51. Bruce D. Ohlson (written comment at Pittsburg Public Hearing dated October 16, 2008)

Letter 51

10/16/2008

Bruce D. Ohlson
3829 Los Altos Pl
Pittsburg
Home phone: 439-5848

Subject: Written comment from meeting

51-1 Make sure you put a GIGANTIC Parking lot in Antioch at the end-of-the-line station. Be sure it is way larger than the Postage Stamp that was build in Bay Point. Make sure there is easy off-on to the freeway. Be sure to include Bike Lockers & Racks, covered and secure. Make sure that buses can easily enter and exit the station. In short, the end-of-the-line station must seamlessly interface with existing transportation infrastructure to make it easy for citizens to use this rail system. This interface will be expensive. Don't leave it to poor (broke) Antioch to plan or build this interface.

51-2 Make sure that bike lanes are placed on both directions of public streets in the 4 cardinal directions from each station. Don't leave this to the cities!

51-3 For the same money we could install Bus Rapid Transit in the median and go TWICE as far. BRT is appropriate for the interim Transportation system as we wait for REAL BART.

51-4 Shame on the BART Board of Directors for charging an unconscionable large amount of money per mile for rail line extension(s)... $100 Million per mile is crazy. "Charge" the tax payers of Contra Costa County the actual cost of the construction of the extension. Costs of "wear and tear" on the rest of the system should not be factored in.

51-5 Re: The Pittsburg station. Be sure stairs are provided at Harbor Street as well as Railroad Avenue. Make it easy on pedestrians and bicyclists. Be sure that the parking lot entrance is NOT on Bliss Avenue. Save Bliss Ave for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit patrons. Be sure there is significant bicycle parking at this station, covered and secure. When widening the sidewalk on Railroad Avenue, be sure to leave sufficient shoulder space so bicyclists can continue to operate safely on Railroad Avenue.

51-6 It is a serious mistake to build this rail system with any track gauge other than current BART width. In the long run, standard gauge rail width now will preclude the construction of REAL BART because of the expense of widening the gauge. Note: DMU Power is a separate issue. The concern of this comment is with track gauge.

Bruce D. Ohlson
10/16/2008
p. 2 of 2

51-7 BART should pay for the construction of the Pittsburg Station, not Pittsburg.

51-8 Add another station at Los Medanos College.

51-9 Put the Antioch station in the median of Highway 4.

51-10 Put a roof over the platform across which people cross to change from Real BART to eBART.

51-11 Add photovoltaic cells to the roof of all stations. We live in Sunny California!

51. Bruce D. Ohlson (web form submittal dated October 16, 2008)

51.1 The Hillcrest Avenue Station in Antioch would contain 1,000 parking spaces in the initial operating phase, with the capacity to expand to a total of 2,600 spaces. Freeway access to the station would be from Hillcrest Avenue, which is immediately west of the station site and provides access to the freeway. The station would be an intermodal center, with bus parking provided close to the pedestrian concourse to the platform. Bicycle and pedestrian access would be available from Hillcrest Avenue. Bicycle lockers and racks are being considered. The City of Antioch has agreed to work with BART to secure funding for the Hillcrest Avenue Station-related parking and access.

51.2 Bike lanes exist or are planned on all the major routes leading to both the Railroad Avenue and the Hillcrest Avenue Stations. Impact TR-8 on page 3.2-96 of the Draft EIR discusses the pedestrian and bicycle access to each station. In response to this comment and other similar ones, the discussion and evaluation of pedestrian and bicycle impacts under Impact TR-8 (starting with the second paragraph) is revised as follows:

> **Railroad Avenue Station Area.** The Proposed Project is expected to generate a significant number of walking and biking trips to and from the stations (see Table 3.2-15). These modes of access to the station are especially notable at the proposed Railroad Avenue Station, which is expected to have 30 percent of the Proposed Project passengers arriving and departing by non-motorized modes. In the year 2030, this represents 266 pedestrian round trips and 19 bicycle round trips arriving at the station each weekday. In addition, the passengers arriving by auto would be walking to the station from where they parked or were dropped off. Both sides of Railroad Avenue have access to the DMU platform with stairs and elevator (see Figure 2-7). However, tThe design of the Railroad Avenue Station recognizes that the sidewalk along the west ~~east~~ side of the Railroad Avenue overcrossing of SR 4 is only 5 feet in width. The proposed station design provides additional sidewalk width in the vicinity of the station entrances. Though the station design includes safety railings that would occupy 6 to 8 inches along each sidewalk curb, the design ~~and~~ avoids construction of other physical elements that would reduce the effective width of the existing sidewalk. Also, the layout of the station platform makes it more convenient to access the station from the east side of Railroad Avenue where the sidewalk is 10 feet wide.
>
> As identified earlier, there are a number of street segments in the vicinity of the Railroad Avenue Station that lack sidewalks either on

one or both sides. The Railroad Avenue Specific Plan prepared by the City of Pittsburg calls for a comprehensive program of sidewalk improvements which would result in construction of sidewalks for all the identified sidewalk gaps and upgrading the existing sidewalks in the area to a 10-foot width (with the exception of the sidewalk on the west side of the Railroad Avenue bridge over SR 4). If widening this sidewalk, which is now 5 feet in width, required a physical widening of the bridge, it could be prohibitively expensive. Other design solutions, such as narrowing the traffic lanes to expand the sidewalk, may be feasible. BART is committed to cooperating with the City of Pittsburg and others in their efforts to enhance safety and security on the Railroad Avenue overpass sidewalks. There are currently sidewalks in the station area on both sides of the primary streets that provide access to the station. One notable exception is Bliss Avenue which lacks sidewalks on either side between Railroad Avenue and Harbor Street. As the park-and-ride parking facility for the station is located on this street segment, it would be critical that the north side sidewalks on this street are completed by the time the Railroad Avenue Station opens.

The Specific Plan also calls for improvement to bicycle facilities on Railroad Avenue which in coordination with the existing bicycle lanes on Harbor Street would link the Railroad Avenue Station with the major existing and planned east-west bicycle facilities located both north and south of the station.

~~The Proposed Project along with the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch that will adopt transit oriented development plans that specifically call for strong linkages between the surrounding development and the stations are expected to enhance the network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.~~

Hillcrest Avenue Station Area. The primary access route for pedestrians and bicyclists to the Hillcrest Avenue Station would be Hillcrest Avenue. The linkage to the station from Hillcrest Avenue would be via improvements to existing Sunset Drive by BART. Hillcrest Avenue lacks a sidewalk along its western side between Sunset Drive and East 18th Street. While it would be desirable to complete this sidewalk, there is an adequate sidewalk along the east side of the street which is closest to the Hillcrest Avenue Station. The City of Antioch has prepared a Ridership Development Plan for the Hillcrest Station Area. This plan includes new roadway facilities such as Slatten Ranch Road, Phillips Lane, and Viera Avenue that will provide access to the Hillcrest Avenue Station. These new roads are

planned to have sidewalks on both sides and bicycle lanes. The CCTA is planning a redesign of the Hillcrest Avenue interchange with SR 4. This redesign takes into consideration the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists; however, with the plan to locate the Hillcrest Avenue Station near this interchange, it is important that the new design for the interchange include adequate sidewalks and facilities for bicyclists.

MITIGATION MEASURE. The following measure to be implemented along with Mitigation Measure TR-~~2~~1.1~~2~~, which calls for improvements at the Hillcrest Avenue/Sunset Drive intersection, would reduce the pedestrian and bicycle impact at the Hillcrest Avenue Station to a less-than-significant level. (LTS)

TR-8.1 Construct sidewalks and bicycles lanes along Hillcrest Avenue and Sunset Drive~~Slatten Ranch Road~~. For the Hillcrest Avenue Station, the Hillcrest Avenue/Sunset Drive intersection will be improved as required in Mitigation Measure TR-~~2~~1.1~~2~~. In addition to the improvements required by TR-~~2~~1.1~~2~~, improvements shall include a sidewalk along the east side of Hillcrest Avenue and a southbound bicycle lane in the areas affected by the construction of the other required intersection improvements. BART shall contribute its fair share of these intersection improvements. In addition, BART shall provide safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian access from the Sunset Drive/Hillcrest Avenue intersection to the station platform area.~~ The portion of Slatten Ranch Road to be constructed by BART shall include sidewalks and bicycle lanes.~~

51.3 The commentor expresses a preference for Bus Rapid Transit over the Proposed Project. This topic is discussed in Section 5, Alternatives, under the BRT Alternative. This comment concerns the merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

51.4 Cost estimates for the Proposed Project are based on preliminary engineering estimates for construction costs. The estimated costs of the Proposed Project do not include any cost items related to the maintenance or the improvement of the existing BART system. Please refer to the breakdown of estimated capital costs for the Proposed Project in Table 2-3 (page 2-37) of the Draft EIR.

51.5 There would be access to the Railroad Avenue Station along both the east and west sidewalks of the Railroad Avenue overcrossing. No stairs would be provided from Harbor Avenue to the station platform. Currently, there is no plan to widen sidewalks on Railroad Avenue as part of the Proposed Project; however, the Draft Railroad Avenue Specific Plan does include pedestrian and bicycle improvements

to enhance access to eBART facilities (see Response 51.2 above). Access to the Bliss Avenue park-and-ride lot is from Bliss Avenue. The City of Pittsburg would assume responsibility for this parking lot, which may eventually be replaced with a parking structure in conjunction with a joint development project. The Draft Railroad Avenue Area Specific Plan calls for Bliss Avenue to be a pedestrian and bicycle oriented street, although lack of space would not allow bicycle lockers at the Railroad Avenue Station. However, there is the possibility that bicycle lockers could be provided by the City at a location near the Railroad Avenue Station.

51.6 The DMU alignment has been designed to accommodate conventional BART. All curves, grades, dimensions, and stations along the alignment would allow for a conversion to BART at a future date, if that is desired. BART is a specialized system with its own track gauge (5 feet, 6 inches) compared to standard gauge tracks, which are 4 feet 8.5 inches wide. Conversion of the DMU tracks to BART would require widening the tracks. The cost to widen the tracks has not been determined, but it would be only one component of converting the system to conventional BART, which would require installation of a third-rail power system, upgraded communications, enlarged stations, and a new, larger maintenance facility at Hillcrest Avenue. The alternative of extending existing BART technology and tracks is evaluated in Section 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. One of the principal reasons the DMU was chosen as the Proposed Project is because it is more cost efficient given the expected ridership. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 2 in Section 3 of this document for further information about BART's decision to advance the DMU technology rather than conventional BART technology.

51.7 The City of Pittsburg offered to pay for design and construction of the Proposed Project's Railroad Avenue Station in order to expedite station development.

51.8 A station at Los Medanos (Century Boulevard) was considered for a possible station site during the original feasibility study of the Proposed Project. However, it did not meet the criteria used to identify potential station sites, which included the following issues:

- Station spacing – Century Boulevard is very close to Railroad Avenue.
- Density of existing and potential future development – The predominant land use is low density retail. Most of the vacant land is slated to be developed as auto dealerships. There is limited opportunity for transit-oriented development (TOD) and the current uses are not transit supportive.
- Accessibility from the local and regional highway network – Century Boulevard does not have freeway access and the nearby Somersville Road interchange is very congested.

- Potential transit connections – Los Medanos College, which is nearby, is the current local transit hub, and is one of the more important focal points for Tri Delta Transit. If a new hub were created at Century Boulevard, it would compete with the Los Medanos hub.
- Constructability – The commercial development in this area has been built right up to the existing right-of-way. The planned widening of SR 4 with the Proposed Project in the median would require a partial taking of several commercial parcels and a total taking of one major motel. Further widening to accommodate a station would involve displacing additional commercial buildings.
- Ridership – The Proposed Project's ridership model showed lower patronage at Century Boulevard than at Hillcrest Avenue.

51.9 The Proposed Project would provide a DMU station in the median of SR 4.

51.10 The transfer platform at Pittsburg/Bay Point would have a canopy over the central portion of the platform for weather protection.

51.11 BART is investigating the possibility of using photovoltaics at its stations. Pilot photovoltaic projects are currently being conducted at the Orinda Station, the Hayward Yard, and the Richmond Yard.

52. Jamie Owen (web form dated November 2, 2008)

Letter 52

11/2/2008

Jamie Owen

Subject: Comment for BART Project

52-1 I strongly recommend building a traditional electric operated BART extension for this project. Time has shown again and again, when short term cost pressures cause a project to be built in the non-optimum way, it costs more in the long run to make it right. Public transportation is there not only to relieve congestion but to provide an environmentally friendly way to travel. Diesel is not where the country needs to head with global warming. This also does not help our reliance on foreign oil and the national security concerns that come with it. All discussions are leading to alternate forms of energy and diesel is not one of them.

I strongly encourage BART to extend the existing line and come up with cost effective ways to deal with the land issues mentioned in the report.

Jamie Owen

Contra Costa County Resident

52. Jamie Owen (web form comment dated November 2, 2008)

52.1 The commentor expresses a preference for the Proposed Project to be powered by electricity rather than diesel. Two electric propulsion alternatives – conventional BART and Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) technology – were considered in Section 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Also, please refer to Master Response 2 and Master Response 3 in Section 3 of this document regarding electric propulsion.

.

53. Laura Park (web form dated October 10, 2008)

Letter 53

10/10/2008

Laura Park

Subject: eBART

Hello!

53-1 What is a "Self-Propelled Rail Car" - does is really utilize diesel?

- Laura Park

53. Laura Park (web form comment dated October 10, 2008)

53.1 Self-propelled rail cars are passenger rail cars that carry their own motors and do not depend on a locomotive to pull them. The self-propelled vehicles proposed for the Proposed Project use on-board diesel engines for propulsion. For this reason, they are known as Diesel Multiple Units or DMUs.

54. Joanne Perez-Morua (web form dated October 11, 2008)

Letter 54

10/11/2008

Joanne Perez-Morua

Subject: eBART

54-1 As a 57 year resident,third generation bart tax payer in the East County, I am totally dismayed that in my life time the REAL BART will not be extended to my Antioch community. I remember taking the first ride on Bart in high school, never dreaming that my grandparents,parents BART tax dollars would go for nothing all theses years. I've now been a BART tax paying citizen myself since 1971, and my grandchildren will never see the REAL BART! I get no satisfaction with this new ebart system, seeing San Francisco,Livermore get theirs before the East County is an outrage!!!!!!!!!!!!!

54. Joanne Perez-Morua (web form comment dated October 11, 2008)

54.1 The commentor expresses a preference for conventional BART over the Proposed Project. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 2 in Section 3 of this document regarding BART's selection of the DMU technology, and the Contra Costa County taxpayer's contributions to the BART system and BART's evaluation of providing conventional BART technology. Approval of the Proposed Project will be determined on the merits of the project. The Proposed Project is independent of a BART extension toward the South Bay, and has its own development history and funding sources.

55. Erica Petrofsky (web form dated November 2, 2008)

Letter 55

11/2/2008

Erica Petrofsky

Subject: Technology for proposed eBart extension

Dear Ms. Balk:

55-1 I support the extension of the BART system, but I must strongly suggest the use of electric light rail cars in the extension, instead of polluting diesel ones. It is socially and environmentally irresponsible to emit diesel air pollution, especially in terms of climate change-inducing gases. Please consider the electric alternative for the proposed extension. Thank you,

Erica Petrofsky

55. Erica Petrofsky (web form comment dated November 2, 2008)

55.1 The commentor expresses a preference for the Proposed Project to be powered by electricity rather than diesel. Two electric propulsion alternatives – conventional BART and Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) technology – were considered in Section 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Also, please refer to Master Response 2 and Master Response 3 in Section 3 of this document regarding electric propulsion.

56. Robert Robb (web form dated October 1, 2008)

Letter 56

10/1/2008 13:43

Robert Robb
robbx213@gmail.com

Subject: Comment on eBART

56-1 eBART is NOT the right thing to do. Increasing the length of the Pittsburgh/Bay Point line will simply encourage more people to move to that region, increasing urban sprawl. Furthermore, that line is already crowded with commuters coming into SF in the morning and leaving in the afternoon. By your own news article, (http://bart.gov/news/articles/2008/news20080924a.aspx) there really aren't any more cars available to handle the increased ridership.

56-2 Instead, you should extend the Dublin/Pleasanton line to Livermore. First of all, it has been part of the overall BART plan longer than any other extension. Second, the trains are nearly empty much of the time and get nowhere near capacity even when there are major events like Raiders, A's, Warriors and Giants games. Third, extending the line to Livermore would increase outbound ridership considering the number of SF residents who work at the Lawrence Livermore National Lab, which employs thousands of people. Fourth, you could connect to the ACE train and thus connect the Bay Area to the central valley by public transit. Is connecting local and regional transit services with state and country transit really that novel of a concept? More people would ride public transit if they could just transfer between services at a common point. And current options for travelers are basically to either ride a train through Sacramento and down the central valley, which takes a LOT of time, or ride an amtrak bus on 580 and pray they miss rush hour traffic. Finally, connecting the central valley to the Bay Area that way would reduce stress on the 580 corridor so that we wouldn't have to waste tax dollars on widening 580 a lane on each side just to see that lane fill up like all the others and be right back at the stop and go situation we're in right now. I mean, we wasted a bunch of money putting a stop in at West Dublin to appease a bunch of boutique shoppers and the mall's owner, why not appease all those frustrated commuters stuck in traffic on 580 every morning? Or the travelers who can't get back and forth between the Central Valley and Bay Area without driving or going through Sacramento? Or the Central Valley sports fans that clog up the freeways and parking lots because they have no other way to get to the game? The list goes on, and hopefully someone in BART that can make a difference gets my point.

56. Robert Robb (web form comment dated October 1, 2008)

56.1 A key element of the Proposed Project is the encouragement of dense development around both station sites as an alternative to typical low suburban growth that would occur if there were no transit available. Both the City of Pittsburg and the City of Antioch are involved in Ridership Development Plans which are intended to provide the mechanism to allow higher density transit-oriented development around the stations. Additionally, the eBART corridor is already developed and highly congested. The Proposed Project is intended to help relieve the congestion along SR 4 and to provide existing and future commuters with an option to using the roadways. In particular, please refer to the project objectives, beginning on page 1-10 of the Draft EIR.

56.2 The commentor suggests that the Proposed Project should not be implemented in favor of an extension of BART's Dublin/Pleasanton line. Without diminishing the merits of a BART extension to Livermore, the Proposed Project serves an important travel need and fulfills project objectives identified in the Draft EIR starting on page 1-10. As a point of information, BART is currently in the early stages of examining an extension to Livermore. Otherwise, this comment concerns the merits of the Proposed Project and does not concern the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Accordingly, no further response is required.

57. Matthew Roe (web form dated September 25, 2008)

Letter 57

9/25/2008 20:24

Matthew Roe
None
matteoroe@hotmail.com

Subject: eBART

57-1 This extension of BART is a must! I live in Brentwood and cannot wait for the extra service areas. In the long run, less traffic, less cars on the road.

57. Matthew Roe (web form comment dated September 25, 2008)

57.1 The commentor expresses support for the Proposed Project and looks forward to the extra service in the area. This comment concerns the merits of the project and does not concern the adequacy of the Draft EIR or BART's compliance with CEQA. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

58. Steve Rohwer (web form dated September 21, 2008)

Letter 58

9/21/2008 7:27

Steve Rohwer
nevadasteve@comcast.net

Subject: eBART plans

58-1 is there really only TWO stations planned for the eBART extention? If BART is really supposed to be part of a comprehensive regional alternative mass transit system, shouldn't there be at least one or two more stations in central Antioch? I know more stations means more cost, but if all can't access BART easily, what's the point?

58. Steve Rohwer (web form comment dated September 21, 2008)

58.1 Providing more stations along a transit line to increase access must be balanced with the number of additional riders provided by those stations and the cost of constructing the stations. Also, constructing stations too closely together can actually reduce ridership by increasing travel time due to station stops. Station locations are carefully chosen according to criteria, such as station spacing, density of existing and potential future development, availability of land for station facilities, accessibility from the local and regional highway network, potential transit connections, constructability, and anticipated ridership. On the existing BART system in suburban areas, the stations are typically about 4-5 miles apart. Station criteria for the Proposed Project allow a shorter distance between stations, and placing stations at Railroad Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue met the station criteria for the Proposed Project.

A station at Los Medanos (Century Boulevard) was considered for a possible station site during the original feasibility study of station criteria for the Proposed Project. However, it did not meet the criteria used to identify potential station sites, which included the following issues:

- Station spacing – Century Boulevard is very close to Railroad Avenue.
- Density of existing and potential future development – The predominant land use is low density retail. Most of the vacant land is slated to be developed as auto dealerships. There is limited opportunity for transit-oriented development (TOD) and the current uses are not transit supportive.
- Accessibility from the local and regional highway network – Century Boulevard does not have freeway access and the nearby Somersville Road interchange is very congested.
- Potential transit connections – Los Medanos College, which is nearby, is the current local transit hub, and is one of the more important focal points for Tri Delta Transit. If a new hub were created at Century Boulevard, it would compete with the Los Medanos hub.
- Constructability – The commercial development in this area has been built right up to the existing right-of-way. The planned widening of SR 4 with the Proposed Project in the median would require a partial taking of several commercial parcels and a total taking of one major motel. Further widening to accommodate a station would involve displacing additional commercial buildings.
- Ridership – The Proposed Project's ridership model showed lower patronage at Century Boulevard than at Hillcrest Avenue.

59. Rajinder Sahota (web form dated October 27, 2008)

Letter 59

10/27/2008

Rajinder Sahota

Subject: Antioch Bart Extension Plan

Hi Katie-

59-1 My name is Rajinder and I am inquiring some detailed information about the Antioch Bart Extension Plan. I own a business on Fitzuren Road off the Contra Loma/ L Street Exit and I was wondering if the new Bart Extension will affect my business. I know the Arco station is part of the land acquisation. Could you tell me which other business if any are going to part of the land acquistation at that exit. Thank you in advance for your help.

Rajinder

59. Rajinder Sahota (web form comment dated October 27, 2008)

59.1 The Proposed Project alignment is located in the median of SR 4. No stations would be located in the vicinity of the Contra Loma/L Street interchange, so there is no large-scale property acquisition in that area. The acquisition of the gas station is not required for the Proposed Project, but more likely is being acquired by Caltrans for the SR 4 widening project. A hut for the train control system has been preliminarily located on undeveloped property on the east side of Contra Loma Boulevard just south of SR 4, but it is not on Fitzuren Road.

60. Michael F. Sarabia (web form dated September 22, 2008)

Letter 60

9/22/2008 17:26

Michael F. Sarabia
Self
mchlsrrb@aol.com

Subject: eBART Environmental Impact Report

60-1 Clearly, you will get approval before the new President appoints a new EPA Director that will monitor all those that receive Federal Funds but are not fighting Global Warming. The last I heard was that eBART will be a Diesel driven train. You may be interested to know that even High Speed Rail switched to Electric from Diesel power. But, you will get under the Legal Wire and continue Carbon Emission to the eventual end of the planet. I am sure you know that all the Carbon Dioxide (and Methane) accumulates forever in the atmosphere. Any (NOTE: Cont in Later Comment) Continuing what I was writing, before I was bumped off…

60-2
- Carbon Dioxide accumulates INDEFINITELY.
- To date, there is no known way to remove it.
- Once Global Warming gets going, it will ACCELERATE.
- There is no alternative.
- Why did we not see this before?
- Because the Oceans and soil, aided by vegetation, absorbed it.

In 2006, an Ocean was found to have reached the CO2 saturation level, Oceans cannot accept any more CO2.

The soil depends on trees and vegetation to split CO2 into Carbon and Oxygen, but two factors change this.

1. There is less forest and vegetation due to wildfires and forest fires.

2. All fires add great amounts of Carbon Dioxide and Carbon Monoxide.

I am 74 years old, how old are your youngest children and grand children. Rhetorical.

Michael F. Sarabia
9/22/2008
p. 2 of 2

60-2 (cont'd)

The ovens in Auschwitz were cooler than 846 Deg. Fahrenheit, but humanity will end when the average temperature reaches somewhere around 140 or 150 F Deg. Las Vegas had one day last summer when the temperature reached 126 or 128 F Deg.

The drought in the West continues, the hurricanes are stronger and the Polar Bear is, finally, recognized to be a Threatened Species, like we all are. Have a nice day! If you move fast, you might get it all approved before Jan 19th, 2009. Sorry, I cannot wish you luck. I really have been and remain a constant and solid supporter of BART.

60. Michael F. Sarabia (web form comment dated September 22, 2008)

60.1 Please refer to Master Responses 2 and 3 in Section 3 of this document, regarding the decision to advance DMU technology for the Proposed Project.

60.2 The Proposed Project's effects on global warming are analyzed in Section 3.11, Air Quality, under Impacts AQ-3 and AQ-CU-15 of the Draft EIR. This analysis demonstrates that the Proposed Project would result in a net reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, contributing to a net benefit to global climate.