

## 5.12 SOCIOECONOMICS

### 5.12.1 INTRODUCTION

The potential effects and potential benefits of each alternative on population and employment patterns and economic development are discussed in this section. Findings regarding environmental justice are also discussed.

An adverse socioeconomic effect would occur if the alternative would induce substantial growth or concentrations of population inconsistent with existing plans and projections or if it would displace a large number of people.

### 5.12.2 IMPACT DISCUSSION

#### **Growth Inducement Consistency with Existing Plans**

The ABAG 2007 population and employment projections for the study area<sup>1</sup> and cities within the SVRTC are shown on Table 5.12-1. These projections are based on the general plan documents for the cities of Fremont, Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara, which include the BEP and SVRTP alternatives and anticipated stations.

**Table 5.12-1: Population, Housing, and Employment (2000-2030)**

Area	Percent Increase Population	Percent Increase Housing	Percent Increase Jobs
Total Study Area <sup>a</sup>	54.6%	59.3%	23.7%
Alameda County	28.7%	28.3%	38.3%
City of Fremont	22.6%	20.9%	30.9%
Santa Clara County	35.5%	36.0%	21.9%
City of Milpitas	44.1%	48.5%	15.9%
City of San Jose	43.2%	45.1%	36.9%
City of Santa Clara	37.6%	39.7%	10.9%

<sup>a</sup> The "Study Area" definition is the same as that used for the FTA "New Starts" process and covers an area approximately 1.5 to 2 miles wide from the BART Warm Springs Station to the proposed Santa Clara Station.

Source: ABAG Projections 2007.

<sup>1</sup> The study area for the socioeconomic analysis aligns with the SVRTC as defined by the FTA New Starts process encompassing an area of approximately ½-mile to one-mile on each side of the corridor. The study area includes portions of the cities of Fremont, Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara.

The greatest population growth is projected to take place in Milpitas and San Jose and the greatest increase in jobs is projected to occur in the City of San Jose and Alameda County. The cities of Milpitas and Santa Clara show a commensurate increase in population with the rest of the area, but a much lower increase in jobs, which means that people will be traveling out of the area to work.

### **No Build Alternative**

The general plans of the cities of Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara include support for the BART extension with provisions of higher densities around the proposed stations and along the corridor. Without implementation of the BEP or SVRTP alternatives, however, the No Build Alternative would result in a more gradual build out of the general plans, as more intense land uses (e.g., higher densities and mixed-use development) would not likely occur around BART station areas at the same rate. Therefore, while the projections of population, housing, and jobs may not change significantly, the timing of such projections would likely be extended with implementation of the No Build Alternative in comparison to the BEP or SVRTP alternatives.

### **BEP Alternative**

The operation of the BEP Alternative would generate approximately 600 jobs for operation and maintenance. This would be a beneficial effect.

The BEP Alternative would provide improved transportation service to people living and working in Fremont, Milpitas, and San Jose, and support planned higher density development adjacent to the proposed Milpitas and Berryessa Stations. The new rail connections would facilitate residential and employment growth planned for the study area, particularly around station areas, consistent with local jurisdiction general plans.

### **SVRTP Alternative**

The operation of the SVRTP Alternative would generate approximately 750 jobs for operation and maintenance. This would be a beneficial effect.

The SVRTP Alternative would also provide improved transportation service to people living and working in the SVRTC including the cities of Fremont, Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara. The new rail connections would facilitate residential and employment growth planned for the study area, particularly around station areas, consistent with local jurisdiction general plans. The SVRTP Alternative would improve transit reliability and services throughout the corridor and provide new stations in downtown San Jose, thereby improving regional access to downtown employment opportunities.

### **Displacement of Existing Businesses or Housing**

The BEP and SVRTP alternatives would require property acquisitions and resultant displacements affecting residential and non-residential properties. The types of displacements associated with the alternatives are described below, along with an estimate of the relative magnitude of each. Displacements would be the result of

acquiring the underlying property in whole or in part to accommodate the alternatives. Tables 5.12-2 and 5.12-3 quantify the number and types of displacement that could occur along the SVRTC from implementing the BEP and SVRTP alternatives. Under the No Build Alternative there would be no displacement of businesses or housing.

The estimate of displacements is based on property utilization in fall of 2007. Estimates presented here are based on Appendix B, BEP Alternative Plan and Profiles, Appendix C, SVRTP Alternative Plan and Profiles, and Appendix D, Station Designs (BEP and SVRTP Alternatives).

Under the BEP Alternative, approximately 47 to 55 businesses, two residential units, up to three community facilities, 80 flea market vendor stalls, 1,050 to 1,075 rental storage tenants, three advertising signs, and one cell phone tower would be displaced.

Under the SRVTP Alternative, approximately 77 to 104 businesses, 2-23 residential units, one community facility, 80 flea market vendor stalls, 1,050 to 1,075 rental storage tenants, 4-6 advertising signs, and four cell towers would be displaced.

The following describes the property acquisitions and related displacements that would occur from implementation of the BEP and SRVTP alternatives by city. The effect of the BEP and SVRTP alternatives would be the same for the portion of the alignment extending from the start of the project up to, but not including, the Las Plumas Yard Option. South of U.S. 101, the effects would only apply to the SVRTP Alternative.

## **BEP and SVRTP Alternatives**

### ***City of Fremont***

Displacement of 12 light industrial properties along the east side of the railroad corridor (Figure B-2 STA 35+45) was previously environmentally cleared on pages 12-15 of Section 4-10 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft 4(f) Evaluation BART Warm Springs Extension published in February 2005.

South of East Warren Avenue and east of the alignment, Traction Power Station SWA and Train Control Building S24 (Figure B-4, STA 78+50) would occupy a site currently occupied by the storage of materials supporting the use on the property west of the alignment and south of East Warren Avenue. The stored materials would be displaced; however, this would not cause the displacement of the main industrial business.

Kato Road would be reconstructed as a new roadway underpass with BART passing over the roadway on a new bridge structure. The grade separation of Kato Road would affect access to two commercial parking lots. Two driveways of separate industrial properties would be lowered, and a small landscaped area within an industrial property would be acquired for utility boxes. Additional landscaping area may be affected to accommodate the needed ROW to grade separate Kato Road. However, the industrial properties would not be displaced (Figure B-7, STA 167+00).

**Table 5.12-2 BEP Alternative – Summary of Displacements**

Location	Residential	Light Industrial Business	Retail Business	Office Business	Restaurant Business	Bar/ Nightclub Business	Community Facilities <sup>a</sup>	Flea Market Vendors	Storage Tenants	Advertising Sign	Cell Towers
Systems Facilities at Railroad Court	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	175-200	0	1
Milpitas Station	1	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	875	0	0
Alignment south of Trade Zone Blvd	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berryessa Station	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	80	0	0	0
No New Yard - Las Plumas Yard Options	0	0-8	0	0	0	0	0-3	0	0	0-3	0
<b>Range of Total BEP Displacements</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>45-53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0-3</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>1,050-1,075</b>	<b>0-3</b>	<b>1</b>

<sup>a</sup> Community Facility: fire station, family center, training center  
Source: VTA, 2007

**Table 5.12-3 SVRTP Alternative – Summary of Displacements**

Location	Residential	Light Industrial Business	Retail Business	Office Business	Restaurant Business	Bar/ Nightclub Business	Community Facilities <sup>a</sup>	Flea Market Vendors	Storage Tenants	Advertising Sign	Cell Towers
Systems Facilities at Railroad Court	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	175-200	0	1
Milpitas Station	1	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	875	0	0
Alignment south of Trade Zone Blvd	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berryessa Station	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	80	0	0	0
Alum Rock Station	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	1
Vent Structure West of Coyote Creek	0-20	0	0	0-15	0	0	0	0	0	0-2	0
Downtown San Jose Station	0	0	1-3	3-4	2-4	1-2	0	0	0	0	0
Diridon/Arena Station and Alignment	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Ventilation Structure Near Stockton Ave	0	1-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara - Maintenance Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Santa Clara Station	0	1	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Range of Total SVRTP Displacements</b>	<b>3-23</b>	<b>59-65</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<b>6-22</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>1,050-1,075</b>	<b>4-6</b>	<b>4</b>

<sup>a</sup> Community Facility: church  
Source: VTA, 2007

South of Scott Creek, construction of Traction Power Station SKR and Train Control Building S26 would cause the displacement of approximately 70 parking spaces from an existing industrial property. No structures would be displaced, and the existing use could continue on the remainder of the property.

From the Alameda/Santa Clara county and Fremont/Milpitas city lines (STA 182+00) to south of Dixon Landing Road, there are two options for the BART alignment:

- **Retained Cut Option.** Under this option, BART would transition into a retained cut at the county and city lines to south of Dixon Landing Road (STA 182+00 to 201+00). Dixon Landing Road would remain at grade, but be supported over the BART retained cut on a new roadway bridge structure. The UPRR crossing would also remain at grade. No buildings or businesses would be displaced as a result of this option.
- **At Grade Option.** Under this option, BART would continue at grade and cross on a new bridge structure over Dixon Landing Road (STA 191+50), which would be reconstructed as a roadway underpass by VTA. VTA would also construct a new bridge for the UPRR to cross over the roadway. An adjacent cross street to the west of the railroad ROW, Milmont Drive, would also be lowered due to the new slope of Dixon Landing Road. Access to two existing driveways on the west side of the alignment, one on the north side of Dixon Landing Road and the other on the south side, would be eliminated. However, each property would have multiple access points remaining. In addition, three driveways would be lowered - two driveways on the north side of Dixon Landing Road east of the alignment and one on the east side of Milmont Drive south of Dixon Landing Road. No buildings or businesses would be displaced as a result of this option.

### ***City of Milpitas***

Construction of High Voltage Substation SRC, Traction Power Substation SRR/Switching Station SRR, Train Control Building S28, and the PG&E tower would cause the displacement of one light industrial business (a recreational vehicle (RV) storage area), 175-200 storage units, and one residence. They would also cause the displacement of approximately 20 parking spaces from an adjacent industrial use; however, the loss of parking would not cause the displacement of the industrial business (Figure B-12, STA 261+00).

South of Curtis Avenue (STA 330+00) to south of Trade Zone Boulevard, the alignment would be constructed in either a Retained Cut Long or Retained Cut Intermediate configuration. The Retained Cut Long Option (Figures B-15, B-16, B-17, B-18, STA 342+00 to 415+00) would require relocation of the freight track on the west side of the railroad ROW 22 feet farther west, necessitating acquisition of up to 20 feet by 2,200 feet of ROW from Parc Metropolitan Condominiums and the Great Mall. The Retained

Cut Intermediate Option (Figures B-19, B-20, B-21, STA 342+00 to 415+00) would require acquisition of up to 20 feet by 3,000 feet of ROW from the Parc Metropolitan Condominiums and Great Mall. Both options would result in the loss of 35 parking spaces and less than 0.01 acre of parkland, but no buildings would be displaced.

Construction of the Milpitas Wye would cause no displacements (Figure B-15, Figure B-16, STA 355+00). The industrial uses had been recently demolished as of the Fall 2007 field surveys, and the site is vacant.

There are two alternate locations for Traction Power Station SME. One location is in an existing UPRR Wye that would be abandoned. The alternate site would be located over the rail ROW north of Montague Expressway. Neither of the alternate locations would cause displacement of businesses (Figure B-15, STA 366+00).

Milpitas Station would be located between Montague Expressway and Capitol Avenue and would cause the displacement of two offices, 18 light industrial businesses, 875 storage tenants, and one residence (Figures D-1 to D-5).

### ***City of San Jose***

South of Trade Zone Boulevard, construction of the alignment would cause the displacement of one industrial business west of the alignment (Figure B-18, STA 406+50).

Traction Power Substation SMB would be located south of Trade Zone Boulevard on the west side of the railroad ROW and would not cause the displacement of any business or residence (Figure B-18 and B-21, STA 416+00).

South of Hostetter Road, Train Control Building S44 would be located on the east side of the railroad ROW. No businesses or residences would be displaced (Figure B-22, STA 458+00).

Berryessa Station would cause the displacement of 25 light industrial businesses, up to 80 vendor stalls, and the loss of 1500 parking spaces of the south parking lot within the San Jose Flea Market (Figures D-6, D-7, and D-8). This would not result in the displacement of the Flea Market.

High Voltage Substation SMR, Switching Station SSM, Gap Breaker Station SXB, and Train Control Building S58 would be located south of Mabury Road on the west side of the ROW (Figure B-30). An optional location for the High Voltage Substation and Switching Station would be west of the alignment, just north of U.S. 101. No businesses or residences would require relocation. The City of San Jose's Maintenance Yard would not be displaced; however, partial use of the yard would displace an area for storage of materials and would require the rearrangement of uses within the yard.

---

## **BEP Alternative Only**

For the BEP Alternative only, there are two options for maintenance yard facilities. The No New Yard Option would not displace any businesses or residences. The Las Plumas Yard Option would cause the displacement of eight industrial businesses, one fire station, one shelter, and one training center (Figure B-31).

## **SVRTP Alternative Only**

South of U.S. 101 within the City of San Jose, the rail line transitions from its alignment aboveground to an underground alignment beneath Santa Clara Street. Tunnel easements would be acquired from approximately 15 properties for the tunnel alignment from the headwall to U.S. 101 (Figure C-5 STA 571+25 to STA 590+00).

Alum Rock Station would be located between US 101 and 28<sup>th</sup> Street on a 19-acre site. The station would cause displacement of six light industrial businesses, one office, and four advertising signs (Figures D-9, D-10, and D-11). Tunnel easements would be acquired from approximately 10 properties for the tunnel alignment from 28<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> streets (Figure C-6 STA 608+00 to Figure C-7 STA 624+00).

Near Coyote Creek, there are three options for the tunnel alignment: Southern Offset Option, Santa Clara Street Option, and Northern Offset Option. Tunnel easements would be acquired from approximately 30 properties for the Southern Offset Option (Figures C-7 and C-8) and approximately 10 properties for the Northern Offset Option (Figures C-11 and C-12). No tunnel easements would be acquired for the Santa Clara Street Option (Figures C-9 and C-10).

Between 17<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> streets, there are five alternate locations for Vent Structure FSS. The first site, located north of Santa Clara Street and west of 17<sup>th</sup> Street, would cause the displacement of 55 parking spaces serving a medical center, but would not cause the displacement of the medical center. The second site, located south of Santa Clara Street and west of 15<sup>th</sup> Street, would cause the displacement of eight residences and four businesses. The third site, located south of Santa Clara Street west of 15<sup>th</sup> Street, would cause the displacement of 15 businesses. The fourth site, located north of Santa Clara Street and east of 13<sup>th</sup> Street, would cause the displacement of 20 residences. The fifth site, located north of Santa Clara and west of 13<sup>th</sup> Street, would cause the displacement of one business and two billboard signs.

Downtown San Jose Station would have three station entrances and one future station entrance between 3<sup>rd</sup> and San Pedro streets (Figure D-12, D-13, and D-14). One entrance would be located on the south side of East Santa Clara Street between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> streets. There are three optional locations for this entrance. Option M-1A, the Ravioli/Firato Delicatessen building, would cause no displacements as the building was under renovation at the time of the building survey. Option M-1B, the Bank of America/Bank of Italy building, would cause the displacement of one dance club/bar, one business, and two restaurants. Option M-1C, the Moderne Drug/Western Dental building would cause the displacement of three businesses. A second entrance, M-7,

would be located at the southwest corner of West Santa Clara and Market streets. This entrance would cause the displacement of three businesses. A third entrance (M-5A), located on the north side of East Santa Clara Street mid-block between Market and 1<sup>st</sup> streets, would cause the displacement of 10 parking spaces, but no businesses would be displaced. A fourth potential future entrance would be located on the north side of East Santa Clara Street mid-block between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> streets (M-4). This future entrance would cause the displacement of one bar and one restaurant. An emergency exit, tunnel vent shaft, and fresh air intake would be located north of Santa Clara Street between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streets. These facilities would cause the displacement of two businesses.

Diridon/Arena Station would cause the displacement of six industrial businesses, one residence, one church, and approximately 200 parking spaces (Figures D-15, D-16 and D-17). Tunnel easements would be acquired for approximately 40 properties for the alignment from Almaden Boulevard to Stockton Avenue within the vicinity of Diridon/Arena Station (Figure C-14 STA 717+00 to Figure C-16 STA 781+00).

Traction Power Substation SDS would be located east of the Diridon/Arena Station (Figure C-15, STA 745+00). No businesses or residences would be displaced.

East of Stockton Avenue, there are four alternate locations for Ventilation Structure STS (Figure C-16, STA 786+00 to STA 792+00). The most southern alternate location would cause the displacement of one industrial business. The second and third alternate locations would cause the displacement of 7 industrial businesses. The fourth and most northern alternate location would cause the displacement of one industrial business.

Tunnel easements would be acquired from approximately five properties from University Avenue to the headwall of the western tunnel portal (Figure C-17 STA 808+00 to C-18 STA 831+20).

### ***City of Santa Clara***

Newhall Yard and Shops Facility would be constructed on the former UPRR Newhall Yard. No residential or business displacements would be required; however, two cell towers would be displaced just north and just south of De La Cruz Boulevard.

Santa Clara Station would cause the displacement of one light industrial business, five retail uses, and three restaurants (Figure D-18, D-19, and D-20).

## **5.12.3 RELOCATION PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS**

All displacement and relocation activities would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) for the BEP and SVRTP alternatives. The Uniform Act ensures the fair and equitable treatment of persons whose real property is acquired or who are displaced as a result of a federal or federally-assisted project. Government-wide regulations provide procedural

and other requirements (appraisals, payment of fair market value, notice to owners, etc.) in the acquisition of real property and provide for relocation payments and advisory assistance in the relocation of persons and businesses.

Applying the Uniform Act to the San Jose Flea Market vendors varies depending on the duration and type of lease a vendor is under. Some vendors have daily permits and as such would not be eligible. Others have weekly, monthly, or annual leases and may be eligible. Eligibility is determined at the time of acquisition. At the appropriate time, each vendor will be interviewed and lease documentation will be reviewed to determine eligibility in accordance with the Act.

VTA's Relocation Program, which complies with federal relocation requirements, provides assistance to affected residence and business owners. This assistance, which varies on a case-by-case basis, can be both financial (e.g., moving costs, rent subsidies, relocation costs, personal property losses, reestablishment expenses, etc.) and technical (e.g., providing information regarding suitable replacement sites, providing referrals, assisting with lease negotiations, assisting with moving logistics, etc.). Business owners also have the option of receiving a fixed payment in lieu of the payments for actual moving and related expenses and actual reasonable reestablishment expenses.

When acquisition occurs, properties would be appraised at fair market value and offers would be based on the approved appraised values. For relocation, the availability of alternate sites would vary; however, the economy is characterized by a comfortable vacancy rate in the project area, which could easily accommodate the need for relocation space in a similar price range. Table 5.12-3 shows vacancy rate ranges for commercial properties in the project corridor cities of Fremont, Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara. The housing stock of over 1.5 million units in Santa Clara County can accommodate relocations associated with the two residential displacements associated with the BEP Alternative and the 3-15 residential displacements associated with the SVRTP Alternative.

**Table 5.12-4: Commercial Vacancy Rates for SVRTC Cities**

Type of Space	Low Vacancy Rate	High Vacancy Rate
Office	14.01%	14.36%
Research and Development	9.56%	19.92%
Manufacturing	3.56%	6.60%
Warehouse	4.26%	5.74%

Source: Colliers International, 2008.

This estimate of displacements is based on property utilization in the fall of 2007. The actual numbers and types of displacements could change prior to project implementation. For purposes of presenting a conservative analysis, properties or easements are assumed to be permanent acquisitions. During final engineering, VTA

may determine that some parcels can be leased during construction, avoiding permanent displacement. Also, the number of displacements, property acquisitions and related relocations and easements required could change during final design and engineering, as could the amount of land required from individual parcels. Estimates presented here are based on Appendix B, BEP Alternative Plan and Profiles, Appendix C, SVRTP Alternative Plan and Profiles, and Appendix D, Station Designs (BEP and SVRTP Alternatives).

Federal and state laws require consistent and fair treatment of owners of property to be acquired, including just compensation for their property. These laws also require uniform and equitable treatment of displaced persons or businesses. The provisions of VTA's Relocation Program will minimize any adverse effects of the business and residential displacements associated with the BEP or SVRTP alternatives; therefore, no mitigation is required.

#### **5.12.4 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FINDINGS**

A transportation project must consider potential effects to human health or the environment on a community composed of minority or low-income populations. The following discussion includes a discussion of effects of the SVRTC alternatives on low-income and minority populations to determine whether or not these are adverse and disproportionate in comparison with effects on other neighborhoods in the corridor.

The population, housing, and employment information provided in Section 4.12, Socioeconomics, indicates that the study area contains a high percentage of minority residents, as well as major retail areas and pockets of higher income areas in the City of Milpitas. Implementation of the BEP and SVRTP alternatives would include direct mobility benefits that are expected to be equitably shared across communities by various demographic groups. The discussion considers whether the alternatives would have disproportionate health and environmental effects on the high minority or low-income neighborhoods identified as defined by Executive Order No. 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*.

VTA has conducted extensive public outreach, including a comprehensive program to coordinate and communicate with these communities throughout the MIS/AA, EIR, SEIR, and this environmental review process. Community members have provided substantive input into the current project design, alignment choices, station area planning, and construction approach, as discussed more fully in Chapter 11, Agency and Community Participation.

### **No Build Alternative**

Although the No Build Alternative may not adversely affect local communities, it would not provide these communities with the benefits of accessibility to transit services, as would the BEP and SVRTP alternatives. Regardless, projects planned under the No Build Alternative would undergo separate environmental review to define whether ethnic, minority, or low-income populations in project areas would experience disproportionately high adverse effects. (See Section 2.6, Related Projects, for a list of future projects under the No Build Alternative.)

### **BEP Alternative**

The geographic area of concern for the BEP Alternative includes areas adjacent to the proposed alignment and around the proposed Milpitas and Berryessa station areas. The area between the planned BART Warm Springs Station and the Berryessa Station consists of vacant, industrial, and residential land uses. This is also an existing rail corridor. The BEP Alternative would therefore not have disproportionate effects on minority or low-income neighborhoods along the alignment. The neighborhoods and businesses will benefit from the improved transit services for the surrounding area.

### **Displacement/Relocation**

Under the BEP Alternative approximately 47 to 55 businesses, two residential units, up to three community facilities, 80 flea market vendor stalls, 1,050 to 1,075 rental storage tenants, three advertising signs, and one cell phone tower would be displaced. Displacement and relocation activities would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as described in Section 5.12.3. This would minimize any adverse effects of the necessary property acquisition associated with the BEP Alternative.

### **Air Quality**

Operation of the BEP Alternative would reduce the amount of air emissions generated in the region. This benefit is directly related to a projected reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled once the BART trains are operating. Construction of the BEP Alternative would generate dust and other pollutant emissions associated with construction and earthmoving activities. These potential effects will be reduced by actions outlined in Chapter 6, Construction.

### **Noise/Vibration**

The BEP Alternative would result in effects from noise and vibration associated with construction equipment, and would also result in noise generated by operation of the BART trains once construction is complete. These effects will be mitigated by the noise and vibration mitigation measures identified in Section 5.10, Noise and Vibration. Construction period effects will be mitigated through measures identified in Chapter 6, Construction. These mitigation measures will reduce adverse noise and vibration effects.

## **Traffic**

The BEP Alternative would reduce the number of vehicles on the roadways, which would be a beneficial effect. However, this alternative would also contribute to traffic congestion on local streets and highways in BART station areas, as discussed in Chapter 3, Transportation and Transit. Fourteen (14) intersections would experience adverse effects due to additional station traffic associated with the BEP Alternative. In 8 of these 14 cases, mitigation is not practicable given physical limitations at the intersections. A total of four directional freeway segments in the vicinity of the Berryessa Station would be affected. (Refer to Chapter 3, Transportation and Transit, for additional discussion; however, in most cases where mitigation is not practicable, mitigating improvements would be required outside the roadway ROW necessitating displacement of businesses and demolition of major structures.)

## **SVRTP Alternative**

Operation of the SVRTP Alternative would provide a direct and positive benefit to the adjoining communities. By providing more convenient access to regional rapid transit and improving connectivity to other transit services, members of the community who may not have access to a private automobile or prefer to use transit will be better served, with improved access to employment, recreation, shopping, and public services, facilities, and other opportunities.

## **Displacement/Relocation**

Construction of the SVRTP Alternative would displace approximately 77 to 104 businesses, 3-20 residential units, one community facility, 80 flea market vendor stalls, 1,050 to 1,075 rental storage tenants, 4-6 advertising signs, and four cell towers. All displacement and relocation activities would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 and VTA's Relocation Program, as described previously in Section 5.12.3, to minimize adverse effects of the property acquisitions associated with the SVRTP Alternative.

## **Air Quality**

When compared to the No Build and BEP alternatives, the SVRTP Alternative would provide a greater reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled in the region resulting in overall air quality improvements. This is a beneficial effect for the entire region, including the environmental justice communities.

Vehicular trips to BART stations would produce localized air emissions (principally CO) in the station areas, but the addition of these trips would not produce air emissions exceeding the federal or state ambient air quality standards, as described in Section 5.1, Air Quality.

Construction of the SVRTP Alternative would generate dust and other pollutant emissions associated with construction and earthmoving activities. These adverse effects will be reduced by actions outlined in Chapter 6, Construction. Implementation of these measures will reduce adverse air quality effects on environmental justice communities during construction.

### **Noise/Vibration**

The SVRTP Alternative would result in adverse effects from noise and vibration associated with construction equipment and operation of the trains once the project is complete. These effects will be reduced by the use of specialized construction equipment to reduce construction vibration effects (vibratory pile placement) and the construction of noise barriers and other noise and vibration mitigation measures, as identified in Section 5.10, Noise and Vibration and Chapter 6, Construction. Implementation of these measures will reduce adverse noise and vibration effects.

### **Traffic**

The SVRTP Alternative would reduce overall vehicle miles traveled in the region. However, this alternative would also contribute to traffic congestion on local streets and highways in station areas, as discussed in Chapter 3, Transportation and Transit. 31 intersections would experience adverse effects due to additional station traffic associated with the SVRTP Alternative. In 22 of these 31 cases, mitigation is not practicable given physical limitations at the intersections. A total of 9 directional freeway segments (2 in the vicinity of the Berryessa Station and (7) in the vicinity of the Alum Rock Station) would be affected. (Refer to Chapter 3, Transportation and Transit, for additional discussion; however, in most cases where mitigation is not practicable, mitigating improvements would be required outside the roadway ROW necessitating displacement of businesses and demolition of major structures.)

It should be noted that the SVRTP Alternative's contribution to effects on traffic at these intersections represents only a small percentage of the anticipated street traffic level increases that are projected to occur from anticipated growth by the year 2030.

## **5.12.5 CONCLUSION**

The construction and operational effects of the BEP or SVRTP alternatives on environmental justice communities can be mitigated as discussed above (although some traffic mitigation measures are deemed not practicable). These mitigations, combined with increased access to regional mass transit and reduction in air pollutant emissions will compensate for the adverse effects. No disproportionately high and adverse effects on environmental justice communities would occur as a result of the BEP or SVRTP alternatives. Implementation of the BEP or SVRTP alternatives will enhance rather than adversely affect the integrated bus system, light rail, and roadway system.

*This page left intentionally blank.*