

Population, Economics, and Housing

3.6.1 Introduction

This section describes existing population and housing characteristics in Fremont, analyzes the Proposed Project's potential impacts on housing supply and population, including displacement of residential and business uses; and identifies mitigation measures to avoid or reduce adverse impacts. This section incorporates information and analysis presented in the 1992 EIR and addresses changes in area population and housing over the past decade. This section also provides updates to information regarding household income, cost of housing, employment, business activity, real estate development, retail sales, and municipal revenues and expenditures presented in the 1992 EIR.

3.6.2 Environmental Setting

Methodology for Assessment of Existing Conditions

Unlike most other analyses in this document, the discussion of population and housing impacts is related to a larger geographic region than the Proposed Project corridor and immediately adjacent areas. This broader assessment is necessary because social and economic impacts often affect a wider geographic area than other impacts; for example, property tax revenues benefit school children throughout Fremont. In addition, the data on social and economic conditions used in this section are based on units such as census tracts that extend beyond the Proposed Project corridor. Consequently, the population and housing study area includes the entire City of Fremont. Statistics about Alameda County are also presented to provide context for the characteristics of the city.

The primary source of data used in this analysis was the 2000 U.S. Census (2000 Census), which contains the most recent comprehensive dataset available. Census information was supplemented with information from the Association of Bay Area Government's (ABAG's) *Projections 2000* (Association of Bay Area Governments 2000). ABAG, a regional agency, develops economic and demographic forecasts based upon current zoning, general plans, and other local development policies, in conjunction with economic and demographic demand coming from both regional and subregional areas.

Other key sources of information consulted on existing population and housing conditions in Fremont and Alameda County included the following.

- The current *Fremont General Plan* (City of Fremont 1991, as amended).
- The *Fremont Housing Element 2001–2006* (City of Fremont 2001).
- *Projections 2002* (Association of Bay Area Governments 2001).
- City of Fremont Planning Department staff.
- City of Fremont Economic Development Department staff.
- *BART Warm Springs Extension Final Environmental Impact Report* (San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District 1991).

Population and housing information was derived from the current *Fremont General Plan* (City of Fremont 1991, as amended). Demographic information was obtained from the 2000 Census, ABAG's *Projections 2002* (Association of Bay Area Governments 2001), and from staff of the City of Fremont's Planning and Economic Development Departments. Additional information was obtained from the California Board of Equalization and Alameda County.

Existing Conditions

The City of Fremont and Alameda County have undergone substantial changes in population, demographics, and housing conditions over the past decade, as well as changes in income, real estate, employment, business activity, retail sales, and municipal revenues and expenditures. The changes in population and income, housing, and employment and business activity trends since 1990 indicate that Fremont has a vibrant, healthy economy. The city's growth rate still outpaces that of Alameda County: residential construction is strong and stable; median and average home prices have grown considerably; and employment and business activity have significantly outpaced projections. This growth suggests that Fremont will soon import workers from other Bay Area locations and beyond. In addition, vacancy rates for office and industrial space are currently less than 10%, and retail sales growth has increased annually, up from declines in the first half of the 1990s. The following sections provide additional detail. Fremont's planning areas, discussed below, are described in detail in Section 3.5 (*Land Use and Planning*).

Demography and Income

According to the 2000 Census, Fremont contains approximately 68,237 households, with a total population of 203,413 persons (3.0 persons per household) and a mean household income of \$103,100 (Table 3.6-1). The city's population growth slowed considerably between 1990 and 2000 from the rapid rate of 37% experienced between 1980 and 1990 to 17% between 1990 and 2000 (Association of Bay Area Governments 2001). Between 1980 and 1990, the growth in number of households in Fremont outpaced population growth; however, this trend reversed between 1990 and 2000, indicating that household size has grown during the last decade. As might be expected from the expansion of the economy in the late 1990s, mean annual household income has increased by 21%.

Table 3.6-1. Population Characteristics, Alameda County and Fremont

	1990	2000	% Change 1990 to 2000
Alameda County			
Total population	1,276,702	1,443,741	13.1%
Number of households	479,518	523,366	9.1%
Income of all households – mean	\$68,000	\$82,500	21.3%
Fremont			
Total population	173,339	203,413	17.3%
Number of households	60,198	68,237	13.4%
Income of all households – mean	\$85,200	\$103,100	21.0%

Note:

Income data are presented in constant 2000 dollars.

Sources: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2002

The 2000 Census indicates that Fremont's population is predominantly White (41%) and Asian (37%), with a smaller percentage of Hispanic- or Latino-heritage inhabitants of any race (13%). Other groups represent less than 10% of the city's population. The racial and ethnic makeup of Fremont's planning areas is generally similar, except that the Irvington Planning Area has twice as many Whites as Asians or Latinos, and the Mission San Jose Planning Area is predominantly Asian (52%).

Housing

The production of single-family residential homes in Fremont was steady over the 4-year period from 1998 through 2001 (Table 3.6-2). An average of 331 homes was constructed annually during that period, with a sharp increase in single-family construction during 1999. Multi-family residential construction has been volatile, with more than 400 units produced in 1998 and 2000, and only 2 units produced in 2001. Housing production in Fremont falls short of demand, according to ABAG's Regional Housing Needs Determination report. The report indicates there is need for 894 additional units per year for the period 1999–2003.

Between 1999 and 2001, 261 affordable housing units were constructed in Fremont. Of those, 240 are considered very low- and low-income housing. The remaining 21 units are considered moderate-income housing. In 2001, affordable housing assistance programs aided 2,029 very low-income households, 1,280 low-income households, and 749 moderate-income households in Fremont. Affordable housing production in Fremont also falls short of demand according, to ABAG's Regional Housing Needs Determination report.

Table 3.6-2. Residential Building Permit Activity in Fremont, 1998–2001

	Total Single-Family Units	Number of New Single-Family Units	Total Multi-Family Units	Number of New Multi-Family Units
2001	48,799	260	20,296	2
<i>% change 00–01</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>-4%</i>	<i><0.01%</i>	<i>-99%</i>
2000	48,539	271	20,294	469
<i>% change 99–00</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>-40%</i>	<i>2.3%</i>	<i>122%</i>
1999	48,268	453	19,825	211
<i>% change 98–99</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<i>-48%</i>
1998	47,815	341	19,614	404

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments

The average sale price of a single-family home was \$374,852 in 1999. The price jumped to \$502,277 in 2000 and \$506,343 in 2001; median sale prices for the same period were \$325,000 in 1999, \$430,000 in 2000, and \$449,950 in 2001. Sale prices were slightly lower for multi-family housing (condominiums), with average sale prices of \$205,466 in 1999, \$289,955 in 2000, and \$318,953 in 2001 and median sale prices of \$192,950 in 1999, \$270,000 in 2000, and \$300,000 in 2001 (Bay East Association of Realtors 2002).

Employment and Business Activity

Total employment in Fremont was estimated at 108,410 in 2000. This number reflects an increase of almost 45% over employment in 1990 (Association of Bay Area Governments 2002), and employment is projected to grow to 130,190 by 2015 (Table 3.6-3). Manufacturing (including high technology) and services industries together are expected to continue to dominate the economy: according to projections, each will individually account for 33% of the labor force by 2015. Employment in the service sector in Fremont increased to 32% in 2000 from a 1990 level of 27% (Table 3.6-4) (Association of Bay Area Governments 2002). The largest private employer in any sector is New United Motors Manufacturing, Inc. (NUMMI).

In 2000, the number of employed residents in Fremont was estimated at 108,597, roughly equivalent to the 108,410 jobs in Fremont. By 2015, Fremont is projected to have 127,300 employed residents and 130,190 total jobs, indicating an increasing number of workers commuting to work in Fremont (Association of Bay Area Governments 2002).

Table 3.6-3. Growth Projections Alameda County and Fremont, 1990–2015

	1990	2000	2005	2010	2015	% Change 1990–2015
Alameda County						
Population	1,276,702	1,443,741	1,534,400	1,588,900	1,628,800	27.6%
Households	479,518	523,366	543,400	562,010	578,540	20.7%
Household size	2.59	2.71	2.77	2.77	2.76	6.6%
Employment*	644,100	751,680	790,400	857,450	914,790	42.0%
Employed residents	645,981	697,882	730,700	789,700	833,800	29.1%
Mean household income in constant 2000 dollars	68,000	82,500	84,200	88,800	93,400	37.4%
Fremont						
Population	173,339	203,413	214,600	220,500	224,800	29.7%
Households	60,198	68,237	70,350	72,240	73,960	22.9%
Household size	2.86	2.96	3.02	3.02	3.01	5.2%
Employment*	75,100	108,410	115,700	123,270	130,190	73.4%
Employed residents	96,579	108,597	113,100	121,300	127,300	31.8%
Mean household income in constant 2000 dollars	85,200	103,100	104,600	110,700	117,100	37.4%

Note:

* The employment indicator represents the total number of jobs in the area, some of which are held by local residents and the remainder of which are held by workers living outside of the area.
1990 and 2000 numbers are actual values.

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2002

Table 3.6-4. Employment in Fremont: 1990, 2000, and 2015

	1990 (Actual)	2000 (Estimated)	2015 (Projected)
Total employed	75,100	108,410	130,190
Percentage employed in:			
Agriculture and mining	1.0%	0.8%	0.6%
Manufacturing and wholesale trade	32.5%	32.5%	33.3%
Retail trade	18.3%	14.9%	14.0%
Services	27.1%	31.6%	32.7%
Other*	20.9%	20.3%	19.5%
Employed residents	96,579	108,597	127,300
Net commuters to other areas	21,479	187	-2,890

Notes: * Other includes jobs in construction, transportation, finance, and government.

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2002

Real Estate Development

Table 3.6-5 outlines the existing supply and demand (absorption rate) for office and industrial space in Fremont. The figures show a vacancy rate of 6% for office space and 9% for industrial space and are similar to vacancy rates throughout Silicon Valley for the same time period. This statistic includes space within the City of Newark since Newark is entirely surrounded by the City of Fremont, and the two cities' office and industrial markets overlap. Conditions have changed substantially since 1990, a period of economic recession, when vacancy rates were 17% for office space and 22% for industrial space. Although the supply of office and industrial space has grown in the last 10 years, the demand for space has outpaced supply (Fremont Economic Development 2002).

Table 3.6-5. Summary of Office and Industrial Space: Supply and Absorption, City of Fremont

	Office Space (square feet) First Quarter 2002	Industrial Space (square feet) First Quarter 2002
Existing ¹	2,310,680	39,404,704
Under construction/new construction completed ²	0	495,140
Vacant ³	211,143	5,237,701
Vacancy rate ⁴	5.6%	9.3% ⁵
Net absorption	8,068 ⁶	(452,920) ⁷

Notes:

¹ Includes Class A, Class B, Class C, and Suburban Garden Office buildings over 10,000 square feet.

Source: BT Commercial Real Estate.

² Source: CB Richard Ellis.

³ Includes available direct and sublease vacancies. Source: BT Commercial Real Estate.

⁴ Vacant square feet divided by the net rentable area (NRA). Source: CB Richard Ellis.

⁵ This figure is a combined total for both Fremont and Newark. Source: CB Richard Ellis.

⁶ Fourth quarter net absorption. Source: CB Richard Ellis.

⁷ First quarter net absorption. This figure is a combined total for Fremont and Newark. Source: CB Richard Ellis.

Source: City of Fremont Economic Development Department, June 4, 2002

Retail Sales

Retail sales growth from the latter half of the 1990s through 2000 (the latest year for which figures are available) was positive for both Fremont and Alameda County (Table 3.6-6). By contrast, between 1989 and 1993–1994, periods of economic recession, average growth in retail sales for the both Fremont and Alameda County was negative (California Board of Equalization 2000).

Municipal Revenues and Expenditures

General financing at the county level has remained relatively stable over the past decade (Table 3.6-7). At the county level, charges for services, which have increased from about 6% to about 12% of total revenues, represent the largest percent change in revenues; the portion of Alameda County revenues from taxes has declined slightly, from about 28% to about 25% (County of Alameda 2001).

Table 3.6-6. Taxable Sales for Alameda County and Fremont, 1989–2000 (dollar amounts are in thousands)

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Growth 1989–2000
Alameda													
Retail	11,663	11,478	10,863	10,728	10,530	10,849	11,170	11,638	12,059	12,276	13,096	14,615	25.3%
Other	7,335	7,345	6,955	7,139	6,882	7,240	8,216	9,283	9,850	9,780	9,662	10,428	42.2%
Total all	18,997	18,823	17,818	17,867	17,412	18,089	19,386	20,921	21,909	22,056	22,758	25,043	31.8%
Fremont													
Retail	1,341	1,371	1,283	1,217	1,175	1,161	1,207	1,347	1,436	1,444	1,553	1,734	29.3%
Other	721	639	683	859	766	888	1,101	1,224	1,340	1,211	1,097	1,267	75.7%
Total all	2,061	2,010	1,966	2,076	1,941	2,049	2,308	2,571	2,776	2,655	2,650	3,000	45.6%

Note:

Adjustments to 2001 dollar are based on CPI for San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA. Series ID: CUURA422SAO

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, DC

<http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/surveymost>

Source: California Board of Equalization, Taxable Sales in California, Annual Report, 1989 through 2000

Table 3.6-7. General Financing, Fiscal Year 2000–2001 Alameda County and City of Fremont

	Alameda County (%)	City of Fremont (%)
Revenues		
Taxes and fees	24.9	69.7
Licenses and permits	0.3	0.3
Fines, forfeitures, and penalties	1.9	1.8
Use of money and property	1.3	8.4
State, federal, and other aid	55.8	11.4
Charges for current services	12.4	2.3
Franchises and surcharges	0.0	6.0
Other revenue	<u>3.4</u>	<u>0.08</u>
	100%	100%
Total revenues (in 000's)	\$1,363,473	\$108,871
Revenues per capita	\$944	\$535
Current Expenditures		
General government	7.4	22.4
Public protection	27.3	73.5
Public assistance, health, and sanitation	64.8	3.4
Public ways and facilities	0.2	0
Recreation and cultural services, education	0.03	0.7
Capital outlay	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%
Total expenditures (in 000's)	\$1,353,277	\$68,889
Expenditures per capita	\$937	\$339
Sources: County of Alameda Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, 2000–2001; City of Fremont, Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances (2000–2001)		

At the municipal level, revenue from taxes has increased by 5%, accounting for about 70% of city revenues, up from about 65% in 1989. Revenue from licenses, permits, and service charges has declined from about 9% to about 3% of Fremont revenues (City of Fremont 2001).

On the expenditure side, Alameda County is spending less on general government (administration) and public facilities, and more on community services than in 1992. In the City of Fremont, general government expenditures have increased only slightly (about 8%), but public safety costs have increased significantly, from about 45% of total expenditures to about 74%, since 1990 (County of Alameda 2001, City of Fremont 2001).

Neighborhood Characteristics

The Proposed Project alignment crosses or is adjacent to five of Fremont's planning areas: Central Area, Mission San Jose, Irvington, Industrial, and Warm Springs. Changes in these planning areas since 1990 include growth in population and households, and changes in ethnic composition.

The population of Fremont as a whole grew by 17% from 1990 to 2000. This growth was reflected in similar growth in the Mission San Jose and Warm Springs Planning Areas. The Central Area experienced the greatest population growth (22%) of the planning areas along the Proposed Project alignment. During the same period, the number of households in the Central Fremont Planning Area grew by 14%, consistent with Fremont's overall household growth rate, indicating that average household size increased in Central Fremont. The Irvington Planning Area experienced little growth (3%).

3.6.3 Relocation/Regulatory Setting

Federal

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended mandates that certain relocation services and payments be made available to eligible residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by construction and operation of transit-related projects. The Act establishes uniform and equitable procedures for land acquisition, and provides for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by federal and federally assisted programs. The Proposed Project is not a federally assisted project; however, BART complies with these regulations to address relocations that result due to capital expansion projects.

State

The California Government Code requires that relocation assistance be provided to any person, business, or farm operation displaced because of the acquisition of real property by a public entity for public use (Chapter 16, Section 7260 *et seq.*). In addition, comparable replacement properties must be available or provided for each displaced person within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement.

Local

The Housing Element of the *Fremont General Plan* (City of Fremont 1991, as amended) contains the following goals and objectives that are relevant to the Proposed Project.

- Housing Goal 1: Conservation and Enhancement of Existing Residential Neighborhoods.
- Housing Goal 2: High Quality and Well-Designed New Housing of All Types Throughout the City.

The city continues to consider these goals from the 1991 Housing Element to be important and applicable to the 2001–2006 timeframe. However, the city recently updated the Housing Element of

the *General Plan*, as required every 5 years by the state. The current Housing Element was adopted by the city in February 2002. New policies will be added to the Housing Element to respond to issues identified during the Housing Element update process. Listed below are the new policies that are applicable to the Proposed Project.

- Increase emphasis on the production of affordable rental units for very low and low income households.
- Expand city partnerships with nonprofit developers to build and maintain affordable residential units.
- Revise city procedures/requirements to encourage additional development of residential units, especially affordable units.

The Irvington Planning Area has been designated as a redevelopment area. A concept plan has been developed for the area, in which housing opportunity sites are identified. The plan identifies housing and community development goals for the redevelopment amendment process. The following goal is relevant to the Proposed Project.

- Integrate the potential future BART station and accompanying residential and commercial development into Irvington.

3.6.4 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

The CEQA Guidelines state that the economic and social effects of a project shall not be treated as a significant effect on the environment. CEQA indicates that social and economic effects be considered in an EIR only to the extent that they would result in secondary or indirect adverse impacts on the physical environment. In general, impacts on a population occur when the distribution or concentration of growth is altered by the implementation or construction of a project. Adverse impacts on housing occur when a project displaces housing or people and requires the construction of replacement housing for people who have been displaced. If businesses are displaced, business activity may also be impacted. Because the City of Fremont is conducting planning efforts in Fremont (see Section 3.5 [*Land Use and Planning*]), options for new housing development are or will be available.

Methodology for Impact Analysis

This analysis considered the impacts outlined in the 1992 EIR and evaluated the impact of the Proposed Project on the changed (post-1992) population, housing, and business activity characteristics outlined in 3.6.2 *Environmental Setting* above. It included assessments of residential and business properties displaced and potential alterations in demographic characteristics as a result of the Proposed Project.

Criteria for Determining Significance of Impacts

Criteria developed by BART and standards of professional practice were used as the adopted thresholds of significance to determine whether the Proposed Project would have significant

environmental impacts on population and housing. Based on these criteria, impacts on population and housing would be considered significant if the Proposed Project were to result in any of the following.

- Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an existing community such that social interaction within the community is severely hampered.
- Substantial growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes or buildings) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or infrastructure), not in accordance with existing community or city plans.
- Displacement of existing businesses or housing, especially affordable housing.
- Displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Significant construction impacts would occur if the Proposed Project were judged likely to result in any of the following.

- Substantial diminishment in access to residences.
- Substantial diminishment in access to, or parking at, a business.
- Physical division in a community such that social interaction within the community is severely hampered.
- Introduction of new development inconsistent with the existing community or general plan.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts Related to Warm Springs Extension

Operational Impacts

Impact POP1 – Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an existing community such that social interaction within the community is severely hampered. With the exception of the area between Walnut Avenue and Stevenson Boulevard and Fremont Central Park, which border residential and open space/recreational uses respectively, the Proposed Project alignment would largely follow the existing UP right-of-way, an established transportation corridor. Because the Proposed Project alignment is located within an established transportation corridor, fewer disruptions to the existing community are anticipated. As part of the City of Fremont's separate grade separations project (see Chapter 2 for a full description), grade-separated access would be established to provide safer and more efficient vehicle circulation across the Proposed Project alignment.

The majority of the alignment that traverses the area has been owned by BART for more than a decade, and has been kept vacant in order to support future southward extension of BART service. Consequently, development of this portion of the Proposed Project alignment with the BART guideway would not disrupt or divide adjacent residential communities compared with existing conditions.

Following the installation of the subway through Fremont Central Park, existing recreational uses would be reestablished. No elevated structures would be constructed within the park. The only permanent aboveground facilities within the park would be one or two ventilation structures. These structures would not displace recreational uses, and would not significantly affect the recreational community utilizing the park.

The proposed Warm Springs Station would occupy land that is largely vacant at present, in an area that supports concentrated commercial and industrial uses. Therefore, the proposed Warm Springs Station would not divide any neighborhoods or established communities.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of existing communities along the Proposed Project alignment, and this impact is considered less than significant. (*Less than significant.*)

Mitigation – None required.

Impact POP2 – Inducement of substantial growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes or buildings) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or infrastructure), not in accordance with existing community or city plans.¹ The Proposed Project is being developed to accommodate existing commuter demand in the area. The Proposed Project could have an indirect growth-inducing effect by accelerating planned growth in a more compact transit-oriented form, particularly in and around the Warm Springs BART Station Specific Plan Area. Changes in land use designations implemented by the City of Fremont since 1992 in the area around the proposed Warm Springs Station would allow for more mixed-use development and could indirectly encourage growth. Transit-oriented and infill development could support BART ridership growth and a reduction in automobile commuting trips in the region. Any future growth that could result from the Proposed Project is under the jurisdiction of the City of Fremont and will be addressed in the city's specific planning process (see Section 4.2.3 [Indirect Adverse Growth-Inducing Impacts in the Local Project Area]).

The Proposed Project could increase the number of jobs in the Proposed Project area by approximately 29 employees associated with BART operations. This increase represents less than 1% of Fremont's projected employment over the next 20 years and is considered negligible. Indirect employment growth could also be encouraged if new commercial development were to follow the introduction of the Warm Springs BART Station. Because this growth would be consistent with the aims of the *Fremont General Plan*, it is considered a less-than-significant impact.

In summary, the Proposed Project could have an indirect growth-inducing effect in the areas immediately adjacent to the proposed Warm Springs BART Station. However, the City of Fremont is conducting a specific planning process that will include environmental review of any changes in land use designations and zoning that would be needed to accommodate anticipated growth, including transit-oriented development. This impact is considered less than significant. (*Less than significant.*)

Mitigation – None required.

¹ Chapter 4 (*Growth-Inducing Impacts*) provides additional analysis of growth issues related to the Proposed Project.

Impact POP3 – Displacement of existing businesses or housing, especially affordable housing.

A total of approximately 29 displacements would be required for the Proposed Project, 27 of which are privately owned. Of the 27 privately owned parcels, three are residences and 24 are businesses. The 1992 EIR identified the potential displacements of the Adopted Project (see Appendix L for potential displacement tables). Some but not all of these displacements are applicable to the Proposed Project. For example, some of the businesses identified in the 1992 EIR have moved or been replaced by new businesses. Table 3.6-8 provides an update of potential displacements identified in the 1992 EIR and required for the Proposed Project. Two of the businesses identified for displacement in the 1992 EIR on High Street in the Irvington District will be displaced by the city's grade separations project. Table 3.6-9 identifies displacements required for the Proposed Project, other than those identified for the Adopted Project.

The Proposed Project would require the displacement of approximately 10 parking spaces from the rear of a parking lot at the Presidio Apartments. No residential units would be displaced.

Two of the residences that would be affected by the Proposed Project are located at 41829 and 41875 Osgood Road in the Irvington Planning Area. However, only a portion of the rear of each parcel would be required to construct a proposed traction power substation. The residences would not be displaced. Therefore, no residential relocations would be required for the Proposed Project.

Of the 24 affected privately owned business, 16 are expected to be displaced. Relatively small portions of the property at the remaining eight businesses would be required for the Proposed Project, and displacement of the operating businesses at the site is not expected to be required. Businesses affected by the Proposed Project include neighborhood-serving retail businesses such as print shops and construction contractor offices. Other businesses include contractor storage lots, container storage lots, machine shops, and motorcycle repair shops. None of these businesses are expected to have unique relocation requirements that could not be accommodated within or in the general vicinity of the Proposed Project area.

The Proposed Project could result in the loss of a portion of the current on-site parking supply for certain businesses because of partial acquisition of these parcels. Potential locations at which parking supply would be reduced are Yoko's Dance Academy, the Fremont Swim Club, Skyway Business Center, and the Spin-a-Yarn restaurant.

Displacement of businesses, including reduction of available parking, and displacement of parking at residential developments are considered significant impacts. Displacement impacts would be minimized by constructing the Proposed Project primarily within the existing UP right-of-way and by implementation of the mitigation measure described below. Mitigation for displacement impacts is guided by the Federal Uniform Relocation and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. This act sets forth mandatory minimum requirements for acquisition, appraisal, and relocation payments and services to compensate for displacements resulting from public agency projects. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure that impacts related to displacement of residents and businesses are addressed as stipulated by federal and state law, and would reduce them to less than significant. (*Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*)

Table 3.6-8. Adopted Project Potential Displacements Identified in 1992 EIR and Required for the Proposed Project

Street Number	Street Name/ Location	Use	Business Name	Number of		Notes
				Businesses	Residences	
Fremont BART Station to Stevenson Boulevard						
2000	Walnut Avenue	Multi-family residential	The Presidio Apartments	0	1	Partial displacement of rear parking lot
SP Railroad Right-of-Way to Paseo Padre Parkway						
N/A	Paseo Padre Parkway	Public facility	City and County of San Francisco	0	0	Full displacement of publicly owned water distribution pumping facility (Irvington Pump Station).
Washington Boulevard to end of Proposed Project Alignment						
41829	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Partial displacement of rear yard for potential traction power substation
41875	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Partial displacement of rear yard for potential traction power substation
42400	Osgood Road	Commercial	Yoko's Dance Academy	1	0	Partial displacement of driveway and parking area.
42400	Osgood Road	Commercial	Fremont Swim Club	1	0	Partial displacement of driveway and parking area
N/A	Osgood Road at Blacow Road	Public facility	City of Fremont Corporation Yard	0	0	Partial use of open parking and storage lot. Identified as undeveloped site in the 1992 EIR.
2878	Prune Avenue	Commercial	AJ Services	1	0	Full displacement
2878	Prune Avenue	Commercial	Euro Car	1	0	Full displacement. Identified as Tritex in the 1992 EIR.
2878	Prune Avenue	Commercial	Mallar	1	0	Partial displacement. Access to rear of business will be reduced.

Street Number	Street Name/ Location	Use	Business Name	Number of		Notes
				Businesses	Residences	
2020	Warm Springs Court	Commercial and industrial	NIP Welding	1	0	Full displacement. Listed as 3 businesses in 1992 EIR – Complete Jet Ski, T.E.M., and Prewiring, Inc.
2040	Warm Springs Court	Commercial	Chino's M.C.	4	0	Full displacement. Listed as two businesses in 1992 EIR. Four suites appear to be occupied.
2090	Warm Springs Court	Commercial and industrial	Russell Diesel Service	1	0	Partial displacement of undeveloped area at rear of parcel
2120	Warm Springs Court	Industrial	Eagle Rock & Supply	1	0	Full displacement
45915	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Spin-a-Yarn restaurant	1	0	Partial displacement of unpaved overflow parking are behind restaurant.
45945	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Amstar Storage Containers	1	0	Listed as unoccupied in 1992 EIR. Partial displacement of rear storage yard.
45973 #1	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Design Glass	1	0	Full displacement.
45973 #2	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Scroggins Construction	1	0	Full displacement. Listed as Vontrex in 1992 EIR
45973 #3	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Allied Contractors	1	0	Full displacement. Listed as T J N/C Machining in 1992 EIR
45974 #4	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Quadrant Machine, Inc.	1	0	Full displacement. Listed as Bay's Machine Shop in 1992 EIR
45973 #5	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Unknown	1	0	Full displacement. Listed as Valley Quartz in 1992 EIR.

Street Number	Street Name/ Location	Use	Business Name	Number of		Notes
				Businesses	Residences	
45973 #6	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Unoccupied	0	0	Full displacement. Listed as L L Machining in 1992 EIR.
45973 #7	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Unoccupied	0	0	Full displacement
45973 #8	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	R.J.L. Construction	1	0	Full displacement. This business is in a structure identified for displacement for the Adopted Project and will be required for the Proposed Project. R.J.L. Construction was not a tenant of the building at the time the 1992 EIR was prepared.
45973 #9	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	JDM Company	1	0	Full displacement. Listed with #10 in 1992 EIR as Bayside Microsystems.
45973 #10	Warm Springs Boulevard	Commercial	Small Business Partners	1	0	Full displacement. Listed with #9 in 1992 EIR as Bayside Microsystems.

Note:
N/A means not applicable.

Source: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District 1991 and Jones & Stokes 2003

Table 3.6-9. New Potential Displacements of the Proposed Project*

Street Number	Street Name/ Location	Use	Business Name	Number of		Notes
				Businesses	Residences	
43801	Osgood Road	Industrial	Western Traction II	1	0	Use of vehicle and equipment storage and vehicular access to industrial building. Building on site would not be displaced.
3065-3179	Skyway Court	Light industrial / office	Skyway Business Center	1	0	Partial displacement of landscaped area.

Optional Irvington Station – no displacement beyond those identified in the 1992 EIR

Note:

* Tables C-1, C-2, and C-6 in Appendix L, taken from Appendix C in the 1992 EIR, list the potential displacements of the Adopted Project. Table 3.6-8 lists potential displacements for the Adopted Project and required for the Proposed Project.

Source: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District 1991 and Jones & Stokes

Mitigation Measure POP3 – Acquire property and relocate residences and businesses. BART’s Real Estate Services Department will implement an acquisition and relocation program that meets the requirements of applicable state and federal acquisition and relocation laws. Acquisition will involve compensation at fair market value for properties, and relocation assistance would include, but is not limited to, down payments or rental supplements, moving costs, business reestablishment reimbursement, and goodwill offers as appropriate. All benefits will be provided in accordance with the Federal Uniform Relocation and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act, and applicable state law.

Impact POP4 – Displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As described in Impact POP3 above, only three residential parcels would be affected by the Proposed Project, and no displacements would result. Compensation for impacts to these three residential parcels would be by Mitigation Measure POP3. Because the Proposed Project would not displace a substantial number of people and would not necessitate the construction of offsite replacement housing, no impact would occur. (*No impact.*)

Mitigation – None required.

Construction-Related Impacts

Impact POP5 – Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an existing community such that social interaction within the community is severely hampered. Temporary community disruption impacts would occur at Fremont Central Park during construction of the Proposed Project. Construction of the Proposed Project at the park would require temporary relocation of Stevenson Boulevard onto the northern edge of the park until the cut-and-cover subway section beneath the existing alignment of Stevenson Boulevard is complete. In addition, construction of the subway within park boundaries (Stevenson Boulevard to SP Railroad Right-of-Way segment of the Proposed Project alignment, described in Chapter 2, *2.7 Construction Scenario*) would affect recreational facilities. However, recreational facilities affected by construction activities would be temporarily relocated within the park and would remain accessible to users. Temporary walkways would be provided over the cut-and-cover construction zone within the park, and a temporary pathway connection would be provided on the top of the cofferdam in Lake Elizabeth, so the pedestrian/bicycle path around Lake Elizabeth would remain usable. Construction zones for vent structures would be contained by fencing and screened from view as much as possible.

Although construction would temporarily disrupt some park activities, the Proposed Project construction scenario would provide for continued use of the park and its recreational facilities. Moreover, park facilities would be restored to their existing (preconstruction) condition when construction of the subway and vent structures in the park is complete. Based on the construction scenario described above and in Chapter 2, minimal temporary disruption of the surrounding community would result from Proposed Project construction in Fremont Central Park, and this impact is considered less than significant. (*Less than significant.*)

Mitigation – None required.

Impact POP6 – Creation of construction-related jobs. No significant construction-period population impacts would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project. Construction of the

Proposed Project is expected to employ 300 persons for a 3-year period. Approximately 40 engineers would also be employed for 18 months during the design-build phase of Proposed Project development, but they would not be onsite in Fremont.

As described in Existing Conditions above, total employment in Fremont is projected to grow from 108,410 in 2000 to 130,190 by 2015, an increase of about 20% (Association of Bay Area Governments 2002). Construction-related employment, including employment for the Proposed Project, would constitute approximately 1% of Fremont's employment growth during this period and would be minimal in the context of total employment growth in Fremont.

Construction employment related to the Proposed Project would likely generate a temporary demand for housing. As a worst-case scenario, if each new employee required separate housing, as many as 300 new housing units would be required. This figure would represent about 5% of household growth projected by 2015 and would be minimal in the context of total households in Fremont. This estimate is extremely conservative. No unique construction techniques or equipment would be required to construct the Proposed Project; therefore, the work force is anticipated to be locally derived (Bay Area) and would not require substantial new housing development. This impact is accordingly considered less than significant. (*Less than significant.*)

Mitigation – None required.

Impact POP7 – Substantial diminishment in access to and parking at businesses and residences. Construction vehicles and equipment will use local roadways to access construction zones along the Proposed Project alignment. Truck and equipment traffic may temporarily disrupt existing local traffic patterns during the 4-year construction of the extension. These circulation changes during construction could make access to existing businesses, residences, and facilities near active construction sites and laydown areas difficult. Based on a likely construction scenario, as described in Chapter 2, Section 2.7, project construction vehicles and equipment would use Walnut Avenue, Stevenson Boulevard, Paseo Padre Parkway, Washington Boulevard, Osgood Road, stubs streets (Blacow Road, Sheldon Court, and Prune Avenue), Auto Mall Parkway, Grimmer Road, and Warm Springs Boulevard to access the railroad right-of-way. Warm Springs Court may be used to access the southern end of the Proposed Project alignment.

Construction laydown areas would be located immediately adjacent to the construction zone, minimizing the number of temporary construction easements required from adjacent properties. Development along the Proposed Project alignment backs up to the UP railroad right-of-way. Because existing development along the alignment does not face the railroad right-of-way, potential for construction activities to block access to businesses or residences or temporarily displace parking lots is very low.

As described in Section 2.7, public roadways within the Proposed Project area would not be blocked during construction. Lanes on Walnut Avenue and Grimmer Boulevard would be narrowed during construction of the BART overcrossing, and lanes on Stevenson Boulevard would be temporarily relocated south onto city property while the subway section is constructed. Adjacent development would not experience a reduction in access because the same number of traffic lanes as currently exist would be available throughout the construction period.

Construction of the Proposed Project would temporarily reduce the total number of parking spaces onsite at the Fremont BART Station by 200 (see Section 2.7 [*Construction Scenario*]). The spaces at the Fremont BART Station affected by construction of the Proposed Project are for BART patrons. Reduction of parking at the station would not reduce parking for adjacent development.

Construction at Paseo Padre Parkway and Washington Boulevard would not disrupt traffic or access to surrounding properties because the City of Fremont's grade separations project would allow for unrestricted crossing of the construction zones. Development adjacent to the grade separations would not be required to access the construction zone; therefore no local access would be blocked.

Osgood Road would be used as an access point for construction vehicles at Washington Boulevard Blacow Road, Sheldon Road, and Prune Avenue. Properties with access onto these streets would not be blocked by construction vehicles using these public rights-of-way because they would be used for access to the construction zone only. Staging of vehicles on the public roadways would be avoided because direct access to the UP railroad right-of-way is available from these stub streets. Flaggers would direct traffic when construction vehicles enter or exit the construction zone as needed to avoid disruption of traffic flows on Washington Boulevard and Osgood Road.

Businesses along Osgood Road from Washington Boulevard to Grimmer Road would have no change in access. Construction vehicles and equipment would use major roadways and stub streets from Osgood, Blacow Road, Sheldon Court, and Prune Avenue to access the construction zone. No changes to business or residential access along these public roadways would be required to construct the Proposed Project.

Construction vehicles would access the Warm Springs Station site from Grimmer Road and Warm Springs Road. Access to adjacent development would not be obstructed during the construction period. Construction south of the Warm Springs Station could be accessed from the station site or from Warm Springs Court. Access to businesses from Warm Springs Court would not be restricted by construction activities. On-street parking supply to businesses along Warm Springs Court in front of businesses would not be restricted.

Diminishment of access at businesses and residences is a potentially significant impact. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the construction scenario under which the Proposed Project would be built and implementation of the following mitigation measure. (*Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*)

Mitigation Measure POP7 – Maintain access, traffic control, and parking supply during construction. BART will develop and implement a traffic and access control plan in consultation with the City of Fremont, local business associations, and local neighborhood and homeowners' associations. Before construction begins, BART and its contractors will verify that the traffic and access control plan avoids restriction of access and that flaggers are used to direct traffic in potentially congested zones such as the Washington Boulevard and Osgood Road area. Construction workers and contractors will be advised to carpool and park on-site when feasible to reduce temporary impacts to parking for adjacent residences and businesses. Movement of heavy equipment and supplies to and from construction sites will be scheduled during non-peak travel times. Similarly, temporary lane closures due to work on aerial or below-grade structures will be scheduled for non-peak travel times. Access to

businesses and residences will be maintained throughout construction phases, and existing parking supply will not be reduced.

Impacts Related to Optional Irvington Station

Some of the impacts and mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would also apply to the optional Irvington Station. As appropriate, the discussion below refers to the previous section, *Impacts Related to Warm Springs Extension*, for descriptions of those impacts and mitigation measures that apply to both the Proposed Project and the optional Irvington Station.

Operational Impacts

Impact POP8 – Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an existing community as a result of the Irvington Station option, such that social interaction within the community is severely hampered. Implementation of the Irvington Station option would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the existing community in the vicinity of the Irvington Station site. The station and associated facilities would have a 26-acre footprint, the majority within the existing UP right-of-way, and the remainder encompassing 11 residential parcels adjacent to the alignment. The residential area potentially displaced by the station is isolated and physically separate from other residential uses in the vicinity. Consequently, displacement of 11 residential units would not affect the physical arrangement or function of surrounding communities. Access along Osgood Road would be improved, and access across the Proposed Project alignment from Washington Boulevard would be maintained and improved as a result of the City of Fremont's separate grade separations project. This impact is considered less than significant. (*Less than significant.*)

Mitigation – None required.

Impact POP9 – Inducement of substantial growth in an area as a result of the Irvington Station option, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes or buildings) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or infrastructure) not in accordance with existing community or city plans.²

The Proposed Project is being developed to accommodate existing commuter demand in the area, and the same would be true of the optional Irvington Station, if constructed. Parcels surrounding the Irvington Station site are largely built out, supporting primarily residential development with smaller areas of industrial and commercial uses (see Section 3.5 [*Land Use*]).

The *Fremont General Plan* acknowledges that introduction of a BART station in the Irvington area could generate land use changes such as increasing commercial and higher-density residential development and mixed-use development. The *General Plan* encourages revitalization of areas within the vicinity of the Irvington Station site; Fremont's intent is to support economic vitality and pedestrian-oriented commercial centers within the Irvington Area. The *General Plan* also supports the city's active role in development of a BART station within this area (City of Fremont 1991, as amended). Consequently, growth in the immediate vicinity of the Irvington Station is consistent with the *Fremont General Plan* and would not constitute a significant adverse impact.

² Chapter 4 (*Growth-Inducing Impacts*) provides additional analysis of growth issues related to the optional Irvington Station.

The optional Irvington Station could increase the number of jobs in the area by approximately 10 employees associated with BART operations. This increase represents less than 0.01% of Fremont's projected employment growth over the next 20 years, and is considered negligible. Indirect employment growth could also be encouraged if new commercial development were to follow the introduction of a new station in this area. Because such growth would be consistent with the aims of the *Fremont General Plan*, it is also considered a less-than-significant impact.

In summary, the optional Irvington Station has the potential to foster growth in immediately adjacent areas. However, this growth has been planned for by the City of Fremont and is consistent with the current *Fremont General Plan* and other relevant plans and policies. The city's planning efforts for the area surrounding the optional Irvington Station have not yet been completed, and there are currently no specific proposals for transit-oriented development surrounding the proposed station site. Therefore, any analysis of potential environmental impacts would be highly speculative. The city's *Specific Plan* and any amendments to the *General Plan*, *Zoning Atlas*, or other relevant planning documents will be subject to appropriate environmental review, as will any future development projects proposed for the areas covered by these plans. This impact is considered less than significant. (*Less than significant.*)

Mitigation – None required.

Impact POP10 – Displacement of existing businesses or housing as a result of the optional Irvington Station, especially affordable housing. Impact POP3 as described above would also apply to the optional Irvington Station. Table 3.6-10 lists the displacements that would be necessary for the optional Irvington Station. All the necessary displacements were identified for the Adopted Project in the 1992 EIR. Eleven residences and four businesses are expected to be displaced. Two of these residences are identified as partial displacements under the Proposed Project, but they would be full displacements with the optional Irvington Station. These businesses and residences are not expected to have unique relocation requirements that could not be accommodated within or in the general vicinity of the Proposed Project area. However, Impact POP3 is considered significant.

None of the 11 residences to be displaced for the optional Irvington Station are considered by the City of Fremont to be affordable housing (Schwob pers. comm.). Therefore, no impacts to affordable housing would occur as a result of the optional Irvington Station.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure POP3 would ensure that impacts related to displacement of residents and businesses at the Irvington Station site are addressed as stipulated by federal and state laws, and would reduce them to less than significant. (*Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*)

Mitigation Measure POP3 – Acquire property and relocate residences and businesses. This mitigation measure is described above.

Impact POP11 – Displacement of substantial numbers of people as a result of the optional Irvington Station, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impact POP4 as described above would also apply to the optional Irvington Station. The optional Irvington

Table 3.6-10. Adopted Project Potential Displacements Identified in 1992 EIR and Required for the Optional Irvington Station

Street Number	Street Name/ Location	Use	Business Name	Number of		Notes
				Businesses	Residences	
41655	Osgood Road	Commercial	United Rentals	1	0	Full displacement. Listed in 1992 EIR as Mission Valley Equipment Company
41753	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement
41791	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	0	2 units listed in 1992 EIR. Units have been removed.
41829	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement*
41875	Osgood Road	Single family residential and commercial	Shirley's Contract Services	1	1	Full displacement*
41646	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement
41688	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement
41700	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement
41742	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement
41760	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement
41786/41788	Osgood Road	Residential and commercial	N/A	1	1	Full displacement

Street Number	Street Name/ Location	Use	Business Name	Number of		Notes
				Businesses	Residences	
41816	Osgood Road	Single family residential and commercial	Edam Landscaping	1	1	Full displacement
41868	Osgood Road	Single family residential		0	1	Full displacement

Notes:

* This property was identified as a partial displacement for the Proposed Project in Table 3.6-8.

N/A means not applicable.

Source: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District 1991 and Jones & Stokes 2003

Station would not require additional displacements beyond those required for the Adopted Project. Based on average household size in Fremont (three persons per household), the optional Irvington Station would result in the relocation of approximately 33 residents, or 0.01% of the total Fremont population. This does not constitute relocation of a substantial number of people. Therefore, no impact due to relocation of a substantial number of people would result from the optional Irvington Station. *(No impact.)*

Mitigation – None required.

Construction-Related Impacts

Impact POP12 – Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an existing community in the vicinity of the Irvington Station site such that social interaction within the community is severely hampered. Construction would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of existing communities in the vicinity of the optional Irvington Station. Construction-related impacts would be temporary, and areas surrounding the site would either be improved or restored to preconstruction conditions following construction. Access across the Proposed Project corridor from Washington Boulevard would be maintained during construction, because grade-separated roadways would already be in place as a result of the City of Fremont’s grade separations project. Construction vehicles and equipment would access the optional Irvington Station from Osgood Road and Washington Boulevard, as described for the Proposed Project (see Impact POP7). Construction traffic management may be required to avoid traffic congestion along Osgood Road. Mitigation Measure POP7 would reduce this impact to less than significant. *(Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.)*

Mitigation Measure POP7 – Maintain access, traffic control, and parking supply during construction. This mitigation measure is described above.

Impact POP13 – Creation of construction-related jobs as a result of implementation of the Irvington Station option. Construction of the optional Irvington Station is not expected to employ any additional workers beyond those required to construct the Proposed Project (see Impact POP6), and would not result in a significant increase in demand for temporary housing. This impact is accordingly considered less than significant. *(Less than significant.)*

Mitigation – None required.

Impact POP14 – Substantial diminishment in access to and parking at businesses and residences near Irvington Station site. Among the construction impacts on adjacent land uses identified in the 1992 EIR, effects on surrounding retail activities were of particular concern. Construction vehicles and equipment would access the optional Irvington Station from Washington Boulevard and Osgood Road. Vehicles would use property acquired for the city’s grade separations project for construction staging and access, thereby avoiding blocking businesses and residences in the Irvington District or reducing parking supply within the district. Mitigation Measure POP7 would reduce the effect of construction-related circulation changes on area businesses to a less-than-significant level. *(Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.)*

Mitigation Measure POP7 – Maintain access, traffic control, and parking supply during construction. This mitigation measure is described above.

Contribution to Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts assessment for population, economics, and housing considers the potential for the Proposed Project, in combination with the projects described in Table 3.1-1, including two transportation projects (the city's grade separations project and the SVRTC project to the south of the Warm Springs Station), as described in Section 3.1-6 of Section 3.1 (*Introduction to Environmental Analysis*), to have impacts to the physical environment. Potential physical impacts assessed are disruption or division of an existing community hampering social interaction; displacement of businesses and residences; and construction-period disruption to traffic, access, and parking within existing communities.

The Proposed Project would generally use a vacant linear corridor reserved for BART and an existing railroad right-of-way. It would not introduce barriers to movement along the alignment, nor would it introduce changes to community cohesion. The city's grade separations project is intended to enhance interaction among communities to the east and west of the railroad right-of-way by providing new grade-separated crossings. The pending and proposed development projects listed in Table 3.1-1 would provide additional residential, regional, and neighborhood-serving commercial services, as well as employment opportunities through development of housing, shopping centers, and light industrial developments. When combined, these projects would provide improved connections to neighborhoods east and west of the railroad right-of-way and increase housing, commercial, and employment resources within the City of Fremont.

Contribution of Warm Springs Extension to Cumulative Impacts **Operational Contribution**

Impact POP-Cume1 – Potential to displace existing businesses and residences. The Proposed Project, the City of Fremont's grade separations project, and SVRTC are expected to displace existing businesses. The Proposed Project would displace up to approximately 16 businesses and no residences; the city's grade separations project may displace 5–10 businesses and residences; and the SVRTC project to the south of the Warm Springs Station could displace up to approximately 43 businesses (Earth Tech, Inc. et al. 2001). The city's grade separations project and the SVRTC project are public-agency undertakings; therefore, relocation benefits similar to those to be applied to the Proposed Project would be expected to reduce potential relocation impacts to less than significant.

In addition, approved and pending development projects listed in Table 3.1-1 would add up to as much as 8 million square feet of light industrial and commercial lease space in Fremont, and 51 units of special populations housing. When combined with the Proposed Project and other transportation improvements, a net gain in commercial and light industrial development is anticipated. Therefore, because cumulative impacts analysis indicates that commercial and light industrial developments will be available for businesses as relocation sites, and publicly sponsored projects will provide relocation benefits to affected businesses, displacement of commercial and industrial development will not result in significant cumulative impact to which the project would contribute. (*Less than significant.*)

Mitigation – No additional mitigation required.

Construction-Related Contribution

Impact POP-Cume2 – Potential to restrict access and egress to existing businesses, residences, and community facilities or to reduce parking supply. The Proposed Project would contribute to

cumulative construction-related population, economics, and housing impacts if, when combined with the other projects listed in Table 3.1-1, the Proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to restricting access and egress to existing businesses, residences, and community facilities or to reducing parking supply. The Proposed Project would not reduce parking supply. The Proposed Project would contribute to construction-period traffic access impacts only in combination with projects under construction simultaneously with the Proposed Project's construction activities.

Several of the projects listed in Section 3.1 would either not be under construction at the same time as the Proposed Project or would use different construction access routes. Since the city's grade separations project will be constructed prior to construction of the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts in combination with the grade separations project. Two of the projects listed in Table 3.1-1 and located within the general vicinity of the Proposed Project alignment are west of I-880. These projects, Pacific Commons and Fremont Materials Recovery Facility, would be expected to use construction access routes outside the Proposed Project area. Therefore, potential cumulative construction-period access and egress impacts would be avoided.

However, five approved and pending development projects are located within the general vicinity of the Proposed Project and may use construction access routes similar to those of the Proposed Project. The SVRTC project, which is located adjacent to and to the south of the Proposed Project, may use Mission Boulevard for construction access, which would create a potential overlap with the Proposed Project and approved and pending development projects. Should all or a combination of these projects be under construction simultaneously, construction vehicles could increase traffic congestion and cause increased wait times at intersections and driveways along major roadways in the Proposed Project area. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce construction-related cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. (*Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*)

Mitigation Measure POP-Cume2 – Coordinate access and traffic control during construction of cumulative projects. BART will work with the City of Fremont and entities constructing other projects if necessary to ensure that the Proposed Project's construction traffic management plan is adjusted to accommodate any overlapping construction traffic from multiple projects. BART will require its contractors to prepare a construction traffic management plan (as described in Mitigation Measure TRN25) that designates truck and equipment access routes to the construction site. Contractors will be required to limit construction vehicle and equipment traffic to designated access routes. The construction traffic management plan will be coordinated with the contractor's construction sequence so that general timeframes when construction vehicles will use designated roadways within the Proposed Project area (months from contractor's start of construction activities) can be estimated.

BART will approve the contractor's construction traffic management plan and submit a copy of the approved construction traffic management plan to the City of Fremont. The city can use the construction traffic management plan when reviewing building permit applications for development projects within the Proposed Project area should the combined projects create the potential for construction traffic generated congestion to block access to existing development.

Contribution of Optional Irvington Station to Cumulative Impacts **Operational Contribution**

Impact POP-Cume3 – Potential for construction of the Irvington Station to create physical barriers to social interactions or to cause displacements. The optional Irvington Station would not have cumulatively considerable contributions to population, economics, and housing impacts because the station would not create physical barriers to social interactions and would not require business or residential displacements beyond those identified for the Adopted Project. See discussion above under Impact POP8. (*No impact.*)

Mitigation – None required.

Construction-Related Contribution

Impact POP-Cume4 – Potential for construction of the Irvington Station to restrict access and egress to existing businesses, residences, and community facilities or to reduce parking supply. Cumulative impacts associated with construction of the optional Irvington Station would be similar to those of the Proposed Project, as identified above. Construction-related impacts from the combined cumulative projects could result in traffic congestion that restricts access and egress to existing businesses, residences, and facilities in the vicinity of the optional Irvington Station. Implementation of Mitigation Measure POP-Cume2 (Coordinate access and traffic control during construction of cumulative projects) would reduce construction-related cumulative impacts so that they are not significant. (*Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*)

Mitigation Measure POP-Cume2 – Coordinate access and traffic control during construction of cumulative projects. This mitigation measure is described above.

3.6.5 References Cited in this Section

Printed References and Web Sites

2000 Census. Available at: <<http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>>. Accessed: June 2002.

Association of Bay Area Governments. *Projections 2002*. Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2020. December 2001. San Francisco, CA.

Association of Bay Area Governments. *Regional Housing Needs Determination for the San Francisco Bay Area 2001–2006 Housing Element Cycle*. June 2001. Oakland, CA.

Bay East Association of Realtors. Available at: <http://www.bayeast.org/hs_12_01_sf.htm; http://www.bayeast.org/hs_12_01_condo.htm>. Accessed: May 2002.

California State Board of Equalization. Available at: <<http://www.boe.ca.gov/news/>>. Accessed: June 2002.

City of Fremont. 1991, as amended. *Fremont General Plan*. Most recent amendment September 12, 2000. Fremont, CA: Planning Department.

City of Fremont. 2001. *Fremont Housing Element 2001–2006*. Fremont, CA. Prepared by Freitas + Freitas Engineering and Planning Consultants, Santa Cruz, CA.

City of Fremont. City of Fremont Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances (2000-2001). Available at:
<<http://www.ci.fremont.ca.us/citysvcs/finance/pdf/combinedstatement-actual.pdf>>.
Accessed: July 2002.

County of Alameda. County of Alameda Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports, 2000–2001. Alameda, CA.

Dyett & Bhatia. *Program EIR on Metropolitan Transportation Commission's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan*. December 2001. San Francisco, CA.

Earthtech, Inc., S. R. Beard & Associates, Manuel Padron & Associates, Inc., and Parsons Transportation Group. 2001. Major Investment Study (MIS) Final Report for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor MIS/EIS/EIR. Santa Clara, CA.

San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District. 1991. *BART Warm Springs Extension Final Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared by DKS Associates, Oakland, CA.

Personal Communications

Angela W. Tsui. Marketing and Communications, City of Fremont. Facsimile regarding office and industrial supply and absorption. June 4, 2002.

Avan Gangaparum, Associate Planner, City of Fremont. Telephone conversation regarding affordable housing. January 27, 2003.

Jeff Schwob, Senior Planner, City of Fremont. Telephone conversation regarding Housing Element. January 30, 2003.

Daniel LaForte. Planning Department, City of Fremont. Email regarding building permits issued during 1999–2001. May 22, 2002.