

1.1 Project Overview

In 1992, the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) adopted the Warm Springs Extension (WSX) project, consisting of a 5.4-mile, two-station extension of the BART system south from the existing Fremont Station to Warm Springs (Adopted Project). The Adopted Project was not constructed because sufficient funds were not available. BART is now proposing to adopt certain modifications and updates to the Adopted Project. The revised project, referred to herein as the Proposed Project, consists of a 5.4-mile extension of the BART system south from the Fremont Station, with a new station at Warm Springs and an optional station at Irvington. Due to changes in the project and in the surrounding circumstances since 1992, the Proposed Project is evaluated in this final supplemental environmental impact report (FSEIR).

On March 25, 2003, BART distributed a draft supplemental environmental impact report (DSEIR) to public agencies and the general public for comment. The DSEIR is a supplement to the environmental impact report (EIR) certified by the BART Board in 1992 (1992 EIR), at the time that the Adopted Project was originally adopted. As then proposed, the Adopted Project consisted of a 5.4-mile, two-station extension of the BART system south of the existing Fremont Station, with new stations at Irvington and Warm Springs and an aerial BART alignment over Lake Elizabeth in Fremont Central Park. In addition, BART also approved a subway alignment under Lake Elizabeth as a design option contingent on availability of local funding. The Proposed Project addressed in the DSEIR is a 5.4-mile extension from the existing Fremont BART Station with a subway alignment under Fremont Central Park and Lake Elizabeth to a terminus station at Warm Springs. An optional Irvington Station is analyzed as part of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is intended to provide new BART service to southern Fremont and to improve the regional transit network.

1.1.1 Project Description

The Proposed Project would consist of constructing and operating a 5.4-mile extension south from the Fremont BART Station to a terminus at Warm Springs, with an optional Irvington Station. The extension alignment would generally parallel portions of the Union Pacific (UP) railroad corridor and Interstates 680 and 880 in southern Alameda County. The initial segment of the Proposed Project would begin on an embankment at the southern end of the existing elevated Fremont BART Station. The alignment would pass over Walnut Avenue on an aerial structure and descend into a cut-and-cover subway north of Stevenson Boulevard. The alignment would continue southward in the subway structure under Fremont Central Park and the eastern arm of Lake Elizabeth, and surface to at grade north of Paseo Padre Parkway. The alignment would pass over grade-separated Paseo Padre

Parkway, and then continue southward at grade, passing under grade-separated Washington Boulevard. From Washington Boulevard, the Proposed Project alignment would continue at grade south to a terminus station at Warm Springs and South Grimmer Boulevards in the Warm Springs district. The Proposed Project includes an optional Irvington Station in the Irvington District at the Washington Boulevard/Osgood Road intersection.

1.1.2 Project Alternatives

The 1992 EIR examined a reasonable range of feasible alternatives, including 11 alignments and 6 design options. Alternatives described and analyzed in the DSEIR included the 2003 No-Project Alternative and the proposed Bus Alternative. Project alternatives considered but rejected in the DSEIR were the 1992 EIR alternatives, taxi service from Warm Springs to Fremont, chauffeur-driven limousine from Warm Springs to Fremont, Capitol Corridor passenger rail service, and commuter rail. The DSEIR provides a focused environmental analysis of the Proposed Project

1.2 Purpose of the FSEIR

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), BART is required, after completion of a DSEIR, to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies having jurisdiction by law with respect to the Proposed Project, and to provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the DSEIR. As the lead agency, BART is also required to respond to significant environmental issues raised in the review and consultation process.

This response to comments volume has been prepared to respond to public agency and general public comments received on the DSEIR for the WSX project, which was circulated for a 45-day public review period, March 25, 2003 to May 9, 2003, and to respond to verbal comments received at the public hearing, which was held on April 14, 2003. This document contains the public comments received on the DSEIR, written responses to those comments, and changes made to the DSEIR in response to the comments.

The FSEIR consists of three documents: the DSEIR; Appendices C–P to the DSEIR; and this response to comments volume. If the BART Board decides to adopt the project, it must consider the 1992 EIR and the FSEIR, including the responses to comments, and make specific findings that the FSEIR complies with CEQA.

The 1992 EIR and the FSEIR and supporting documentation are available at selected local libraries in Fremont, Newark, and Union City, and at 1000 Broadway, Suite 620, Oakland, CA 94607.

1.3 Format of the Response to Comments Volume

This document has been prepared as an addendum to the DSEIR, as allowed by Section 15088(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. The document includes the following sections.

- **Section 1. Introduction.**
- **Section 2. Comments on the DSEIR and Responses.** During the public review period, comments were received on the DSEIR from state, regional, and local agencies; public groups

and organizations; private companies and firms, and individuals. Section 2 contains copies of all the written comments on the DSEIR and all the verbal comments received at the public meeting (in the form of the written transcript of the meeting). Table 2-1 lists each letter and comment received on the DSEIR.

Each letter and each comment within each letter has been numbered. Each letter is given an identifying name in the top margin (e.g., Letter 2), with individual comments within the letter numbered in the right margin (e.g., 2-3 for the third comment in the second letter). Each letter is followed by responses to all the comments contained in the letter in order of occurrence. The response numbers correspond to the comment numbers.

The verbal comments in the written transcript of the public meeting are numbered similarly. The text of each commenter is given an identifying name, with individual comments numbered with in the right margin.

Section 2 also provides responses to substantive and significant environmental issues raised in the comments as required by the CEQA Guidelines Section 15132. Detailed responses are not provided to comments on the merits of the Proposed Project. When a comment is not directed to significant environmental issues related to the Proposed Project and/or the DSEIR, the comment is noted but no response is warranted.

Responses to comments generally provide clarification, explanation, or elaboration. In some cases, the responses indicate that changes, modifications, or corrections to the text of the DSEIR are required.

- **Section 3. Revisions to the DSEIR.** Section 3 contains revisions to text from the DSEIR that has been amended as a result of comments received during the public review process. Section 3 also provides modifications and corrections to the text of the DSEIR and correction of minor typographical errors identified by BART. Changes to the DSEIR are shown with page revisions in the order in which they appear in the DSEIR. Text in standard print is original text from the DSEIR. Underscored (underscored) text indicates additions to the original text, and strikethrough (~~strikethrough~~) text indicates deletions to the original text.