> The optional vehicular overpass at Paseo Padre Parkway would have significant visual impacts.	None feasible.	Significant visual effect.
Warren Avenue Design Option	<i>Direct:</i> The aerial structure over Mission Boulevard and Warren Avenue would be highly visible to travellers on both streets.	None feasible.	Significant visual effect.
Alternative 4	<i>Direct:</i> Same as Proposed Project, except significant impacts near Driscoll Road from the depressed right-of-way.	Same as Proposed Project plus screening fences and trees along Driscoll Road.	Same as Proposed Project, with additional significant impacts near Driscoll Road.

Table S-2
Summary of Impacts (continued)

Environmental Area/ Extension Scenario	Description of Impact	Mitigation Measures	Net Impact After Mitigation
NOISE AND VIBRATION (continued)			
<i>Noise</i> Central Park Design Option 2A	<i>Direct:</i> Option 2A would have 9 more sensitive receptors with significant impacts than the Proposed Project.	Install sound walls to protect sensitive receptors.	Significant residual impact on a small portion of Central Park and Lake Elizabeth.
Central Park Design Option 3	<i>Direct:</i> Thirty-nine (39) more sensitive receptors with significant impacts than the Proposed Project.	Install sound walls to protect sensitive receptors.	Significant residual impact on a small portion of Central Park.
Alternatives 4 thru 11 (except Alternative 8)	<i>Direct:</i> Alternative 4 would have significant impacts on 42 sensitive receptors, Alt 5 impacts 98, Alt 6 impacts 106, Alt 7 impacts 145, Alt 9 impacts 90, Alt 10 impacts 107, Alt 11 impacts 107.	Install sound walls to protect sensitive receptors.	Same residual impacts as Proposed Project.
Alternative 8	<i>Direct:</i> Alternative 8 significantly impacts 537 sensitive receptors.	Install sound walls to protect sensitive receptors.	To Washington Blvd, same residual impacts as Proposed Project. South of Washington Blvd, Alternative 8 would have residual impacts on residences and a school.
<i>Vibration</i> Proposed Project, Alternatives 4 thru 11, All Central Park Design Options	<i>Direct:</i> A maximum of 103 sensitive receptors would be affected by groundborne vibration from passing trains.	Isolation of the tracks with special ties and/or trackbed construction.	Not significant, except under Alt 8, where some residences would have significant residual vibration impacts.
<i>Noise and Vibration</i> Proposed Project, Alternatives 4 thru 11, All Design Options	<i>Construction:</i> Construction equipment and activities could cause short term noise and vibration impacts along the project corridor.	Include noise and vibration limits in construction contracts.	Short term impacts, not significant.
AIR QUALITY			
Proposed Project, Alternatives 4 thru 11, All Design Options	<i>Direct:</i> No violations of state or federal carbon monoxide standards are predicted. The project would reduce emissions of ozone precursors and particulates (PM10), pollutants of regional significance. This would be a beneficial effect.	None required.	Beneficial regional impacts.
	<i>Direct:</i> Freight trains in the subway under Washington Blvd could cause local diesel exhaust accumulations and odor problems.	Provide adequate ventilation in the subway segment to handle diesel exhaust from expected number of freight trains.	Not significant.

(Ecosystems issues are addressed in section 3.5 with specific mitigation on page 3.5-26)

Page 2-7, Third Paragraph under IRVINGTON STATION, Third Sentence:

Add the following sentence:

The main driveway to the parking lots on Osgood Road approximately two-thirds of the way toward the south end of the station will be signalized.

Page 2-9, Second Paragraph, under WARM SPRINGS STATION:

Add at the end of the paragraph:

Both auto driveways to the parking lots on Warm Springs Boulevard will be signalized.

Page 2-16, First Paragraph:

Add at the end of the paragraph:

The southern driveway to the parking lot on Warm Springs Boulevard and the driveway to the parking lot on Kato Road will be signalized.

Page 2-35, Second Paragraph:

Last sentence which reads:

Completion of the Capacity Expansion Program currently being implemented by BART, e.g., new C-car procurement, Daly City Turnback/Yard, electrical capacity expansion, automatic train control and wayside train control/system performance modifications and brake rate algorithm modifications, would provide 2.25-minute spacings on transbay lines.

Is changed to read:

Completion of the Capacity Expansion Program currently being implemented by BART, e.g., new C-car procurement, Daly City Turnback/Yard, electrical capacity expansion, automatic train control and wayside train control/system performance modifications and brake rate algorithm modifications, would provide 2.25-minute spacings transbay.

Page 2-36, Third Paragraph, beginning at the Fourth Sentence:

Which reads:

Routes 120 and 140 have headways of 15 and 10 minutes, respectively, during commute hours. Route 180 provides more complete service coverage between the Fremont BART Station and the CalTrain Depot in San Jose. Route 180 has a scheduled headway of 10 minutes during commute hours and 15 minutes during the day. It has been assumed that the three SCCTD bus routes now serving the Fremont Station would relocate to the end station for each of the proposed project alternatives. Three local SCCTD lines (Routes 20, 71 and 33) would provide 15-minute peak and off-peak frequencies.

Is changed to read:

Routes 120 and 140 have headways of 35 and 30 minutes, respectively, during commute hours. Route 180 provides more complete service coverage between the Fremont BART Station and the CalTrain Depot in San Jose. Route 180 has a scheduled headway of 15 minutes during commute hours and 30 minutes during the day. It has been assumed that the three SCCTD bus routes now serving the Fremont Station would relocate to the end station for each of the proposed project alternatives. Three local SCCTD lines (Routes 20, 71 and 33) would provide 15-minute peak and 30 off-peak frequencies.

Page 2-42, First Paragraph:

Add the following after the third sentence:

(mitigations for stormwater control are discussed on page 3.4-10 and wetland habitats on page 3.5-26).

Page 2-49:

Table 2-5 is revised.

Under Alternative 8, change the amounts \$470, \$120, \$600, \$740 and \$820 to \$370, \$100, \$480, \$620 and \$700, respectively.

Under Proposed Project, change Right-of-Way Cost to \$163 and Total Project Cost to \$683.

A revised Table 2-5 is attached.

Table 2-5 (Revised)
Estimated Conceptual Capital Costs for Proposed Project and Alternatives with Basic Features
(Millions of Dollars - Escalated to Time of Expenditure)

Item	Description (miles/number of stations)	Proposed Proj. (7.8/3)	Alt 4 (5.4/2)	Alt 5 (5.4/2)	Alt 6 (7.8/2)	Alt 7 (7.8/2)	Alt 8 (7.8/2)	Alt 9 (5.4/1)	Alt 10 (7.8/1)	Alt 11 (7.8/2)
1	Construction and Procurement	\$340	\$280	\$270	\$260	\$270	\$370	\$180	\$230	\$320
2	Engineering and Management	\$90	\$70	\$70	\$60	\$70	\$100	\$50	\$60	\$80
3	Start-up and Agreements	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10
4	Total Construction Cost (items 1 + 2 + 3)	\$440	\$360	\$350	\$330	\$350	\$480	\$240	\$300	\$410
5	Right-of-way Cost	\$163	\$110	\$90	\$160	\$180	\$140	\$80	\$140	\$150
6	Subtotal Project Cost (items 4 + 5)	\$610	\$470	\$440	\$490	\$530	\$620	\$320	\$440	\$560
7	Vehicle Cost	\$80	\$55	\$55	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$55	\$80	\$80
8	TOTAL PROJECT COST (items 6 + 7)*	\$683	\$525	\$495	\$570	\$610	\$700	\$375	\$520	\$640

*The above cost estimates do not include hazardous material removal and noise, vibration and other mitigations.

Page 2-50:

Table 2-6 is revised.

In the title, change (\$ in Millions) to (Millions of Dollars - Escalated to Time of Expenditure).

Change under Alternative 8, the project cost amount of \$740 to \$620.

Change under Alternatives 9 and 10, additional cost for at-grade Paseo Padre, "+9" to "+10" and "+8" to "+10", respectively.

A revised Table 2-6 is attached.

Page 3.3-2, First Paragraph, under REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Replace the following:

the local level for the project site include: the City of Fremont Hazardous Materials Division

With the following:

...the local level for the project site include: the Environmental Protection Division of the City of Fremont;

Page 3.3-3, Last Paragraph, Second Sentence:

Replace the following:

The City issues business plans, which are required by state law, submitted by facilities that use or store hazardous materials above a certain quantity.

With the following:

The City reviews business plans, which are required by State Law, submitted by regulated facilities that use or store hazardous materials above a certain quantity and issues Hazardous Material Permits for approved sites.

Page 3.3-7, Table 3.3-1, the following changes have been made:

Under the Status of Site 13, replace the following:

City has granted closure of site.

Table 2-6 (Revised)
Estimated Conceptual Cost for Proposed Project and Alternatives with Design Options
(Millions of Dollars - Escalated to Time of Expenditure)

	Prop. Proj.	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Alt. 6	Alt. 7	Alt. 8	Alt. 9	Alt. 10	Alt. 11
1. BASIC FEATURES OF PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES									
Length (miles)	7.8	5.4	5.4	7.8	7.8	7.8	5.4	7.8	7.8
Stations:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Irvington		X	X						
Warm Springs		X	X						
South Warm Springs									
Alignment at Park									
Vertical Align. at Pasco Padre.		Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial
Vertical Align. at Washington Blvd.		At-grade*	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial	Aerial
Project Cost with Basic Features (w/o vehicles)	\$610	Subway \$470	Subway \$440	Subway \$490	Subway \$530	Subway \$620	Subway \$320	Subway \$440	Subway \$560
2. ADDITIONAL COSTS FOR DESIGN OPTIONS:									
a) For Central Park Design Options									
1 - Subway under Lake Elizabeth		+\$60	+\$60	+\$60	+\$40	+\$40	+\$60	+\$60	+\$60
2A - Aerial around Lake		+5	+5	+5	+5	+5	+5	+5	+5
2S - Subway around Lake		+65	+65	+65	+45	+45	+65	+65	+65
3 - Aerial around Park		+7	+7	+7	+7	+7	+7	+7	+7
b) For other Design Options in combination with (a) above:									
At-Grade Pasco Padre									
with basic aerial alternative	+9	Basic	+9	+10	+7	+6	+10	+10	+9
with subway design options 1 and 2S	-17	N/A**	-17	-16	+2	0	-16	-16	-17
At other locations see NOTES below.									
3. COST FOR PROPOSED MITIGATIONS									
	\$32	\$29	\$29	\$31	\$27	\$46	\$29	\$32	\$32
4. COST FOR BART VEHICLES									
	\$80	\$55	\$55	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$55	\$80	\$80

* Includes overpass in cost estimate.
 ** Basic with Central Park Options.

NOTES:
 For Aerial Option over Washington Blvd., subtract \$2m from applicable alignments (Alternatives 6, 9, 10, 11).
 For Aerial Option over Warren Ave., add \$13m to the applicable alignments (Alternatives 6, 7, 10, 11, and Proposed Project).
 For End Option (UPRR Relocation), add \$3m to the applicable alignments (Alternatives 6, 7, 10, 11, and Proposed Project).

With the following:

Appropriate site closure is required, but has not been adequately addressed.

Under the Status of Site 27, replace the following:

Groundwater monitoring in progress.

With the following:

Treatment facility is in place.

The revised pages of Table 3.3-1 are attached.

Page 3.3-14, Last Paragraph:

Replace the following:

Operation of the project would not involve the use or storage of hazardous materials; however, there is a potential exposure to hazardous materials due to underground fuel pipelines located along portions of the proposed alignment. Ruptured or leaking fuel pipelines could contaminate surrounding soils or groundwater and create a potential health and safety risk. In addition, the proposed BART alignment would be located adjacent to the existing SPTCo and UPRR tracks which could expose BART patrons to hazardous materials spills in the event of a train accident or collision involving a SPTCo or UPRR train carrying hazardous materials. Trains from both rail companies carry hazardous materials on the track on a daily basis.

With the following:

Operation of the project would involve the use and storage of hazardous materials in and adjacent to the car wash and inspection pit adjacent to the tailtrack area south of the terminal station. The car wash would use a 1% solution of oxalic acid stored in a holding tank. Containers of a 10% oxalic acid solution would be stored on-site. Hazardous materials used in the emergency maintenance pit would include 80 or 90 weight lube oil, isopropyl alcohol and solvents for degreasing. The solvents may contain mineral spirits, 1,1,1 trichloroethane or xylene. These hazardous materials would be transported, stored and handled in conformance with standard BART procedures and applicable laws and regulations.

Table 3.3-1 - continued (Revised)

Site Name and Address	Incident	Potential or Known Subsurface Contaminants	Status
13. Fremont Wire & Plating ³ 2156 Prune Avenue	Improper storage of sodium hydroxide and sulfuric acid; sodium hydroxide spill.	Metals identified in soils.	Appropriate site closure is required, but has not been adequately addressed.
14. Mallar Finishing ³ 2878 Prune Avenue	City issued violation due to improper storage.	Unknown.	Unknown.
15. Glenmoor Companies ² 2020 Warm Springs Court	Storage of waste oil in 55-gal. drum; violation issued 1/90.	Unknown.	Unknown.
16. Tri-City Circuits ³ 2199 Warm Springs Court	Transportation, storage, and disposal facility; violations due to improper handling of hazardous materials.	Unknown.	Unknown.
17. J&L Enterprises ² 2040 Warm Springs Court	Violations issued in 9/88 due to improper labeling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials.	Unknown.	Unknown.
18. Russett Diesel Service ³ 2090 Warm Springs Court	Removal of underground gasoline and diesel tanks.	Petroleum hydrocarbons, including oil and grease, detected in soils.	Unknown.
19. The Pump Shop ¹ 45845 Warm Springs Blvd.	Notices of violation issued in 5/89 and 10/89 by County due to contaminated absorbent material located in storm drain sump.	Unknown.	No further information available in file.

Table 3.3-1 - continued (Revised)

Site Name and Address	Incident	Potential or Known Subsurface Contaminants	Status
27. Fleming Foods ³ 48811 Warm Springs Blvd.	Unknown.	Petroleum hydrocarbons identified in groundwater.	Treatment facility is in place.
28. Bedford Properties/Cal Concrete ¹ 48870 Kato Road	Removal of underground gasoline and diesel tanks.	Petroleum hydrocarbons identified in soils and groundwater.	A bioremediation closure report was prepared for site in 12/89.
29. Tempglass ¹ 48999 Kato Road	Site has been identified on RWQCB Underground Fuel Leaks List.	Unknown. No information in file.	Unknown. No information in file.
30. Hertz Equipment Rental ¹ 48887 Kato Road	Release from underground waste oil tank in 3/89.	Oil and grease identified in soils.	No further information available in file.
31. Emco Dist. ¹ 48900 Millmont Drive	Groundwater monitoring program implemented in 12/85.	Petroleum hydrocarbons identified in groundwater.	No further information available in file.

¹ Source: RWQCB files, reviewed by Baseline in April 1991.

² Sources: BART, 1990, Draft EIR for Warm Springs Extension Project. Ausmus, Beverly, 1990, Needs Assessment: Environmental Liability Assessment, Warm Springs Extension Project.

³ Source: Kal Krishnan Consulting Service, 1991, Phase II Environmental Survey, Warm Springs Extension.

Notes: RWQCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board.
City = City of Fremont.
ACWD = Alameda County Water District
Locations of sites are shown on Figure 3.3-1.

There is a potential of exposure to hazardous materials due to underground fuel pipelines located along portions of the proposed alignment. Ruptured or leaking fuel pipelines could contaminate surrounding soils or groundwater and create a potential health and safety risk. In addition, the proposed BART alignment would be located adjacent to the existing SPTCo and UPRR tracks which could expose BART patrons to hazardous materials spills in the event of a train accident or collision involving a SPTCo or UPRR train carrying hazardous materials. Trains from both rail companies carry hazardous materials on the track on a daily basis.

Page 3.3-18, Second Paragraph, Last Sentence:

Replace the following:

No information regarding site investigations was available for site 11; the City of Fremont has granted closure for site 13 (Figure 3.3-1 and Table 3.3-1).

With the following:

No information regarding site investigations was available for site 11; Site 13 has been ordered to implement an approved closure plan; however, as of this date, this has not been done and the case has been referred to enforcement (Figure 3.3-1 and Table 3.3-1).

Page 3.5-3 to Page 3.5-8, Table 3.5-1:

Is amended to include:

Mule Deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), Eared grebe (*P. nigricollis*), Clark's grebe (*Aechmophorus clarkii*), White pelican (*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*), Chestnut-backed chickadee (*Parus rufescens*), Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) (replaces Northern shrike), Northern oriole (*Icterus galbula*), Black headed grosbeak (*Pheucticus melanocephalus*), and House sparrow (*Passer domesticus*).

A revised Table 3.5-1 is attached.

Page 3.5-14, Second Paragraph:

After last sentence, add the following text:

A botanist surveyed the project alignment in August 1991 for the delta tulle-pea (*Lathyrus jepsonii* spp. *jepsonii*) and Hoovers's button celery (*Erynigium*

Table 3.5-1 (Revised)
Birds and Mammals Observed or Expected to Use Habitat
Along Proposed Project Alignment

Common (<i>Scientific</i>) name	Habitats ¹				
	UR	GA	LE	RF	SW
Birds					
Double-crested Cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>)			□		
Pied-billed Grebe (<i>Podilymbus podiceps</i>)			□		
Horned Grebe (<i>Podiceps auritus</i>)			□		
Eared Grebe (<i>Podiceps nigricollis</i>)			□		
Western Grebe (<i>Aechmophorus occidentalis</i>)			□		
Clark's Grebe (<i>Aechmophorus clarkii</i>)			□		
White Pelican (<i>Pelecanus erythrorhynchos</i>)			□		
Great Blue Heron (<i>Ardea herodias</i>)			□		
Green-backed Heron (<i>Butorides striatus</i>)			□		□
Great Egret (<i>Casmerodius albus</i>)		□	□		□
Snowy Egret (<i>Egretta thula</i>)			□		□
Black-crowned Night Heron (<i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>)			□		
Canada Goose (<i>Branta canadensis</i>)			□		
Greater White-fronted Geese (<i>Anser albifrons</i>)			□		
Cinnamon Teal (<i>Anas cyanoptera</i>)			□		
Bufflehead (<i>Bucephala albeola</i>)			□		
Mallard (<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>)			□		
Ruddy Duck (<i>Oxyura jamaicensis</i>)			□		□
Turkey Vulture (<i>Cathartes aura</i>)	□				

¹ UR = Urban and residential landscaped; GA = Grassland and agriculture; LE = Lake Elizabeth; RF = Riparian forest; SW = Seasonal wetlands.

Key:

- + = Species of special concern.
- * = Candidate for listing under Federal Endangered Species Act.
- = Species observed in habitat.
- = Species expected in habitat.

Table 3.5-1 - continued (Revised)

Common (<i>Scientific</i>) name	Habitats ¹				
	UR	GA	LE	RF	SW
Black-shouldered Kite (<i>Elanus caeruleus</i>)+		☐			
Northern Harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>)+		☐			
Sharp-shinned Hawk (<i>Accipiter striatus</i>)		☐			
Cooper's Hawk (<i>Accipiter cooperii</i>)+		☐		☐	
Red-shouldered Hawk (<i>Buteo lineatus</i>)		☐		☐	
Red-tailed Hawk (<i>Buteo jamaicensis</i>)		☐			
Ferruginos Hawk (<i>Buteo regalis</i>)		☐			
American Kestrel (<i>Falco sparverius</i>)		☐			
Ring-necked Pheasant (<i>Phasianus colchicus</i>)		☐			
Virginia Rail (<i>Rallus limicola</i>)			☐		
American Coot (<i>Fulica americana</i>)			☐		☐
Common Moorhen (<i>Gallinula chloropus</i>)			☐		☐
Sora (<i>Porzana carolina</i>)			☐		☐
Killdeer (<i>Charadrius vociferus</i>)					☐
Black-necked Stilt (<i>Himantopus mexicanus</i>)					☐
Greater Yellowlegs (<i>Tringa melanoleuca</i>)			☐		☐
Least Sandpiper (<i>Calidris minutilla</i>)			☐		☐
Short-billed Dowitcher (<i>Limnodromus griseus</i>)			☐		☐
Long-billed Dowitcher (<i>Limnodromus scolopaceus</i>)			☐		☐
Common Snipe (<i>Gallinago gallinago</i>)		☐			☐
Long-billed Curlew (<i>Numenius phaeopus</i>)*		☐			☐
Western Gull (<i>Larus occidentalis</i>)			○		
Rock Dove (<i>Columba livia</i>)	☐				

¹ UR = Urban and residential landscaped; GA = Grassland and agriculture; LE = Lake Elizabeth; RF = Riparian forest; SW = Seasonal wetlands.

Key:

- + = Species of special concern.
- * = Candidate for listing under Federal Endangered Species Act.
- ☐ = Species observed in habitat.
- = Species expected in habitat.

Table 3.5-1 - continued (Revised)

Common (<i>Scientific</i>) name	Habitats ¹				
	UR	GA	LE	RF	SW
Mourning Dove (<i>Zenaida macroura</i>)	☐	☐	☐		
Burrowing Owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>)+		☐			
White-throated Swift (<i>Aeronautes saxatalis</i>)		☐	☐	☐	☐
Anna's Hummingbird (<i>Calypte anna</i>)		☐		☐	
Nuttall's Woodpecker (<i>Dendrocopos nuttallii</i>)				☐	
Downy Woodpecker (<i>Dendrocopos pubescens</i>)				☐	
Northern Flicker (<i>Colaptes auratus</i>)				☐	
Black Phoebe (<i>Sayornis nigricans</i>)		☐		☐	
Say's Phoebe (<i>Sayornis saya</i>)		☐		☐	
Tree Swallow (<i>Tachycineta bicolor</i>)		☐		☐	
Violet-green Swallow (<i>Tachycineta thalassina</i>)		☐	☐		
Northern Rough-winged Swallow (<i>Stelgidopteryx serripennis</i>)			☐	☐	
Cliff Swallow (<i>Hirundo pyrrhonota</i>)		☐	☐		
Barn Swallow (<i>Hirundo rustica</i>)		☐	☐		
Common Crow (<i>Corvus brachyrinchos</i>)		☐		☐	
Scrub Jay (<i>Aphelocoma coerulescens</i>)	☐			☐	
Chestnut-backed Chickadee (<i>Ponis sufescens</i>)				☐	
Bushtit (<i>Psaltriparus minimus</i>)				☐	
Marsh Wren (<i>Cistothorus palustris</i>)			☐		
Swainson's Thrush (<i>Catharus ustulatus</i>)				☐	☐
Northern Mockingbird (<i>Mimus polyglottos</i>)	☐			☐	
American Robin (<i>Turdus migratorius</i>)	☐	☐			
Loggerhead Shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>)		☐		☐	

¹ UR = Urban and residential landscaped; GA = Grassland and agriculture; LE = Lake Elizabeth; RF = Riparian forest; SW = Seasonal wetlands.

Key:

- + = Species of special concern.
- * = Candidate for listing under Federal Endangered Species Act.
- ☐ = Species observed in habitat.
- = Species expected in habitat.

Table 3.5-1 - continued (Revised)

Common (<i>Scientific</i>) name	Habitats ¹				
	UR	GA	LE	RF	SW
European Starling (<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>)	☐	☐			
Yellow Warbler (<i>Dendroica petechia</i>)			☐	☐	
Yellow-rumped Warbler (<i>Dendroica coronata</i>)				☐	
Common Yellowthroat (<i>Geothlypis trichas</i>)			☐	☐	
Wilson's Warbler (<i>Wilsonia pusilla</i>)				☐	
Lazuli Bunting (<i>Passerina amoena</i>)			☐	☐	
California Towhee (<i>Pipilo crissalis</i>)	☐	☐		☐	
Rufous-sided Towhee (<i>Pipilo erythrophthalmus</i>)				☐	
Savannah Sparrow (<i>Passerculus sandwichensis</i>)		☐	☐		☐
Song Sparrow (<i>Melospiza melodia</i>)				☐	
Lincoln's Sparrow (<i>Melospiza lincolni</i>)			☐	☐	
Golden-crowned Sparrow (<i>Zonotrichia atricapilla</i>)		☐		☐	
White-crowned Sparrow (<i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i>)		☐			
Red-winged Blackbird (<i>Agelaius phoeniceus</i>)			☐		☐
Tricolored Blackbird (<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>)*			○		○
Western Meadowlark (<i>Sturnella neglecta</i>)		☐			
Brewer's Blackbird (<i>Euphagus cyanocephalus</i>)	☐	☐			
Northern Oriole (<i>Icterus galbula</i>)				☐	
House Finch (<i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i>)				☐	
Lesser Goldfinch (<i>Carduelis psaltria</i>)		☐	☐	☐	
American Goldfinch (<i>Carduelis tristis</i>)		☐		☐	
Black-headed Grosbeak (<i>Pheocticus melanocephalus</i>)				☐	
House Sparrow (<i>Passer domesticus</i>)	☐	☐			

¹ UR = Urban and residential landscaped; GA = Grassland and agriculture; LE = Lake Elizabeth; RF = Riparian forest; SW = Seasonal wetlands.

Key:

- + = Species of special concern.
- * = Candidate for listing under Federal Endangered Species Act.
- ☐ = Species observed in habitat.
- = Species expected in habitat.

Table 3.5-1 - continued (Revised)

Common (<i>Scientific</i>) name	Habitats ¹				
	UR	GA	LE	RF	SW
<i>Mammals</i>					
Mule deer (<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i>)		□		□	
Red Fox (<i>Vulpes fulva</i>)		□		□	
Gray Fox (<i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i>)		□		□	
Black-tailed Jackrabbit (<i>Lepus californicus</i>)		□			
Meadow Vole (<i>Microtus californicus</i>)		○			
Deer Mouse (<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>)		○			
Western Harvest Mouse (<i>Reithrodontomys megalotis</i>)		○			
California Ground Squirrel (<i>Otospermophilus beecheyi</i>)		□			
Bottae Pocket Gopher (<i>Thomomys bottae</i>)		□			
Virginia Opossum (<i>Didelphis virginiana</i>)				□	
Striped Skunk (<i>Mephitis mephitis</i>)				□	
Muskrat (<i>Ondatra zibethius</i>)			□		
Raccoon (<i>Procyon lotor</i>)				□	

¹ UR = Urban and residential landscaped; GA = Grassland and agriculture; LE = Lake Elizabeth; RF = Riparian forest; SW = Seasonal wetlands.

Key:

- + = Species of special concern.
- * = Candidate for listing under Federal Endangered Species Act.
- = Species observed in habitat.
- = Species expected in habitat.

aristulatum var. hooverii). No suitable habitat for the delta tule-pea was identified nor were either species observed during the field surveys.

Page 3.5-17, Second Paragraph:

After the last sentence, add the following text:

Five sites along the proposed project alignment were surveyed for San Francisco forktail damselflies (*Ischnura gemina*) on September 17, 1991 by Dr. John Hafernik, San Francisco State University. The sites included drainage channels near Kato Road, Warren Avenue, Warm Springs Boulevard, Durham Road and the Lake Elizabeth area including the Mission Creek drainage. The Kato Road, Durham Road, and Mission Creek drainages contained habitat that appeared suitable for the San Francisco forktail damselfly. No San Francisco forktail damselflies were found; hence, this species does not currently inhabit these wetlands or is rare. The nearest record for this species is from a flood control channel at the western end of the Durham Road about 2.5 miles northwest of the project alignment. Captured individuals of *Ischnura denticollis*, which are morphologically and ecologically similar to *I. gemina*, had characteristics that indicate past interbreeding with *I. gemina*, suggesting that the San Francisco damselfly was found in these wetlands in the past and might extend their range into them in the future.

Page 3.5-19, Third Line:

Insert "approximately" in front of "26 feet wide."

Page 3.5-29, First Paragraph under DESIGN OPTION 2A, Second Sentence:

Add to the end of the sentence after forest:

except as discussed in Section 3.7.3, page 3.7-20 regarding impacts to Lake Elizabeth during construction for Design Option 2A.

Page 3.6-13, Third Paragraph:

Add a new forth sentence following the phrase "...inclusive land use category":

The area extending south of Grimmer Boulevard to Brown Road is designated a study area in the General Plan. The City or any other party could initiate a study for a potential change in land use in this area.

Page 3.6-18:

Delete the last sentence:

Similarly, the City has proposed that land use designations around the proposed Irvington Station area be reviewed.

Page 3.6-22, Last Paragraph, Last Two Sentences:

Replace the following:

Although Shapell has withdrawn its request, this area is still being assessed to determine whether a viable residential community can be created. A major constraint would be the nearby NUMMI plant, which has expressed concern that residential land use would be incompatible with the operation of an automobile manufacturing plant.

With the following:

Although Shapell has withdrawn its request for a General Plan amendment, the General Plan identifies the area generally bounded by South Grimmer Boulevard, I-680, Mission Boulevard/Brown Road and the railroad corridor as a Study Area for a potential change of land use. Any party could initiate a land use study of the area, although no change is being assessed at present. Existing industrial operations in the area, including NUMMI, have expressed concerns about changing land use designations adjacent to industrial operations to allow residential development.

Page 3.6-30, Last Paragraph:

The phrase "specific plan" in the first and last lines is hereby changed to "study plan."

Page 3.6-31, Second Full Paragraph:

Replace the following:

The development of a BART station in Irvington is very important to the redevelopment potential of this area. To this end, the Irvington BART Station Concept Plan was created and adopted in March 1990. The plan addresses issues of land use, urban design, site design and circulation associated with the development of an Irvington BART Station. It is fairly specific and addresses issues such as parcels available for new development and recommended land uses for them, orientation of the station structure,

and circulation for pedestrians and automobiles between the station and the surrounding areas.

With the following:

The development of a BART station in Irvington is seen by the City of Fremont as being very important to the redevelopment of this area. Recent plans for redevelopment actions in the area have been approved with flexibility for future integration of the proposed Irvington Station. In March 1990, plans and specifications for street widening in the Irvington area, with final designs for plazas and central places were approved. However, design and street improvements related to the BART Station were to be considered at later date, when plans were available, to ensure that the BART station design fits into the community and neighborhood.

Footnote 2, Page 3.6-31 is hereby deleted.

Page 3.6-43, Second Item Listed Under NEIGHBORHOOD MITIGATION MEASURES:

Replace the following:

- Construction traffic control criteria should be developed in consultation with local business associations before any construction activity is undertaken by BART. A traffic control plan could be prepared in accordance with these criteria.

With the following:

- Construction traffic control criteria should be developed in consultation with the City of Fremont and local business associations before any construction activity is undertaken by BART. A traffic control plan could be prepared in accordance with these criteria.

Page 3.7-11, Third Paragraph, First Sentence:

Insert "approximately" in from of "26 feet wide."

Page 3.7-19, Second Full Paragraph, First Sentence:

Replace the following:

Again, like the Proposed Project alignment, the BART structure for Design Option 2A would cover about 115,000 square feet (2.6 acres) of land in the park while the proposed BART alignment would occupy about five acres.

With the following:

Again, like the Proposed Project, the BART structure for Design Option 2A would cover about 115,000 square feet (2.6 acres) of land in the park.¹

The footnote does not change.

Page 3.7-19, Third Full Paragraph, Third Sentence:

Precede sentence with "For example, the conceptual engineering drawings show that the" and delete the capital "The" at the beginning of the sentence.

Page 3.7-20, Second Paragraph under CONSTRUCTION PERIOD IMPACTS, Last Sentence:

Delete the phrase "by 10 to 12 feet more than would be the case once construction is completed" and replace with "until construction is completed."

Page 3.9-11/12:

The first full paragraph on page 3.9-11 which reads:

A focused subsurface archaeological testing program would be designed to determine the depositional integrity and the cultural complexity of deposits at specific locations that will be affected by the Proposed Project (as per CEQA Appendix K guidelines). These investigations would be conducted by qualified professionals experienced in South Bay prehistoric studies. The testing programs should be conducted within the context of appropriate research considerations and should result in a detailed technical document that defines the exact project impacts to the site and presents a project-specific mitigation program for addressing those impacts.

Is hereby moved to the next page and inserted in the Mitigation subsection after the hearing CA-Ala-343.

Page 3.11-1, Footnote 1:

Which reads:

¹ In 1988 the death rate in the United States for passenger cars was 1.19 per hundred million miles. For buses the rate was 0.03, for scheduled airlines it was 0.01 deaths and for passenger rail trains it was 0.02. National Safety Council, 1990, *Accident Facts*, p. 90.

Is changed to read:

¹ In 1988 the death rate in the United States for passenger cars was 1.19 per hundred million miles. For buses the rate was 0.03, for scheduled airlines it was 0.01 deaths per hundred million passenger miles and for passenger rail trains it was 0.02 per hundred million passenger miles. National Safety Council, 1990, *Accident Facts*, p. 90.

Page 3.11-4, First Line:

Replace the following:

The Fremont Fire Department currently operates eight fire stations.

With the following:

The Fremont Fire Department currently operates nine fire stations.

Page 3.12-13, third paragraph, fourth sentence:

Replace the following:

City of Fremont plans provide for Osgood Road/Warm Springs Boulevard to become a four-lane undivided facility from Washington Boulevard to just north of Mission Boulevard.

With the following:

City of Fremont plans provide for Osgood Road/Warm Springs Boulevard to become a four-lane facility with provision for left turn movements from Washington Boulevard to just north of Mission Boulevard.

Page 3.12-20, Second Line under RAIL LINES:

Replace the word "barriers" with "automated gates."

Page 3.12-36, Table 3.12-9:

Correct typographical error:

- For Driscoll Rd.-Osgood Rd./Washington Bl, the evening peak hour V/C ratio with the proposed project should be 1.09.

The corrected table is attached.

Page 3.12-56, After the Second Bullet:

Add a new bullet:

- I-680 Northbound Ramps-Luzon/Washington Boulevard would have an evening peak hour LOS E, with or without the project. The BART extension would contribute 1.2 percent of the traffic to this intersection in year 2010.

Page 3.12-56:

Delete the last bullet regarding Fremont Boulevard/Cushing Road-I-880 Southbound Ramps.

On the following pages and tables:

Page 3.12-57, Table 3.12-10;

Page 3.12-77, Table 3.12-17;

Page 3.12-85, Table 3.12-22;

Page 3.12-91, Table 3.12-27;

Page 3.12-103, Table 3.12-37:

Incorporate City of Fremont comments regarding planned improvements, with and without the project for these intersections:

- I-680 Northbound Ramps-Luzon/Washington Boulevard, which results in significant impact both with and without the project.
- I-680 Northbound Ramps/Durham Road, which changes impact to not significant.
- Fremont Boulevard/Cushing Road-I-880 Southbound Ramps, which changes impact to not significant.

The corrected tables are attached.

Table 3.12-9 (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Proposed Project
Year 1998

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
Irvington							
1. Fremont Bl/Bay St/ Washington Bl	A.M.	B (0.64)	B (0.65)		218	9.4	No
	P.M.	D (0.81)	D (0.83)		200	6.6	
2. Driscoll Rd-Osgood Rd/ Washington Bl		F (1.23)	F (1.39)		308	8.7	Yes
		E (0.95)	F (1.09)		282	7.4	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Washington Bl		E/A	E/B		35	2.2	No
		E/C	E/C		32	1.8	
4. I-680 NB Ramps-Luzon/ Washington Bl		A (0.55)	A (0.55)		34	2.0	No
		B (0.62)	B (0.63)		31	1.6	
5. Osgood Rd/Blacow Rd		A (0.41)	A (0.41)		13	1.0	No
		A (0.29)	A (0.29)		12	1.2	
6. Osgood Rd/BART St Irvington		--	A (0.44)		299	18.9	No
		--	A (0.41)		228	19.1	
Warm Springs							
1. Osgood Rd/ Durham Rd		C (0.79)	C (0.79)		78	1.6	No
		D (0.85)	D (0.85)		71	1.6	
2. I-680 SB Ramps/ Durham Rd		B (0.64)	B (0.65)		67	1.5	No
		A (0.59)	B (0.61)		61	1.8	
3. I-680 NB Ramps/ Durham Rd		A (0.51)	A (0.52)		45	2.3	No
		A (0.42)	A (0.44)		52	2.5	
4. S. Grimmer Bl/Osgood Rd-Warm Springs Bl		>C	>C		195	7.0	Yes
		>C	>C		177	8.2	
5. Fremont Bl/ S. Grimmer Bl		A (0.49)	A (0.49)		50	2.2	No
		A (0.44)	A (0.44)		46	2.2	
6. Fremont Bl/ I-880 NB Ramps		F/A	F/A		44	2.5	Yes
		E/B	E/B		40	2.1	
7. Fremont Blvd/Cushing Rd-I-880 SB Ramps		>C	>C		21	0.9	Yes
		>C	>C		29	2.0	
8. Mohave Dr/ Mission Bl		C (0.80)	D (0.84)		281	5.5	Yes
		F (1.25)	F (1.30)		256	4.4	
9. Warm Springs Bl/BART St W.S. North		--	C (0.71)		417	15.5	No
		--	B (0.64)		263	10.4	
10. Warm Springs Bl/ BART St W.S. South		--	B (0.63)		434	16.3	No
		--	C (0.75)		395	14.9	
11. Warm Springs Bl/ Mission Bl		E (0.96)	E (0.97)		359	5.1	Yes
		F (1.02)	F (1.02)		326	3.6	

Note: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-9 - continued (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Proposed Project
Year 1998

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
<i>South Warm Springs</i>							
1. Milmont Dr/ Kato Rd	F/D		F/E		290	12.8	Yes
	F/A		F/B		263	16.2	
2. Warm Springs Bl/ Kato Rd/Scott Creek Rd	C (0.71)		C (0.77)		178	4.7	Yes
	D (0.82)		D (0.87)		161	4.0	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Scott Creek Rd	E/A		E/A		98	4.2	No
	D/A		D/A		89	4.0	
4. I-680 NB Ramps/ Scott Creek Rd	A/A		A/A		76	4.7	No
	A/A		A/A		34	2.5	
5. N. Milpitas Bl/ Dixon Landing Rd	E (0.93)		E (0.94)		75	2.3	Yes
	D (0.86)		D (0.88)		68	2.0	
6. Milmont Dr/ Dixon Landing Rd	F (1.10)		F (1.28)		285	9.0	Yes
	A (0.58)		B (0.69)		259	10.5	
7. I-880 NB Ramps-California Cr/Dixon Landing Rd	F (1.16)		F (1.32)		285	8.5	Yes
	D (0.82)		E (0.94)		259	8.8	
8. I-880 SB Ramps/ Dixon Landing Rd	A/A		A/A		64	3.5	No
	A/A		A/A		171	11.5	
9. Warm Springs Rd/BART St S.W.S. North	--		A (0.54)		8	0.3	No
	--		A (0.46)		7	0.3	
10. Warm Springs Rd/ BART St S.W.S. SE	--		B (0.62)		139	5.5	No
	--		A (0.51)		126	5.1	
11. Kato Rd/BART St S.W.S. South	--		A (0.49)		332	24.0	No
	--		A (0.33)		301	53.5	

Note: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-10 - (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Proposed Project
Year 2010 (Cumulative Impact)

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
<i>Irvington</i>							
1. Fremont Bl/Bay St/ Washington Bl	A.M.	F (1.03)	F (1.03)		40	1.1	Yes
	P.M.	F (1.05)	F (1.05)		37	0.8	
2. Driscoll Rd-Osgood Rd/ Washington Bl	A	(0.60)	B (0.66)		142	4.0	No
	C	(0.78)	C (0.80)		130	3.2	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Washington Bl		E/D	E/D		40	1.4	Yes
		F/F	F/F		37	1.2	
4. I-680 NB Ramps-Luzon/ Washington Bl	C	(0.75)	C (0.76)		38	1.5	Yes
	E	(0.97)	E (0.98)		35	1.2	
5. Osgood Rd/Blacow Rd	A	(0.45)	A (0.55)		221	9.4	No
	A	(0.54)	A (0.58)		203	8.8	
6. Osgood Rd/BART St Irvington	--		A (0.45)		229	16.5	No
	--		A (0.50)		217	12.5	
<i>Warm Springs</i>							
1. Osgood Rd/ Durham Rd	E	(0.96)	E (0.97)		93	1.5	Yes
	D	(0.87)	E (0.94)		84	1.5	
2. I-680 SB Ramps/ Durham Rd	D	(0.86)	D (0.88)		79	1.9	Yes
	A	(0.50)	A (0.51)		72	2.1	
3. I-680 NB Ramps/ Durham Rd	C	(0.78)	D (0.80)		53	2.0	No
	B	(0.69)	B (0.70)		62	2.4	
4. S. Grimmer Bl/Osgood Rd-Warm Springs Bl	B	(0.62)	B (0.67)		231	8.3	No
	A	(0.46)	A (0.50)		210	8.2	
5. Fremont Bl/ S. Grimmer Bl	A	(0.59)	A (0.60)		59	2.2	No
	A	(0.45)	A (0.47)		54	2.3	
6. Fremont Bl/ I-880 NB Ramps	C	(0.71)	C (0.71)		53	1.3	No
	A	(0.42)	A (0.42)		48	1.3	
7. Fremont Blvd/Cushing Rd-I-880 SB Ramps	C	(0.74)	C (0.74)		25	0.4	No
	C	(0.77)	C (0.77)		34	0.6	
8. Mohave Dr/ Mission Bl	D	(0.83)	D (0.90)		334	5.3	Yes
	D	(0.87)	E (0.91)		304	5.3	
9. Warm Springs Bl/BART St W.S. North	--		C (0.79)		496	17.0	No
	--		A (0.46)		313	17.3	
10. Warm Springs Bl/ BART St W.S. South	--		B (0.67)		516	17.6	No
	--		A (0.52)		469	23.9	
11. Warm Springs Bl/ Mission Bl	E	(0.95)	E (0.96)		426	5.3	Yes
	C	(0.77)	D (0.88)		388	5.8	

Notes: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

Level of impact assumes implementation of improvements planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-10 - continued (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Proposed Project
Year 2010 (Cumulative Impacts)

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
<i>South Warm Springs</i>							
1. Milmont Dr/ Kato Rd	C (0.71)		D (0.82)		326	12.9	No
	A (0.59)		C (0.79)		296	13.0	
2. Warm Springs Bl/ Kato Rd/Scott Creek Rd	E (0.91)		E (0.94)		200	3.9	Yes
	C (0.72)		C (0.77)		182	4.7	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Scott Creek Rd	A (0.35)		A (0.37)		110	5.1	No
	A (0.45)		A (0.45)		100	3.8	
4. I-680 NB Ramps/ Scott Creek Rd	A/A		A/A		85	5.4	No
	A/A		A/A		38	2.5	
5. N. Milpitas Bl/ Dixon Landing Rd	F (1.01)		F (1.01)		84	2.3	Yes
	D (0.88)		D (0.90)		76	2.2	
6. Milmont Dr/ Dixon Landing Rd	F (1.02)		F (1.22)		321	9.0	Yes
	E (0.97)		F (1.05)		292	8.1	
7. I-880 NB Ramps-California Cr/Dixon Landing Rd	E (0.96)		F (1.12)		321	5.9	Yes
	C (0.78)		C (0.78)		292	6.7	
8. I-880 SB Ramps/ Dixon Landing Rd	A (0.60)		A (0.60)		72	2.0	No
	A (0.49)		A (0.49)		193	4.8	
9. Warm Springs Rd/BART St S.W.S. North	--		A (0.51)		9	0.3	No
	--		A (0.52)		8	0.3	
10. Warm Springs Rd/ BART St S.W.S. SE	--		A (0.58)		156	5.4	No
	--		B (0.61)		143	5.7	
11. Kato Rd/BART St S.W.S. South	--		C (0.78)		373	18.6	No
	--		A (0.46)		339	23.8	

Notes: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

Level of impact assumes implementation of improvements planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-17 (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Alternatives 4 or 5
Year 2010

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
<i>Irvington</i>							
1. Fremont Bl/Bay St/ Washington Bl	A.M.	F (1.03)	F (1.03)	F (1.06)	46	1.2	Yes
	P.M.	F (1.05)			43	1.0	
2. Driscoll Rd-Osgood Rd/ Washington Bl	B	(0.60)	B (0.66)	C (0.80)	136	3.8	No
	C	(0.78)			124	3.0	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Washington Bl	E/D		E/D	F/F	39	1.4	Yes
	F/F				36	1.2	
4. I-680 NB Ramps-Luzon/ Washington Bl	C	(0.75)	C (0.76)	E (0.98)	37	1.5	Yes
	E	(0.97)			34	1.2	
5. Osgood Rd/Blacow Rd	A	(0.45)	A (0.55)	A (0.57)	221	9.4	No
	A	(0.54)			203	8.8	
6. Osgood Rd/BART St Irvington	--		A (0.45)	A (0.50)	223	16.1	No
	--				212	12.3	
<i>Warm Springs</i>							
1. Osgood Rd/ Durham Rd	E	(0.96)	E (0.97)	E (0.93)	84	1.4	Yes
	D	(0.87)			77	1.4	
2. I-680 SB Ramps/ Durham Rd	D	(0.86)	D (0.87)	A (0.51)	67	1.6	Yes
	A	(0.50)			61	1.8	
3. I-680 NB Ramps/ Durham Rd	C	(0.98)	D (0.80)	C (0.70)	54	2.1	No
	B	(0.69)			56	2.1	
4. S. Grimmer Bl/Osgood Rd-Warm Springs Bl	B	(0.62)	B (0.66)	A (0.52)	261	9.3	No
	A	(0.46)			237	9.2	
5. Fremont Bl/ S. Grimmer Bl	A	(0.59)	B (0.61)	A (0.49)	135	4.8	No
	A	(0.45)			123	5.0	
6. Fremont Bl/ I-880 NB Ramps	C	(0.71)	C (0.71)	A (0.43)	126	3.0	No
	A	(0.42)			115	2.9	
7. Fremont Blvd/Cushing Rd-I-880 SB Ramps	C	(0.74)	C (0.74)	C (0.97)	45	0.7	No
	C	(0.77)			79	1.4	
8. Mohave Dr/ Mission Bl	D	(0.83)	D (0.90)	E (0.91)	265	4.2	Yes
	D	(0.87)			241	4.3	
9. Warm Springs Bl/BART St W.S. North	--		C (0.77)	A (0.46)	472	16.4	No
	--				320	17.6	
10. Warm Springs Bl/ BART St W.S. South	--		D (0.82)	B (0.61)	657	21.4	No
	--				597	28.5	
11. Warm Springs Bl/ Mission Bl	E	(0.95)	F (1.01)	D (0.86)	577	7.1	Yes
	C	(0.77)			525	7.7	

Notes: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

Level of impact assumes implementation of improvements planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-22 (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Alternatives 6, 7 or 8
Year 2010

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent *	
<i>Warm Springs</i>							
1. Osgood Rd/ Durham Rd	A.M.	E (0.96)	E	(0.97)	95	1.6	Yes
	P.M.	D (0.87)	D	(0.90)	86	1.6	
2. I-680 SB Ramps/ Durham Rd		D (0.86)	D	(0.87)	41	1.0	Yes
		A (0.50)	A	(0.50)	37	1.1	
3. I-680 NB Ramps/ Durham Rd		C (0.78)	C	(0.79)	30	1.2	No
		B (0.69)	B	(0.69)	33	1.3	
4. S. Grimmer Bl/Osgood Rd-Warm Springs Bl		B (0.62)	B	(0.66)	217	7.8	No
		A (0.46)	A	(0.50)	197	7.8	
5. Fremont Bl/ S. Grimmer Bl		A (0.59)	A	(0.60)	81	2.9	No
		A (0.45)	A	(0.47)	74	3.1	
6. Fremont Bl/ I-880 NB Ramps		C (0.71)	C	(0.71)	47	1.2	No
		A (0.42)	A	(0.42)	43	1.1	
7. Fremont Blvd/Cushing Rd-I-880 SB Ramps		C (0.74)	C	(0.74)	25	0.4	No
		C (0.77)	C	(0.77)	31	0.5	
8. Mohave Dr/ Mission Bl		D (0.83)	D	(0.90)	369	5.8	Yes
		D (0.87)	E	(0.92)	336	5.8	
9. Warm Springs Bl/BART St W.S. North		--	D	(0.83)	509	17.4	No
		--	A	(0.46)	310	17.2	
10. Warm Springs Bl/ BART St W.S. South		--	B	(0.66)	535	18.1	No
		--	A	(0.53)	487	24.6	
11. Warm Springs Bl/ Mission Bl		E (0.95)	E	(0.96)	457	5.7	Yes
		C (0.77)	D	(0.89)	416	6.2	
<i>South Warm Springs</i>							
1. Millmont Dr/ Kato Rd		C (0.71)	D	(0.82)	347	13.6	No
		A (0.59)	D	(0.81)	315	13.7	
2. Warm Springs Bl/ Kato Rd/Scott Creek		E (0.91)	E	(0.94)	204	4.0	Yes
		C (60.72)	C	(0.77)	185	4.8	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Scott Creek Rd		A (0.35)	A	(0.37)	116	5.3	No
		A (0.45)	A	(0.45)	105	4.0	

Notes: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

Level of impact assumes implementation of improvements planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-27 (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Alternative 9
Year 2010

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
<i>Warm Springs</i>							
1. Osgood Rd/ Durham Rd	A.M.	E (0.96)	E	(0.97)	84	1.4	Yes
	P.M.	D (0.87)	D	(0.87)	76	1.4	
2. I-680 SB Ramps/ Durham Rd		D (0.86)	D	(0.86)	17	0.4	Yes
		A (0.50)	A	(0.50)	15	0.5	
3. I-680 NB Ramps/ Durham Rd		C (0.78)	C	(0.79)	10	0.4	No
		B (0.69)	B	(0.69)	13	0.5	
4. S. Grimmer Bl/Osgood Rd-Warm Springs Bl		B (0.62)	B	(0.66)	252	9.0	No
		A (0.46)	A	(0.46)	229	9.0	
5. Fremont Bl/ S. Grimmer Bl		A (0.59)	B	(0.61)	143	5.1	No
		A (0.45)	A	(0.45)	130	5.3	
6. Fremont Bl/ I-880 NB Ramps		C (0.71)	C	(0.71)	109	2.6	No
		A (0.42)	A	(0.42)	99	2.5	
7. Fremont Blvd/Cushing Rd-I-880 SB Ramps		C (0.74)	C	(0.74)	35	0.6	No
		C (0.77)	C	(0.77)	69	1.2	
8. Mohave Dr/ Mission Bl		D (0.83)	D	(0.90)	273	4.4	Yes
		D (0.87)	E	(0.87)	248	4.3	
9. Warm Springs Bl/BART St W.S. North		--	C	(0.76)	468	16.2	No
		--	A	(0.46)	313	17.3	
10. Warm Springs Bl/ BART St W.S. South		--	C	(0.80)	638	20.9	No
		--	A	(0.61)	579	27.9	
11. Warm Springs Bl/ Mission Bl		E (0.95)	F	(1.01)	583	7.1	Yes
		C (0.77)	C	(0.77)	530	7.7	

Notes: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

Level of impact assumes implementation of improvements planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-37 (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Alternative 11
Year 2010

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
<i>Irvington</i>							
1. Fremont Bl/Bay St/ Washington Bl	A.M.	F (1.03)	F (1.03)		58	1.6	Yes
	P.M.	F (1.05)	F (1.06)		53	1.2	
2. Driscoll Rd-Osgood Rd/ Washington Bl	A (0.60)		B (0.69)		207	5.7	No
	C (0.78)		D (0.81)		188	4.6	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Washington Bl	E/D		E/D		58	2.1	Yes
	F/F		F/F		53	1.8	
4. I-680 NB Ramps-Luzon/ Washington Bl	C (0.75)		C (0.77)		56	2.2	Yes
	E (0.97)		E (0.98)		51	1.8	
5. Osgood Rd/Blacow Rd	A (0.45)		A (0.60)		324	13.3	No
	A (0.54)		A (0.59)		295	12.3	
6. Osgood Rd/BART St Irvington	--		A (0.47)		334	22.4	No
	--		A (0.54)		315	17.2	
<i>South Warm Springs</i>							
1. Milmont Dr/ Kato Rd	C (0.71)		D (0.83)		372	14.4	No
	A (0.59)		D (0.83)		340	14.6	
2. Warm Springs Bl/ Kato Rd/Scott Creek Rd	E (0.91)		F (1.02)		568	10.3	Yes
	C (0.72)		C (0.79)		519	12.3	
3. I-680 SB Ramps/ Scott Creek Rd	A (0.35)		A (0.45)		461	18.4	No
	A (0.45)		A (0.47)		420	14.4	

Notes: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

Level of impact assumes implementation of improvements planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Table 3.12-37 - continued (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Traffic Analysis Results - Alternative 11
Year 2010

Intersection	W/out Proposed Project		With Proposed Project		BART-Generated Traffic		Significant Impact
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	Amount	Percent*	
<i>South Warm Springs (cont.)</i>							
4. I-680 NB Ramps/ Scott Creek Rd	A.M.	A/A		A/A	368	19.9	No
	P.M.	A/A		A/A	208	12.5	
5. N. Milpitas Bl/ Dixon Landing Rd	F	(1.01)	F	(1.01)	98	2.7	Yes
	D	(0.88)	D	(0.90)	89	2.6	
6. Milmont Dr/ Dixon Landing Rd	F	(1.02)	F	(1.24)	363	10.0	Yes
	E	(0.97)	F	(1.07)	331	9.1	
7. I-880 NB Ramps-California Cr/Dixon Landing Rd	E	(0.96)	F	(1.12)	363	6.6	Yes
	C	(0.78)	D	(0.81)	331	7.6	
8. I-880 SB Ramps/ Dixon Landing Rd	A	(0.60)	B	(0.61)	107	2.9	No
	A	(0.49)	A	(0.50)	205	5.1	
9. Warm Springs Rd/BART St S.W.S. North	--		A	(0.52)	56	2.0	No
	--		A	(0.53)	51	2.1	
10. Warm Springs Rd/ BART St S.W.S. SE	--		C	(0.79)	485	15.0	No
	--		C	(0.80)	453	16.1	
11. Kato Rd/BART St S.W.S. South	--		D	(0.81)	485	22.9	No
	--		A	(0.47)	443	29.0	

Notes: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is shown as AM peak hour on top of PM peak hour. Unsignalized one- and two-way stop controlled intersections are shown as the worst movement from the minor street followed by the worst movement from the major street (e.g. D/A). Unsignalized all-way stop controlled intersections are shown as either better than LOS C (<C) or worse than LOS C (>C).

Level of impact assumes implementation of improvements planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.

*BART generated traffic as a percent of total volume at intersection.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991.

Page 3.12-62, Table 3.12-12:

Remove line 3 under South Warm Springs, regarding I-680 Southbound Ramps/Scott Creek Road.

The mitigation measure shown would not be needed in 1998, since the unsignalized level of service of E is not considered a significant impact.

Page 3.12-62, Table 3.12-12:

There are several corrections to this table. The corrected table is provided. The following changes have been made:

- Driscoll Road-Osgood Road/Washington Boulevard: The A.M. peak LOS under the "effect of mitigation" column should read "B (0.70)." The improved lane configuration should be changed to remove references to dedicated right turn lanes, and to change the southbound through movement to three through lanes.
- Fremont Boulevard/I-880 northbound ramps: The effect with the proposed project is shown as a signalized intersection. This intersection is currently unsignalized. Also, the effect of the mitigation was typed incorrectly, and the comments should indicate that this improvement involves interchange reconstruction.

Page 3.12-63, Table 3.12-13:

There are several corrections to this table. The corrected table is provided. The following changes have been made:

- Driscoll Rd.-Osgood Road/Washington Boulevard: The eastbound approach should not show a dedicated right turn lane. It should instead have three through lanes.
- I-680 NB Ramps-Luzon/Washington Boulevard: Reflect that the City of Fremont has no improvement plans. Show additional needed improvements at this intersection to mitigate.
- I-680 NB Ramps/Durham Road: Change the City of Fremont's planned improvement in accord with City's comment letter. These improvements are adequate, so no further mitigation would be needed.
- Fremont Boulevard/I-880 northbound ramps: The table shows that two southbound left turn lanes are planned. The correct planned improvement

**Table 3.12-13 (Revised)
Summary of Intersection Mitigation Measures & Residual Impacts -- Proposed Project
Year 2010 - Cumulative**

Irvington	Impact with Proposed Project	Effect of Mitigation	Residual Significant Impact	Exist. Plinnd. Addtl.	Northbound						Southbound						Number of Lanes						Comments				
					Impact			Mitigation			Residual			Exist. Plinnd. Addtl.			Lanes			Lanes				Lanes			
					L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R		L	T	R	
1.	Union/Fremont/ Bay - Washington	AM F (1.03) PM F (1.05)	..4	Yes	Exist. Plinnd. Addtl.	0	2	1*	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	
2.	Driscoll Rd-Osgood Washington Bl	B (0.66) C (0.80)	NA	No		1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	1	b
3.	I-680/SB Ramps/ Washington Bl	E/D E/F	NA	Yes		0	0	0	1	0	1*	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	2	1*	0	2	1*	0	2	1*	c
4.	I-680 NB Ramps-LUzon/ Washington Bl	C (0.76) E (0.98)	C (0.76) C (0.74)	No		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	c
5.	Osgood Rd/Blacow Rd	A (0.55) A (0.58)	NA	No		0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	b
Warm Springs																											
1.	Osgood Rd/ Durham Rd	E (0.97) E (0.94)	C (0.76) C (0.75)	No		1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	c
2.	I-680 SB Ramps/ Durham Rd	D (0.88) A (0.51)	NA	Yes		2	0	1*	0	0	0	0	2	1*	0	2	1*	0	2	1*	0	2	0	1	2	0	d
3.	I-680 NB Ramps/ Durham Rd	D (0.80) B (0.70)	NA	No		2	1	1	1	1**	1	1	2	1*	1	2	1*	1	2	1*	1	2	0	2	0	0	b
4.	S. Grimer Bl/Osgood Rd - Warm Springs Bl	B (0.67) A (0.05)	NA	No		1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	b
6.	Fremont Bl/ I-880 NB Ramps	C (0.71) A (0.42)	NA	No		0	1	0	0	1	1*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1*	b
7.	Fremont Bl/Cushing Rd - I-880 SB Ramps	C (0.74) C (0.77)	NA	No		0	1	1	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	b

Note: For each intersection, LOS and V/C ratio is given for AM peak hour over PM peak hour. Lane configurations are existing geometrics over planned geometrics (by Fremont or Milpitas) over additional improvements.

1. Impact with proposed project assumes implementation of City of Fremont or Milpitas improvement plans. See Appendix D for details of mitigation measures at intersections for the proposed project and all alternatives.

Guide to comments:
a. Mitigation includes installation of traffic signal.
b. Mitigation implements City of Fremont or Milpitas plans.
c. Mitigation is more than planned by City of Fremont or Milpitas.
d. Impact slightly exceeds City of Fremont goal of 0.85 V/C ratio; additional mitigation not recommended.
e. Additional mitigation not feasible.
* = Free right turn where exclusive turn lane has an exclusive receiving lane, allowing free flow traffic without yielding; ** = One through lane is a shared left turn lane; *** Right turn movement would have overlap signal phase with northbound turn lane. U-turns should be prohibited on the northbound approach.

Source: DKS Associates, 1991

has no left turn lanes, since left turning traffic will be accommodated by the new loop on-ramp. This change does not affect the LOS analysis, since there was no traffic assigned to the movement in question.

- Fremont Boulevard/Cushing Road-I-880 SB Ramps: Reflect the City of Fremont's comment that overlap phasing on the eastbound right turn movement would create acceptable levels of service.

Page 3.12-65, First Bullet, First Line:

Replace the following:

At Driscoll Road-Osgood Road/Washington Boulevard, implement the City of Fremont's planned improvements which include adding two through lanes and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach, one through lane on the southbound approach, one through-lane and a free-flow right-turn lane on the eastbound approach.

With the following:

- At Driscoll Road-Osgood Road/Washington Boulevard, implement the City of Fremont's planned improvements which include adding two thru-lanes on the northbound approach, one thru-lane on the southbound approach, one thru-lane and a free flow right turn lane on the eastbound approach.

Page 3.12-65, Fifth Bullet:

Add the following sentence:

In the Traffic Impact Fee Study, this intersection was identified as an existing deficiency to be improved by the City.

Page 3.12-65, Sixth Bullet:

Add the following sentence:

In the Traffic Impact Fee Study, this intersection was identified as an existing deficiency to be improved by the City.

Page 3.12-66, First Bullet:

Add a reference to improvements on the eastbound and westbound approaches.

Replace the following:

At Milmont Drive/Kato Road, implement the City's planned improvements which are to signalize the intersection, and widen the northbound and southbound approaches to two through-lanes, and one left-turn lane.

With the following:

- At Milmont Drive/Kato Road, implement the City's planned improvements which are to signalize the intersection, widen the northbound and southbound approaches to two thru-lanes, and one left turn lane, and with the eastbound and westbound approaches to have one left, thru and right lane.

Page 3.12-66, Third bullet:

Regarding the I-680 Southbound Ramps/Scott Creek Road intersection, remove the following:

- At I-680 Southbound Ramps/Scott Creek Road, the improvements planned by the City of Fremont involve signalization. There would be no residual impact after the mitigation.

Page 3.12-67, Third Bullet:

Remove reference to improvements at this intersection being planned by the City of Fremont.

Replace the following:

- At I-680 Northbound Ramps-Luzon/Washington Boulevard, implementation of the City's planned improvements would result in an acceptable LOS with no residual impact. The improvement involves the addition of a second left-turn lane on the southbound and eastbound approaches.

With the following:

- At I-680 Northbound Ramps-Luzon/Washington Boulevard, add a second left turn lane on the southbound and eastbound approaches. These improvements would be needed with or without the proposed project. There would be no residual impact.

Page 3.12-67, Last Bullet:

Replace the following:

- At I-680 Northbound Ramps/Durham Road, the City's planned improvement (making the eastbound-to-southbound right-turn movement free flowing) would not be adequate. Providing a second

left-turn lane on the eastbound approach would result in no residual impact.

With the following:

- At I-680 Northbound Ramps/Durham Road, the City's planned improvements are adequate. These improvements involve restriping the center lane as a through-left lane on the southbound approach, adding a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach, and adding a right turn lane on the westbound approach.

Page 3.12-79, First Paragraph:

Replace the following:

The difference in alignment between Alternatives 6, 7 and 8 is expected to have no effect on the level of transportation impacts. They are therefore discussed together.

With the following:

The difference in alignment between Alternatives 6, 7 and 8 is expected to have little effect on the level of transportation impacts. They are therefore discussed together. However, Alternative 8, which would be an aerial alignment down the street median of Osgood Road and Warm Springs Boulevard, would constrain the ability to provide turn lanes due to the 70 - 80 foot spans between columns.

Page 3.12-87, First Paragraph:

Add this paragraph:

Alternative 8 would require additional mitigation measures to accommodate the elevated span down the median of Osgood Road and Warm Springs Boulevard. This would involve lengthening and spacing the spans such that adequate room is given to accommodate turn movements at intersections.

Page 5-2:

Add the following paragraph between the sixth and seventh paragraphs:

The intersections of I-680/SB Ramps/Washington Boulevard, I-680 SB Ramps/Durham Road, Mohave Drive/Mission Boulevard, and Warm Springs Boulevard/Kato Road - Scott Creek would operate at V/C ratios greater than 0.85 after mitigation and are significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

Page 6-2, Second Paragraph:

Replace the following paragraph:

- **Visual Quality.** Additional development will create an environment that is more built up which would allow the BART aerial structures less likely to contrast with or dominate their surroundings. Development and the maturation of plantings around Central Park will contribute to a visually complex environment capable of visually absorbing the BART structures.

With the following:

- **Visual Quality.** Now-vacant and underutilized areas along the project alignment are likely to be developed in the future. In general, the result of this additional development will create an environment that is more built up and, as a consequence, the BART aerial structures are less likely to contrast with or dominate their surroundings. Even in Central Park, new civic buildings proposed at the park's north end would create a setting in which the BART aerial structure would be less obtrusive. In other areas of the park new and maturing landscaping will create a more visually complex environment that would be more capable of absorbing the proposed BART structures.

Page 9-12, End of Page:

Add new section:

9.2.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (Section 15126(d)(2)) state that an "environmentally superior alternative," in consideration of avoidance of adverse impacts of the project, i.e., the proposed BART extension, should be discussed in the EIR. The environmentally superior alternative in terms of avoidance of significant adverse impacts would be the No Project alternative where there would be no adverse effects because there would be no construction or operation of a BART extension. However, the No Project alternative would also not have any of the beneficial effects associated with implementation of the BART alternatives.

In addition, the CEQA Guidelines state that if the No Project alternative is found to be the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Using this guideline, these identifications can be made. For "local" impacts, i.e., those that occur close to the project, Alternative 3, the TSM

alternative, would create fewer adverse impacts on vegetation, wildlife, noise, displacement, and visual quality. On a regional basis, the BART build alternatives are generally superior to the No Project: regional miles traveled would be reduced, air quality would improve, energy usage would decline, and transit service levels would be improved. Overall, the level of transit service provided to residents of the corridor would be greater with the BART build alternatives. Of the build alternatives, Alternative 9, a 5.4-mile extension with one station at Warm Springs, would have the least adverse effects because of the shorter length and the deletion of the adverse effects of the Irvington Station. Of the extensions to the county line (7.8 miles), Alternative 10, which has only one station at South Warm Springs, would avoid the adverse impacts associated with the stations at Irvington and Warm Springs. However it should be noted that these "environmentally superior alternatives" do not provide as high a level of transit service.

Of the Design Options for Central Park, Design Option 2S (subway around Lake Elizabeth, avoiding the lake) would be the environmentally superior design option as it would avoid the remnant of the riparian forest and would have less impacts to the recreational values of the park.

Appendix D, Page D-2:

Modify table D-2 to eliminate references to dedicated right turn lanes for the northbound and southbound approaches. Show the southbound approach as having three through lanes.

Revised table included.

5.2 NEW MITIGATIONS

The following items represent new mitigations, new coordination efforts or mitigations as a result of comments during the public review period and responses to those comments.

Construction Storage Yard

Contractor's site plans will be reviewed by BART and the City of Fremont to control the locations and durations of storage.

City of Fremont Review Opportunities

Although BART is not required to obtain building permits from local municipalities, an opportunity for technical review of the contract plans and specifications will be provided to the City of Fremont.

The Fremont Fire Department will be afforded review opportunities as requested. BART will work with the Fremont Fire Department on the proposed Extension in the same manner as on the existing BART Fremont Station.

