Ceaser, David

david@carfreecity.us ()
07/12/2006 11:53 PM

To: brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov, sheryl_dorado@dot.ca.gov, carl_weingarten@dot.ca.gov
cc:
Subject: Caldecott Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (david@carfreecity.us) on Wednesday, July 12, 2006 at 23:53:14

Firstname: David

Lastname: Ceaser

Business: non-profit

Phone: 510 981 1427

Address: 1004 Hearst Avenue

City: Berkeley

State: Ca

Zip: 94710

Comments: Please make any new construction you do in the Caldecott Tunnel right of way bike accessible. Bikes are often not considered in our car dominated culture. Please think of all people, including bicyclists and pedestrians, when designing this project. 1

thank you.

1- See Option J in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

Chick,Warren

"Warren Chick"
<shepsdad@comcast.net>
07/31/2006 02:12 PM

To "'Warren Chick'" <shepsdad@comcast.net>,
<Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc "Nancy & Leigh Forsberg" <ncforsberg@comcast.net>
bcc
Subject RE: Caldecott Public Comment re The Draft Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report dated May 2006

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please replace my earlier letter dated July 11, 2006, with the attached letter dated July 31, 2006, and keep the July 11th enclosures with the July 31st letter.

Thank you,

Warren Chick

Warren Chick (warren@shepsdad.net)
Tel.: (510) 843-3556

From: Warren Chick [mailto:shepsdad@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 2:15 PM
To: Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
Cc: Warren Chick; Mark K. Yowe; 'Mimi Hancock'; Paula A. Mulhall; Larry and Esther Thal; Larry and Arlene Kaufman; Walter Moos; Susan Miller; Christopher Booth; 'Debora Booth'; 'Maggie and Brennan Mulligan'; 'Frank Hubach'
Subject: Caldecott Public Comment re The Draft Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report dated May 2006

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My comments and supporting documents are attached.

Please be so kind as to send an immediate receipt.

Thank you,

Warren Chick

Warren Chick (warren@shepsdad.net)
Tel.: (510) 843-3556

Caldecott Tunnel Project.doc

Reader please note: The following letter is Mr. Chick's July 31, 2006 letter. The footer on the letter mis-states the date.

WARREN HYDE CHICK
718 Grizzly Terrace Drive
Oakland, CA 94611

(510) 843-3556
shepsdad@comcast.net

July 31, 2006

Caldecott Public Comments
Gregory C. McConnell, Sr. Environmental Planner
Attn: Sheryl Dorado, Assoc. Environmental Planner
Dept. of Transportation, District 4, Environmental Analysis
Mail Station 8B, P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

e-mail Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This letter is in response to The Draft Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report dated May 2006 (the "Report").

I attended the project open house held in Orinda on June 7, 2005. At the meeting I was told that the tunneling work would proceed on a 24 hour, 7 days/week basis for approximately one year, with spoils being dumped outside the east portal throughout the night, then loaded into dump trucks at first light and throughout the day and carted away. I indicated that I was especially concerned about noise and lighting at night. The CalTrans right-of-way man at the meeting did inform me that there is court precedent for his proposition that I will pretty much have to grin and bear it, citing Harding, et al v. The State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation 159 Cal.App.3d 359; 205 Cal.Rptr. 561 (1984). I filled out a comment card, a copy of which is attached. I had previously voiced some of my concerns in a letter dated Jan. 30, 2003, to Cristina Ferraz, Project Manager, copy attached.

I am concerned about the impact of construction activities at the east end of the tunnel on my family, including our two dogs (If our dogs are disturbed, they will disturb us!), and about the impact on the wildlife in the Caldecott Wildlife Corridor which is immediately below us. I served on Caldecott Wildlife Corridor Committee for three years. The activities I am concerned about are those that produce noise, light, and vibrations, especially if work is scheduled between the hours of 10 PM to 7 AM, and, to a lesser extent, during weekends and holidays. I am also concerned about any planned detours that would prevent the use of Fish Ranch Road, Hwy. 24, and the existing Caldecott Tunnel, which are our primary means of getting to and from our home.

Our bedroom and family room are in direct line of sight of the areas of construction activities. We are high above them on a ridge and at the mouth of a practical megaphone resulting from the contour of the hill below us. Even now, our sleep is occasionally disturbed by the sound beeping from tow trucks and Caltrans trucks backing up on the highway or off ramps, by the loud hailers used by Caltrans and the CHP (for their radios, or for shouting directions at other drivers), etc., and by bright lights used for construction activities at the Caltrans property on the north side of Hwy. 24, between the Caldecott and Gateway. These are now only minor annoyances, because they are infrequent and of short duration. But construction activity would be many times as disturbing; it would be constant rather than infrequent, and of long duration, lasting many months, perhaps years.

The Report, does not adequately evaluate these impacts or provide for specific practical measures to abate or mitigate them.

The Report does not provide a schedule that can be used to evaluate the impacts of construction. How many months or years would the construction last? What are the proposed working hours, on weekdays, on weekends and during holidays? 1

Such a schedule should provide proposed working hours and days for each phase of construction (mobilization, temporary structures and enclosures, road cuts, temporary roads, bridges and detours, retaining walls, tunnel excavating, grouting, paving, etc., etc.).

What are the noise levels going to be at 718 Grizzly Terrace Drive during each phase; during the day; during the night? What are the transient noises that we would hear during the night? 2

Noise Abatement or Mitigation During Construction

The Report, on page 234, addresses construction noise as follows:

> **3.1.3.3 NOISE**
>
> *d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in*
>
> *ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels*
>
> *existing without the project?*
>
> Noise generated while constructing the tunnel improvement project **could** at times reach levels higher then the existing traffic noise. The impact from construction activities would be **temporary** [emphasis added] and can be reasonably minimized by implementing provisions in Section 7-1.01I, "Sound Control Requirements" of the Caltrans Standard Specifications, which may include the following measures:
>
> • *Consider constructing noise barriers as first items of work, where feasible;*

Caldecott Public Comments, July 11, 2006, page 2

> • *Erect temporary noise barriers, if necessary; and*
> • *Keep the community informed of upcoming especially noisy construction activities and establish a field office to handle noise complaints.*

How **could** there not be increased noise? Unlike the current "white noise" of traffic, even if average noise levels for construction are not significantly higher, that does not take into account the effect of occasional disturbing loud noises that will interfere with our sleep in a significant way (just like a gunshot or a scream in the night would). 3

How **temporary** would the increase be; six month, one year, two years?

Noise Barriers are not planned for our neighborhood, and your Report has already stated that barriers would be ineffective for homes on the ridge. Report, p. 168: 4

> **2.2.8.4 AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**
>
> ....
>
> **Noise Abatements Not Feasible**
>
> TNM analyses show that, for residences situated on the top of slope (receptors R1 through R8, and R16), no soundwalls within the State right-of-way could possibly reduce the noise levels by at least 5 dBA, the minimum amount required to be considered *feasible*. Due to the steep terrain between these residences and freeway, constructing noise barriers within the private properties would not be feasible, either. Noise abatements would not be feasible for some of the units (R25 and R26) in the planned but not yet constructed buildings on Caldecott Lane.

Keeping the community informed is no help at all, not any more than the Report helps by informing us right now that there will be increased noise levels. How does being informed help a person sleep through the night?

Likewise, establishing a field office to receive complaints is simply not a good substitute to abating or mitigating the problem before it occurs. Would the field office be open and available by telephone in the middle of the night, and would it have the authority and ability to stop the noise right away? The ability to complain does not restore interrupted sleep!

A better approach would be to determine in advance what loud noises can be anticipated, and to provide a way of abating or mitigating them. I am asking that this be done. Please make a list of every piece of equipment and every other source of loud noises, and what kind of noise (description, level, pitch, etc.) it will make, what time of day, and how it will be mitigated. 5

Please investigate the following abatement or mitigation alternatives:

Caldecott Public Comments, July 11, 2006, page 3

6

1. No night work. (Or, if night work is somehow less expensive and, therefore, necessary for economic reasons, spend some of those savings on the following.)

2. Enclose work area at east portal with temporary building.

3. Enclose each piece of stationary equipment.

4. Modify each piece of mobile equipment (for example: better mufflers, quieter backup warning).

5. Keep batch plant remote from east portal.

6. Move staging area for transfer of spoils to Caltrans property at Gateway Exit, and modify mobile equipment to reduce noise during transit from east portal to staging area.

7. No construction activity outside of the Caltrans right-of-way on Fish Ranch Road.

8. If all else fails, or if all of the above is too expensive, then subsidize a temporary rental dwelling for me and my family away from the impacted area. (This alternative will not benefit the wildlife corridor; all the others would.)

Temporary Lighting for Construction Abatement / Mitigation

7

We are concerned about bright construction lighting shining directly into our family room and bedroom windows at night. We experienced this very thing for a period of three to four weeks about one year ago. The lights were aimed horizontally from the Caltrans siding on the north side of 24, just west of Gateway, and carried fairly brightly into our home.

Please consider having construction lighting pointing down instead of horizontally, or, if horizontal, have it pointing east, away from our homes.

Traffic Disruption during Construction

8

Please include discussion of any Fish Ranch Road closures, or on and off ramp closures, in your next report.

Vibrations during Construction

9

Please investigate the impact of noise and vibrations, caused by blasting, on dogs and cats, and wildlife.

Caldecott Public Comments, July 11, 2006, page 4

I am enclosing a letter from Frank Hubach, July 11, 2006, along with his firms brochure and his CV. Among other things, he recommends testing noise and vibration at our home prior to construction to document existing conditions. This, of course, would vary at different times of day or night. Would you be willing to do that, and also do a practical test of some of the noise generating pieces of equipment that you anticipate will be used during construction? 10

Neighbors

The following residents and property owners at Grizzly Peak Estates have asked that their names be appended to this letter, indicating their support and the fact that they have similar concerns relating to their homes:

Mark Yowe, 702 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Mimi Hancock, 702 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Paula Mulhall, 718 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Larry Kaufman, 701 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Arlene Kaufman, 701 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Walter Moos, 724 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Susan Miller, 724 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Christopher Booth, 10 Woodside Way, Oakland, CA 94611
Debora Booth, 10 Woodside Way, Oakland, CA 94611
Brennan Mulligan, 16 Woodmont Way, Oakland, CA 94611
Maggie Tsui, 16 Woodmont Way, Oakland, CA 94611
Leigh Forsberg, 708 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611
Nancy Forsberg, 708 Grizzly Terrace Drive, Oakland, CA 94611

Very truly yours,

Warren Chick

Enclosures

cc: Yowe, Hancock, Mulhall, Kaufman, Kaufman, Moos, Miller, Booth, Booth, Mulligan, Tsui, Hubach

Caldecott Public Comments, July 11, 2006, page 5

FRANK HUBACH ASSOCIATES, INC.

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc. (FHA) is an engineering consulting firm located in Richmond, California. Founded in May 1984, FHA provides testing, design and consultation services in the fields of acoustics and vibration.

FHA utilizes a team approach, employing a balance between theory and experience. This approach results in high quality, fast service. Our goal is to fulfill client requirements in a cost-effective manner within the constraints of the budget, schedule and technology of the project. FHA provides consulting services to architects, engineers, contractors, building owners, and corporations on a wide range of projects in the industrial, commercial, entertainment, residential and high-technology sectors.

FHA maintains a laboratory equipped with a full complement of Bruel & Kjaer testing and analysis instrumentation. Testing is conducted in accordance with industry standards and a substantial amount of time is invested in developing specialized test and analysis methodologies.

Our experience in architectural, mechanical, structural, electrical and geotechnical engineering disciplines is an invaluable asset. This knowledge enables us to develop total solutions which integrate acoustics and vibration with other engineering and design considerations.

Principals in our organization are members of the following professional societies:

American Society of Heating, Refrigerating & Air-Conditioning Engineers
American Society for Testing and Materials
Institute of Environmental Sciences & Technology
Institute of Noise Control Engineering
Vibration Institute

Please visit our website at **www.fha-eng.com**.

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc
2700 Rydin Road, Suite F
Richmond, CA 94804

Acoustics and Vibration
Engineering Consultants

Phone 510-528-1505
Fax 510-528-1509
Email: fha@ix.netcom.com

FRANK HUBACH ASSOCIATES, INC.

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc. (FHA) is an engineering consulting firm located in Richmond, California. Founded in May 1984, FHA provides testing, design and consultation services in the fields of acoustics and vibration.

FHA utilizes a team approach, employing a balance between theory and experience. This approach results in high quality, fast service. Our goal is to fulfill client requirements in a cost-effective manner within the constraints of the budget, schedule and technology of the project. FHA provides consulting services to architects, engineers, contractors, building owners, and corporations on a wide range of projects in the industrial, commercial, entertainment, residential and high-technology sectors.

FHA maintains a laboratory equipped with a full complement of Bruel & Kjaer testing and analysis instrumentation. Testing is conducted in accordance with industry standards and a substantial amount of time is invested in developing specialized test and analysis methodologies.

Our experience in architectural, mechanical, structural, electrical and geotechnical engineering disciplines is an invaluable asset. This knowledge enables us to develop total solutions which integrate acoustics and vibration with other engineering and design considerations.

Principals in our organization are members of the following professional societies:

American Society of Heating, Refrigerating & Air-Conditioning Engineers
American Society for Testing and Materials
Institute of Environmental Sciences & Technology
Institute of Noise Control Engineering
Vibration Institute

Please visit our website at **www.fha-eng.com**.

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc
2700 Rydin Road, Suite F
Richmond, CA 94804

Acoustics and Vibration
Engineering Consultants

Phone 510-528-1505
Fax 510-528-1509
Email: fha@ix.netcom.com

SERVICES

ACOUSTICAL, VIBRATION AND ELECTROMAGNETIC TESTING

- architectural acoustics
- environmental acoustics
- room reverberation (decay)
- OSHA noise compliance
- structural dynamics
- soil dynamics
- audio systems
- HVAC systems
- sound transmission class (STC)
- high technology facilities
- manufact. criteria evaluation
- historical structures & artwork

ACOUSTICAL ENGINEERING

ARCHITECTURAL ACOUSTICS

- film/tv studios
- discos and clubs
- auditoria
- offices & meeting rooms
- commercial buildings
- hotels and convention centers
- recording & broadcast studios
- churches
- amphitheaters
- restaurants
- hospitals
- manufacturing plants

NOISE CONTROL

- critical listening rooms
- recording studios
- construction equipment
- multi-residential dwellings
- hospitals
- rail traffic
- airport operations
- environmental noise
- mechanical equipment & systems
- commercial buildings
- motor vehicle traffic
- hotels & convention centers
- manufacturing plants
- OSHA
- educational facilities
- clean rooms

VIBRATION ENGINEERING

STRUCTURAL DYNAMICS

- vibration-sensitive clean rooms and laboratories
- geotechnical/foundation design
- equipment platforms & pedestal support
- perceptible building movement
- vibration impact on people, equipment, buildings & artwork
- Finite Element Analysis (FEA)

MACHINE VIBRATION

- mechanical equipment and systems
- scanning electron microscopes
- semiconductor process equipment
- optical equipment
- laser instruments
- precision machine tools

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

SERVICES

SIX PHASE PROJECT APPROACH

Phase A - Preliminary Testing

Preliminary testing is undertaken to determine initial conditions, establish design criteria and qualify sites. This data is essential for design.

Phase B - Design

Our approach is to provide continuous input throughout the design process - **not just a 95% review**. Specifications, recommendations and details are provided from the start of conceptual design through to completion of contract documents. This allows our input to be handled in a cost-effective and efficient manner. Master contract documents including specifications, schedules and detail drawings are provided.

Phase C - Construction Administration

To assure conformance with the design intent, FHA provides submittal/shop drawing review and construction observation.

Phase D - Performance Verification Testing

Testing is conducted to verify conformance with the design criteria and to identify construction anomalies associated with architectural acoustics, noise, and vibration.

Phase E - Owner's Equipment

When appropriate, FHA provides special services for equipment not specifically addressed in the design process.

Phase N - Environmental Noise - Testing and Design

It is often necessary to limit the exterior noise of the facility to comply with the owner's "good neighbor policy" or a local Noise Ordinance.

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

FHA PROJECTS (Partial List)

COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN SERVICES FOR HIGH TECHNOLOGY

ATMEL CORPORATION
Colorado Springs & Rousset, France
Semiconductors

BOEING ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
Bellevue, WA
Semiconductor R&D

DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CORPORATION
MA, CA & Scotland
Semiconductors

DUPONT
Blantyre, Scotland
Mask-Making Facilities

HEWLETT-PACKARD
Corvallis, OR & Palo Alto, CA
Semiconductors

HUALON MICROELECTRONICS CORP.
Hsin-Chu, Taiwan
Semiconductors

INTERNATIONAL RECTIFIER
Rancho Cordova & Temecula, CA
HEXFET High Power Rectifiers

KOMATSU
Hillsboro, OR
Semiconductors

LSI LOGIC CORP.
Edmonton, Canada & Milpitas, CA
Semiconductors

MOTOROLA INC.
Mesa, AZ
Semiconductors

NATIONAL SEMICONDUCTOR
Arlington, TX & So. Portland, ME
Semiconductors

NEC
Roseville, CA & Livingston, Scotland
Semiconductors

RAMTRON CORPORATION
Colorado Springs, CO
Semiconductors

RAYTHEON
Andover, MA
Monolithic Microwave I.C.'s

ROCKWELL
Colorado Springs, CO
Semiconductors

SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES
Albuquerque, NM
RHIC & PSL Facilities

SEMATECH
Austin, TX
Semiconductor R&D

SHIN-ETSU AMERICA
Vancouver, WA
Semiconductors

SIEMENS
North Tyneside, U.K.
Semiconductors

SILICON SYSTEMS INC.
Santa Cruz, CA
Semiconductors

UNITED MICROELECTRONICS CORP.
Hsin-Chu, Taiwan
Semiconductors

VITELIC CORPORATION
Hsin-Chu, Taiwan
Semiconductors

VLSI TECHNOLOGY
San Antonio, TX
Application Specific I.C.'s

WACKER SILTRONIC CORP.
Portland, OR
Crystal Growth

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

FHA PROJECTS (Partial List)

ENGINEERING CONSULTATION OR TESTING SERVICES FOR HIGH TECHNOLOGY

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES
Austin, TX
Semiconductors

AT&T
Allentown, PA
Semiconductors

CHIRON RESEARCH CORP.
Emeryville, CA
Medical Research

CRAY RESEARCH
Colorado Springs, CO
Semiconductors

CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR
Bloomington, MN
Semiconductors

DELCO ELECTRONICS
Kokomo, IN
Automotive Semiconductors

ERSO/ITRI
Taiwan
Semiconductor R&D

HEWLETT-PACKARD
Newark, CA
Materials Fab Building

HUGHES IEG TECH CENTER
Carlsbad, CA
Semiconductors

IBM
Fishkill, NY & Rochester, MN
Semiconductors

INTEL
Aloha, OR
Semiconductors

MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR
Boise, ID
Central Utilities Plant

NANOMETRICS
Santa Clara, CA
SEM Manufacturer

NIKON PRECISION
San Bruno, CA
Semiconductor Equipment Mfr.

PHILIPS SEMICONDUCTORS
Nijmegen, Netherlands & Albuquerque, NM
Semiconductors

SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR
Santa Clara, CA
Semiconductors

SHIMUZU AMERICA
Camus, WA
Pile Driving Vibration

SIEMENS
Villach, Austria
Semiconductors

SOLAR ENERGY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Golden, CO
Energy Research & Development

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
Stanford, CA
CIS Ctr. for Integrated Systems

SILTEC SILICON
Salem, OR
Crystal Growth Facility

TOSHIBA
San Jose, CA
Semiconductors

ULTRATECH
Santa Clara, CA
Semiconductor Equipment Mfr.

XEROX CORPORATION
El Segundo, CA
Semiconductors

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

FHA PROJECTS (Partial List)

EDUCATIONAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL & INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES

AIRPORT EXECUTIVE INN
San Francisco, CA
Airport Noise Control

APPLIED MATERIALS
Santa Clara, CA
Office Privacy/Noise Control

BANK OF AMERICA
Concord, CA
Data Center

BOISE CASCADE
Menlo Park, CA
Noise & Vibration Control

BRENTWOOD ELDERS
Brentwood, CA
Retirement Home Acoustics

CA. ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE
Sacramento, CA
Structural Fatigue

CALIFORNIA CASUALTY
San Mateo, CA
Phone Switchgear Vibration Control

CHEVRON STRATIGRAPHIC LABS
San Ramon, CA
Geology/Metallurgy Research

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL
Oakland, CA
Speech & Hearing Facility

CITY OF MORGAN HILL
Morgan Hill, CA
Traffic Noise/Modeling

COIT TOWER
San Francisco, CA
Historical Mural Preservation

HILTON HOTEL
Oakland, CA
Mechanical Noise Control

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Bloomington, IL
Natural Sciences & Learning Center

LUXOR HOTEL
Las Vegas, NV
Hotel & Casino Noise Control

HOTEL PACIFIC
Monterey, CA
Hotel Acoustics

KAISER PERMANENTE HOSPITAL
Oakland, CA
Environmental Noise Control

PALOMAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL
Escondido, CA
Health Care Facility

RINCON CENTER
San Francisco, CA
Historical Mural Preservation

SEAGATE MAGNETICS
Scotts Valley, CA
Industrial Facility

TERA CORPORATION
Berkeley, CA
Wind Electric Generator

TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE
California
SATCOM Communication Facility

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Tucson, AZ
Life Sciences Building

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
San Francisco, CA
Exhaust Hood Noise Control

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
Austin, TX
Research Building

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

FHA PROJECTS (Partial List)

MEDIA STUDIOS, CHURCHES, AUDITORIA, AND LISTENING SPACES

BRODERBUND
San Rafael, CA
Acoustical Design
Room Acoustics

CBS/WOLF PRODUCTIONS
San Francisco, CA
Acoustical Design
Sound Stage

EPISCOPAL HOMES FOUNDATION
Lafayette, CA
Acoustical/Sound System Design
Auditorium

KCRA
Sacramento, CA
HVAC Noise Control
TV Studio

LUCASARTS ENTERTAINMENT CO.
Nicasio, CA
Acoustical Design
Music Suite

LUCASFILM LTD.
Skywalker Ranch, CA
Acoustical Design
Control Room/Isolation Booths

MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY ASSOCIATION
Tucson, AZ
Acoustical Design
Video Studio Complex

NBC STUDIO A
Chicago, IL
Acoustical Design
Television Studio

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
San Francisco, CA
Acoustical Design
Media Arts Center

PIXAR ANIMATION STUDIOS
Richmond, CA
Vibration Control
Laser Cameras

PIXAR ANIMATION STUDIOS
Emeryville, CA
Noise/Vibration Control
Laser Cameras

THE PLANT RECORDING STUDIO
Sausalito, CA
Acoustical Design
Recording Studio A

PRAIRIE SUN RECORDING
Cotati, CA
Acoustical Consultation
Recording Studio

SANTANA
San Rafael, CA
Acoustical Design
Rehearsal Space

SOUND HOUSE
Seattle, WA
Acoustical Design
Recording Studio

ST. PAUL MISSIONARY CHURCH
Sacramento, CA
Room Acoustics
Sanctuary

WALTER AFANASIEFF
San Rafael, CA
Acoustical Design
Recording Studio

WESTERN IMAGES
San Francisco, CA
Acoustical Design
Video Production Studio

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

REPEAT CLIENTS (Partial List)

ACORN ENGINEERING
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES
ANDERSON DEBARTOLO PAN, INC.
APPLIED MATERIALS
AVANTEK, INC.
BLACK & VEATCH
BLUE DIAMOND GROWERS
BOEING
BOISE CASCADE
BPLW ARCHITECTS
COMPREHENSIVE ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES
DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CORPORATION
EHRLICH ROMINGER, ARCHITECTS
FLUOR DANIEL INC.
GRAEBER SIMMONS & COWAN, ARCHITECTS
HEWLETT-PACKARD
HUGHES AIRCRAFT
INDUSTRIAL DESIGN CORPORATION
INTEL CORPORATION
INTERNATIONAL RECTIFIER
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP
JHW ARCHITECTS
KAISER PERMANENTE HOSPITAL
KAUFMAN & BROAD
KIRKWOOD-BLY INC.
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION
LUCASFILM LTD.
LUCASARTS ENTERTAINMENT
MICROUNITY
MOTOROLA
MURRAY & DOWNS, ARCHITECTS
NATIONAL SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.
OBAYASHI CORPORATION
PHILIPS SEMICONDUCTOR
PIXAR ANIMATION STUDIOS
PRAIRIE SUN RECORDING
RANDY HOLT & ASSOC.
SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR
SANDIA NATIONAL LABS
SEMATECH
SILICON SYSTEMS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
THERMA CORPORATION
TKS INDUSTRIAL CO.
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
VLSI TECHNOLOGY
WHL ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

RESUME

FRANK J. HUBACH

Frank J. Hubach, President of FHA, has over twenty years experience in noise and vibration control for advanced technology, industrial and commercial projects. Design and testing of facilities where micro-vibration is of great concern for metrology and lithography has been his focus. Projects range from comprehensive campus master planning to remodeling in the private, public and institutional sectors. Structural dynamics and mechanical systems for cleanrooms and laboratories have been the specialty. His musical and audio engineering background also makes him well suited for acoustic design of critical listening rooms for recording, broadcast and performance.

Mr. Hubach has over thirty years experience in construction, electronics and audio engineering. He is considered a leading authority on noise and vibration control for microelectronics manufacturing. Mr. Hubach has published several papers and been a speaker at numerous conferences and seminars. He has given expert witness testimony in state and federal courts for acoustic forensics, noise control and construction.

EDUCATION

1971 Bachelor of Engineering Electrical Engineering	New York University Bronx, NY
1970 to 1972 Coursework Graduate Studies in Acoustics and Electronics	New York University Bronx, NY

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

1984 to Present President	Frank Hubach Associates, Inc. Richmond, CA
1978 to 1984 Associate/V.P./Treas./President	Acoustical Consultants, Inc. San Francisco, CA
1975 to 1978 President/Owner/Audio Engineer	Pacific Application Systems Mill Valley, CA
1974 to 1975 V.P./Commercial Contractors	American Wall Systems, Inc. Middletown, NY
1971 to 1974 Recording Engineer	Record Plant Recording/Freelance New York, NY

Frank Hubach Associates, Inc *510-528-1505*

SEMINARS/PAPERS

SEMINARS
(contributing speaker)

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

"Controlling Vibration in Microelectronic Manufacturing Facilities" - 1989 and 1990

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

"Design of Vibration Free Environments for Precision Manufacturing" - 1986

PAPERS

Advanced Techniques for Controlling Building Vibration. 1993 CleanRooms West Convention Conference in Santa Clara, CA, September 1993.

Hubach, Frank J. and Edwards, Bob, Empirical Determination of Sound Isolation Requirements for Recording Studio Isolation Booths. 93rd Audio Engineering Society (AES) Convention in San Francisco, CA, October 1992.

Controlling Horizontal Microscale Vibration in Building Floor Entablatures. 1991 Symposium on Optical Science and Engineering (for SPIE) in San Jose, CA, October 1991.

Vibration Attenuation in Soil. National Conference on Noise Control Engineering (for INCE) in Tarrytown, NY, July 1991.

Neal, Stephen R.W. and Hubach, Frank J., Historic Artwork Preservation and Vibration Mitigation During Building Renovation. National Conference on Noise Control Engineering (for INCE) in Tarrytown, NY, July 1991.

RESUMES

STEPHEN R.W. NEAL

Stephen R.W. Neal, Vice President of FHA, has over twenty years of experience consulting in acoustics and vibration engineering. Vibration, interior noise and environmental noise control for microelectronic manufacturing facilities has been a primary focus. He has thirty years experience in design, construction and operation of mechanical, electrical and audio systems.

Mr. Neal specializes in mechanical systems noise and vibration control, acoustical analysis and structural dynamics. As manager of FHA's computer systems and instrumentation laboratory he is responsible for development of noise, vibration and electro-magnetic field (EMF) measurement and analysis methodologies. Typical assignments include design and test engineering, finite element analysis, on-site construction observation, and development of construction and performance specifications.

EDUCATION

1969 Bachelor of Science Physics	University of California Los Angeles, CA

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

1984 to Present Vice President	Frank Hubach Associates, Inc. Richmond, CA
1981 to 1984 Acoustic & Vibration Consultant	Acoustical Consultants, Inc. San Francisco, CA
1972 to 1981 Senior Audio Engineer Audio Department Manager	FM Productions, Inc. (Bill Graham Presents) San Francisco, CA
1968 to 1971 Scene Technician	University of California Los Angeles, CA

SEMINARS/PAPERS

PAPERS

Neal, Stephen R.W., Quantification of Structural Vibration and Development of Criteria: An Introduction to IES Draft Standard RP-24. 1991 Symposium on Optical Science and Engineering (for SPIE) in San Jose, CA, October 1991.

Neal, Stephen R.W. and Hubach, Frank J., Historic Artwork Preservation and Vibration Mitigation During Building Renovation. National Conference on Noise Control Engineering (for INCE) in Tarrytown, NY, July 1991.

Neal, Stephen R.W. and others, Measuring and Reporting Vibration in Microelectronics Facilities, Institute of Environmental Sciences, IES-RP-CC-025 (Final Draft), 1991.

Frank J. Hubach - Expert Witness Experience

2000 Expert testimony in Arbitration proceedings in the State of Washington. Civil case re: Construction litigation regarding specifications for noise control of large industrial exhaust systems

1999 Retained as expert in Superior Court, State of California. Criminal case re: Acoustic forensics of speech intelligibility at incident site.

1997 Retained as expert, conducted acoustical tests and deposed in Superior Court, State of California. Civil case re: Acoustical privacy in apartment building and building codes.

1993 Retained as expert, conducted acoustical tests and deposed in Superior Court, State of California. Civil case re: Noise impact to residences from proposed CalTrans freeway construction.

1991 Retained as expert, conducted acoustical tests and testified in Municipal Court, San Francisco. Civil case re: Nightclub noise and noise ordinance.

1989 Retained as expert in Municipal Court and conducted acoustical tests, Berkeley, CA. Civil case re: Acoustical privacy, neighbors noise and noise ordinance.

1983 & 87 Retained as expert in Superior Court, State of California, and conducted acoustical tests. Criminal case re: Acoustic forensics of speech intelligibility at crime scene

1986 Retained as expert in Superior Court, State of California. Criminal case re: Acoustical privacy in courtroom between counsel and handcuffed client in murder case

1984 Retained as expert in Superior Court, State of California, and conducted acoustical tests. Criminal case re: Acoustic forensics of speech intelligibility at crime scene

1982 Retained as expert, conducted acoustical tests and testified in Federal Court, San Francisco. Criminal case re: Acoustic forensics of speech intelligibility at wrongful death crime scene

s:\mkt\expertcv.fjh

CALDECOTT
Improvement Project

COMMENT CARD
Informational Open House
June 7 & June 9, 2005

(Contact information below is optional)

Name: WARREN CHICK
Address: 718 GRIZZLY TERRACE DR
OAKLAND, CA 94611
Phone: 510 843 3556
E-mail: SHERSDAD@COMCAST.NET

Comments may be submitted today or mailed to:
Brigetta Smith
Public Information Officer
California Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

☒ Please add me to the project mailing list

Thank you for your interest in the Caldecott Improvement Project. A summary of comments from the informational open houses will be posted on the project website at **www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/caldecott.**

Comments:
My home overlooks the east end of the Caldecott tunnel. I am concerned about the impact of construction activities at night, on me and on wildlife using the Caldecott wildlife corridor — sound and light in particular. I am especially concerned about use of any private land along Fish Ranch Road for construction yards.
OVER

I was a signatory of the report by the consortium re the Caldecott ~~wildl~~ Wildlife Corridor.

I would like to see specs prohibiting any activity outside of the public right of way; and limiting activity inside the right of way to daylight hours Mon-Fri.

Warren Chick

Please mail ~~to~~ a copy of this comment to me.

1- Tunnel excavation will utilize NATM. The nature of tunnel construction necessitates around the clock construction activity to control cost and schedule. When constructing a tunnel, construction work can proceed only in limited areas. For example, tunnel excavation can occur only at one location for each portal. Because of this limitation, the cost and schedule of a tunnel project will increase dramatically if the hours of construction are limited. In addition when the advance of a tunnel is delayed, additional support measures are required to assure that the face of the tunnel remains stable. Under the current plan, which involves tunnel construction 5

days per week, 24 hours per day, these additional support measures will be required only over the weekend. However, if tunnel construction were limited to one shift per day, these additional support measures would have to be installed every day, which would have significant cost implications. The estimated duration for the work hours for each major stage of construction is summarized by Activity, Duration, and Shifts: Mobilize/Portal Development - 8 months, 10 hour shifts. Tunnel Excavation - 18 months, 24 hour shifts. Final Lining - 8 months, 10 hour shifts. Tunnel Systems - 7 months, 10 hour shifts. Tunnel Approaches - 7 months, 10 hour shifts. Other activities: 6 months. The schedule does not include risks and Contractor could elect to work more shifts. The project duration would be lengthened by approximately by approximately 14 months if tunnel construction were performed only form the east portal and the majority of this added schedule would be 24 hour per day tunnel excavation. The proposed start date of construction is June 2009. The proposed end date is December 2013.

Please see the essay on "Construction Impacts" in Chapter 1.

2- This location is at such a distance from the freeway that it is impossible to predict, with any accuracy, the exact level of noise that will be received. Wind direction, thermal inversions, etc. could have a major effect on the noise. With the implementation of the measures discussed in the essay on "Construction Impacts" in Chapter 1, construction noise is expected to be no louder than the existing typical ambient noise levels at receptors near the east and west construction staging areas.

3- On State Route 24 the highest single event noise producers (with the exception of the sirens of police and emergency vehicles) are heavy-duty trucks. Though they may produce noise at higher levels than the peak averaged hourly noise level, their frequency of passbys is irregular and unpredictable, and, unlike the sound of a jet flying by, the sound level is not much higher than the peak hourly level of the traffic that it is mixed with. Since freeway traffic noise is continuous, with irregular peaks, it would not be an accurate representation of the noise environment to describe the freeway only by the peaks caused by these individual truck passbys so Caltrans and the FHWA use a time averaged noise descriptor. When Caltrans performs its noise studies the percentage of heavy-duty trucks is factored into the model, though the volume of heavy-duty truck traffic is not expected to increase.

4- Comment noted.

5- Sequentially excavated tunnel construction is equipment intensive and requires a variety of relatively specialized equipment. Excavation will be largely performed using a roadheader*, but a hydraulic excavator similar to a backhoe but equipped with a digger paddle in lieu of a bucket will also be required in weaker and more intensely fractured ground. Rubber tired mine articulated trucks will be used to transport the excavated materials out of the tunnel. For excavation using the roadheader, the trucks will be charged directly from the roadheader, but where a hydraulic excavator is used, the trucks must be loaded with excavated material using a loader or an LHD**. Shotcrete will be supplied by rubber-tired transit mixers to a self-propelled shotcrete pump equipped with a robotic boom for shotcrete placement. Rock anchors and spiling will require the use of a drill jumbo***. A separate drill jumbo may be required to install the relatively long pipe canopy members required in the poorer ground at each portal. Outside the tunnel, diesel powered front end loaders will load excavated material onto highway trucks. Other equipment used outside the tunnel includes air compressors, forklifts, cranes, and heavy trucks for material deliveries. These equipment requirements necessitate a relatively large maintenance shop to service and maintain this equipment in addition to a warehouse to maintain an adequate inventory of spare parts.

*Roadheader - A track-mounted unit equipped with a rotating cutterhead affixed to a hydraulic boom. Excavated materials are gathered in an apron at the front of the unit and transported by conveyor to the rear of the machine.

**Load-Haul-Dump. A low profile rubber-tired loader equipped with an oversize bucket.

***Drill jumbo - A self-propelled unit equipped with two or three drills and a man-basket, each mounted on a hydraulic boom.

The contract specifications will stipulate maximum noise levels for all equipment. With the implementation of the measures identified in the essay on "Construction Impacts" in Chapter 1, construction noise is expected to be no louder than the existing typical ambient noise levels at receptors near the east and west construction

staging areas. At this time it is anticipated that only tunnel excavation will be performed on a 24-hour-per-day schedule. The estimated duration and the work hours for each major stage of construction is summarized below:

Activity	**Duration**	**Shifts**
Mobilize/Portal Development	8months	10 hour
Tunnel Excavation	18 months	24 hour
Final Lining	8 months	10 hour
Tunnel Systems	7 months	10 hour
Tunnel Approaches	7 months	10 hour
Other Activities	6 months	

6- The nature of tunnel construction necessitates around the clock construction activity to control cost and schedule. When constructing a tunnel, construction work can proceed only in limited areas. For example, tunnel excavation can occur only at one location for each portal. Because of this limitation, the cost and schedule of a tunnel project will increase dramatically if the hours of construction are limited. In addition when the advance of a tunnel is delayed, additional support measures are required to assure that the face of the tunnel remains stable. Under the current plan, which involves tunnel construction 5 days per week, 24 hours per day, these additional support measures will only be required over the weekend. However, if tunnel construction were limited to one shift per day, these additional support measures would have to be installed every day, which would have significant cost implications.

The staging area at the east portal is approximately 1.4 acres and enclosing this area with a temporary building is not economically feasible.

Please see the essay on “Construction Impacts” in Chapter 1.

The contract specifications will require that construction equipment satisfy noise criteria that when satisfied will result in construction noise being at or below ambient noise levels. If stationary equipment does not satisfy noise requirements, then either the equipment will be replaced or other measures, such as enclosing the equipment within a sound dampening structure, will be implemented.

Requiring that the batch plant be located away from the east portal would necessitate double handling of all the shotcrete and concrete that will be mixed in the plant and this would have serious cost ramifications. In addition, this requirement would also result in increased construction traffic.

Excavated material will be removed from the tunnel by “off road trucks” that are not permitted to travel on highways. Therefore, transfer of the excavated material to highway trucks has to occur within the staging area immediately adjacent the portal.

Currently there are no plans for construction activity outside of the Caltrans right-of-way on Fish Ranch Road. However, the Contractor could elect to lease additional area for staging of equipment or materials somewhere in close proximity to the tunnel portal and the contract specifications will not prohibit such a lease.

With the implementation of the measures mentioned in the essay on “Construction Impacts” in Chapter 1, construction noise is expected to be no louder than the existing typical ambient noise levels at receptors near the east and west construction staging areas.

During construction, noise related complaints should be directed to the project’s Resident Engineer. The Resident Engineer will then determine if the any additional noise abatements are necessary.

7- All construction lighting will be shielded so that the lighting filament is not visible to nearby residents, and the temporary soundwall along Caldecott Lane will also shield residences along Caldecott Lane from the construction staging area.

8- Detailed construction and design plans will be developed during the design phase of the project. Typical construction closures (freeway mainline, on-ramp, off-ramp, etc.) are limited to those hours that should have minimal or no traffic delays. For many facilities and locations, this means lane and ramp closure windows are limited to night-time. There may be times when closures outside the windows are needed. However, those closures are kept to a minimum. For Fish Range Road, there may be limited weekend closures on a few occurrences.

9- Blasting associated with construction is expected to be minimal and infrequent, and not expected to adversely effect sensitive domesticated animal and wildlife populations.

10- In regards to construction noise impact, hourly (Leq(h)), as well as maximum (Lmax), noise level descriptors were used to analyze impact. Measurements of existing ambient noise levels have been made at several locations adjacent to the Caldecott Tunnel. The locations were chosen based on their exposure to the construction noise. These measurements included both daytime and nighttime noise. Ambient noise levels vary throughout the day. Peak noise levels were recorded from single events (as measured by the descriptor Lmax) such as vehicular back firing (e.g., trucks, motorcycles). The ambient noise levels were then compared to expected noise levels from construction activities.

For the construction staging area at the west portal, the analysis indicates that if noise from construction activities (including single events) does not exceed 86 dBA at a distance of 50 feet and a temporary noise barrier is constructed, construction noise at the measurement locations is expected to be no louder than existing ambient noise. Put another way, no single construction noise event will create noise higher than the single noise events that are occurring now, nor will continuous noise levels be higher than the existing continuous ambient noise levels, hence, there will be no significant impact due to construction noise. For this project the contract will require that noise from equipment be kept under the noise level of 86 dBA at 50 feet. This is a standard currently being used on other state projects and has been shown to be consistently attainable. Since noise monitoring will be included in the contract specifications to ensure compliance with these noise levels, it will not be necessary to perform noise testing at individual residences.

For the analysis of construction noise at the east portal, ambient noise readings were taken on Grizzly Terrace Drive, the neighborhood with the most exposure to the construction noise. The construction noise limit of 86 dBA at 50 feet will also apply to this staging area. The analysis indicates that with normal dissipation in noise over distance (with no temporary soundwall), construction noise, whether continuous or single event, will not reach levels higher than those that are now occurring.

In regards to vibration, blasting is the only operation with any potential to damage property. Because the blasting charges will be limited, used sparingly, and be far beneath the properties, most residences will not be exposed to any potentially damaging vibrations. When blasting is planned to be used the state will survey the properties that it has determined to have any risk of damage from the blasting and perform vibration monitoring as well as document the condition of the properties. Specific properties cannot be stated in this document as the blasting will only be used sporadically, if at all, and any monitoring is subject to the permission of the property owner.

Please see the essay on “Construction Impacts” in Chapter 1.

Please see Chapter 9 for the response to the comment card you enclosed.

Cohen, Mitch

M.Cohen@kp.org
07/12/2006 04:46 PM

To coldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov,
caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc info@ebbc.org
bcc
Subject Comments on Caldecott Tunnel Improvements

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am a year-round bicycle commuter. I am deeply disappointed that the Caldecott Tunnel improvements provide no accommodation for bicycles.

BART cannot provide me 5 pm bicycle access to Orinda or Walnut Creek, due to the commuter demands. Climbing an extra 500+ feet and 6.5 miles may be feasible for bicyclists in great shape, but it certainly is a major impediment to most bicyclists and potential bicycle commuters. 1

I strongly urge you to reconsider, and to add safe, breathable, bicycle access to the tunnel project.

Sincerely,

Mitch Cohen
Sr. Data Consultant for Encounter Information Operations
Kaiser Permanente
1950 Franklin St., 16th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

E-mail: m.cohen@kp.org
NCAL Office: 510/987-2673 (tie: 8-427)
NCAL Fax: 510/873-5244 (tie: 8-427)

CONFIDENTIAL OR PRIVILEGED: This communication contains information intended only for the use of the individuals to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from other disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any disclosure, printing, copying, distribution or use of the contents is prohibited. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by returning it by reply email and then permanently deleting the communication from your system. Thank you.

1- See Option J in the essay on “Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements” in Chapter 1.

Cohn, Steve

"Steve Cohn"
<steve_cohn@comcast.net>
07/10/2006 12:15 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Comment on Caldecott Tunnel

While a pedestrian/bike element to the new Caldecott Tunnel would be a wonderful idea in a world with infinite resources, I do not believe the tens of millions of dollars that it would cost would be the best way to utilize this money.

The Caldecott Tunnel is:
0.6 miles long
2.2 miles from and about 700 feet above College Avenue at Rockridge BART
2.1 miles from and about 400 feet above Orinda BART A trip between Rockridge and Orinda is 4.9 miles going through the tunnel on Highway 24.

Currently, the shortest route from Rockridge to Orinda not using the tunnel is up Claremont, down Fish Ranch Road and down Highway 24. This is 5.9 miles and climbs 1,100 feet (800 feet going the other way). This is currently only available to cyclists who are willing to ride on Highway 24 east of the tunnel. Most cyclists are unwilling to do this and travel miles further (with a lot more vertical) either through Moraga/Canyon or up Wildcat. Walkers have to go at least 1.5 miles further and 400 feet higher (over Grizzly and El Toyonal which is extremely steep).

Almost any biker who is willing to ride 5 miles and climb 400-700 vertical feet, will ride 6 miles and climb 800-1,100 feet. The additional riders a tunnel would serve would be minimal. I can't imagine anyone would want to walk through a 4,000 foot tunnel either for exercise (when there are beautiful trails on the hills above) or for utility (when BART can get you from Orinda to Rockridge in 5 minutes for $1.40.

A much better use of funds, for a fraction of the cost of a bike/pedestrian tunnel, would be a segregated path (a continuation of the St. Stephen's trail) from Orinda, through Gateway and up to Fish Ranch Road. An additional path through Gateway Valley to Lost Valley in Orinda would be another great asset. Both would well serve the bike/pedestrian community on the Highway 24 corridor and be a cost effective element of the Caldecott Tunnel expansion plans. 1

Steve Cohn
29 La Fond Lane
Orinda, CA 94563
email steve_cohn@comcast.net

1- Please see the essay on “Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements” in Chapter 1.

Conly, Leonard (7/28/07)

lconly@lmi.net ()
07/28/2006 12:45 PM

To brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov, sheryl_dorado@dot.ca.gov, carl_weingarten@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (lconly@lmi.net) on Friday, July 28, 2006 at 12:45:57

Firstname: Leonard

Lastname: Conly

Business: Len's Electric

Phone: 510-526-2548

Address: 1252 Gilman St

City: Berkeley

State: CA

Zip: 94706

Comments: If a fourth bore is to built, it should be built as a dual-use tunnel, i.e. it should be designed so that it can be converted to rail use at some time in the future. It is inevitable that oil supplies will dwindle and that
the requirements for mass transit will increase to the point that it will be necessary to use this tunnel for rail. As the consequences of global warming become more evident, the public will demand an increase in the availabilty of mass transit along this corridor.

Leonard Conly

1-Please see the essays on “Purpose and Need” and “Transit” in Chapter 1.

Conly, Leonard (7/15/06)

lconly@lmi.net ()
07/15/2006 10:36 AM

To: brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov, sheryl_dorado@dot.ca.gov
cc:
Subject: Caldecott Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (lconly@lmi.net) on Saturday, July 15, 2006 at 10:36:27

Firstname: Leonard

Lastname: Conly

Business: Len's Electric

Phone: 510-459-5841

Address: 1252 Gilman St

City: Berkeley

State: CA

Zip: 94706

Comments: I have prepared a comment on the Draft EA/EIR which is approximately 600 words in length. When I attempt to paste it into this comment box, it only accepts one paragraph of my text. Please send me an email address to which I can submit my comments, or a mailing address. I also urge you to hold another public hearing on this issue.

Leonard Conly

Conly, Leonard (7/15/06)

lconly@lmi.net ()
07/15/2006 10:36 AM

To: brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov, sheryl_dorado@dot.ca.gov
cc:
Subject: Caldecott Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (lconly@lmi.net) on Saturday, July 15, 2006 at 10:36:27

Firstname: Leonard

Lastname: Conly

Business: Len's Electric

Phone: 510-459-5841

Address: 1252 Gilman St

City: Berkeley

State: CA

Zip: 94706

Comments: I have prepared a comment on the Draft EA/EIR which is approximately 600 words in length. When I attempt to paste it into this comment box, it only accepts one paragraph of my text. Please send me an email address to which I can submit my comments, or a mailing address. I also urge you to hold another public hearing on this issue.

Leonard Conly

Conly, Leonard (7/15/06)

lconly@lmi.net ()
07/15/2006 10:49 AM

To: brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov, sheryl_dorado@dot.ca.gov
cc:
Subject: Caldecott Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (lconly@lmi.net) on Saturday, July 15, 2006 at 10:49:03

Firstname: Leonard

Lastname: Conly

Business: Len's Electric

Phone: 510-459-5841

Address: 1252 Gilman St

City: Berkeley

State: CA

Zip: 94706

Comments:
COMMENTS ON DRAFT EA/EIR FOR CALDECOTT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT BY LEONARD CONLY, 1252 GILMAN ST, BERKELEY, CA 94706

On page viii of the Summary of the Draft EA/EIR on the Caldecott Improvement Project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/caldecott/draft_ea_eir.htm), under the section titled "Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion," mass transit is eliminated from further discussion as an alternative to building a fourth bore for the Caldecott Tunnel in order to relieve congestion.

The elimination of mass transit from further discussion is environmentally irresponsible. Nowhere in this Draft EA/EIR is there any reference to global warming, climate change, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, or carbon dioxide. There is no discussion of the different amounts of GHG emissions that will result from any of the alternatives proposed.

For instance, according to the American Public Transportation Association ("Conserving Energy and Preserving the Air We Breathe" (http://www.publictransportation.org/reports/index_energy.asp) a passenger on a bus produces one half the carbon dioxide emissions per mile as a passenger in an automobile. Nowhere in the Draft EA/EIR is this fact mentioned.

The claims of the Draft EA/EIR that the problem of congestion cannot be solved by transit is simply unbelievable. It is time for Caltrans to begin practicing Transit Demand Management (TDM) rather than Business As Usual (BAU).

At the United Nations' World Environment Day conference in San Francisco on Wednesday, June 1, 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05, establishing California as a leader in the fight against global warming and he announced greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets for California. Executive Order S-03-5 establishes these GHG targets and charges the California Environmental Protection Agency secretary with the coordination of the oversight of efforts to achieve them.

The Governor said:

"California will continue to be a leader in the fight against global warming

and protecting our environment. Today I am establishing clear and ambitious targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in our state to protect our many natural resources, public health, agriculture and diverse landscape.

"The targets the Governor announced today call for a reduction of GHG emissions to 2000 levels by 2010; a reduction of GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; and a reduction of GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050."

A complete report of the Governor's remarks at the UN World Environment Day conference can be read at http://www.schwarzenegger.com/news.asp?id=2054. The full text of Executive Order S-03-5 can be read at http://www.schwarzenegger.com/news.asp?id=2055.

The Governor has declared that GHG emissions represent a serious threat to the health of California's environment, and yet Caltrans is proposing the expansion of our existing highway system which will only increase these emissions.

California is having a difficult time reconciling two conflicting goals: one is to curb the production of greenhouse gases, and the second is to improve our transportation system by continued reliance on the automobile rather than on transit. It is time to re-order our priorities. If we build this tunnel, it will mean that we are committed to business as usual, and have decided to gamble with our future by risking the consequences of global warming.

American cars and pickup trucks are responsible for nearly half of the greenhouse gases emitted by automobiles globally, even though the nation's vehicles make up just 30% of the nearly 700 million cars in use, according to a recent report by Environmental Defense ("U.S. Emits Half of Carbon-Caused Greenhous Gas, Study Says" Los Angeles Times, June 28, 2006)

Given the fact that global warming may turn out to be the greatest environmental crisis which we have ever faced, it is difficult to understand how this problem is being ignored in the Draft EA/EIR. (Please read article on latest global warming research in MIT Technology Review, July/August, 2006 at http://www.technologyreview.com/read_article.aspx?id=17057&ch=biztech).

There is also no provision in this proposal for accommodating bicycles through the fourth bore. This is an inexcusable oversight. It perpetuates the short-sightedness that we have shown by not building our transportation systems to accommodate bicycle traffic.

If history is any guide, building another bore of the Caldecott Tunnel will simply increase automobile traffic and as a result greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions . I urge Caltrans to reject this Draft EA/EIR since it does not include data on the current production of GHG emissions on this corridor and how it would change as a result of the building of a fourth bore.

In the event that a second EIR cannot demonstrate a significant reduction in GHG emissions as a result of this proposal, I urge you to develop a new proposal which will solve the congestion problem at the Caldecott Tunnel through the increased use of transit, including BART, in Alameda and Contra Costa County or by imposing tolls to curb congestion at the existing Tunnel. We have a responsibility to our children to change the nature of our transportation system.

Leonard Conly
1252 Gilman St.
Berkeley, CA 94706
510-526-2548

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion
The following alternatives were evaluated and eliminated from further

consideration based on
feasibility, costs, environmental and engineering considerations and failure to meet the Purpose and
Need of the project:
• Southern Alignment Tunnels;
a. Two-lane south of the existing bores (Alternative 2S);
b. Three-lane south of the existing bores (Alternative 3S);
• Four Lane Tunnel Alternatives;
• Street and Highway Operations Alternative;
• Mass Transit; and
• Bikeway Tunnel Alternative.

Conly, Leonard (7/15/06)

Greg Mcconnell/D04/Caltrans/CAGov
07/31/2006 07:09 AM

To sheryl_dorado@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: COMMENTS ON DRAFT EA/EIR FOR CALDECOTT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Another letter
----- Forwarded by Greg Mcconnell/D04/Caltrans/CAGov on 07/31/2006 07:09 AM -----

Jack Gaines/D04/Caltrans/CAGov
07/28/2006 09:41 AM

To Greg.McConnell@dot.ca.gov
cc
Subject COMMENTS ON DRAFT EA/EIR FOR CALDECOTT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Jack Holden Gaines
Public Affairs Officer
O: 510-286-4454
C: 510-316-2005

Caltrans Improves Mobility Across California

Leonard Conly <lconly@lmi.net>
07/27/2006 13:26 MST

To: jack.gaines@dot.ca.gov
cc:
bcc:
Subject: COMMENTS ON DRAFT EA/EIR FOR CALDECOTT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Dear Mr. Gaines:

I spoke to Jeff at 510-715-7180 and he told me that if I sent you these comments (see below) on the Caldecott Improvement Project that you would see that they were properly posted. I tried to paste them into the message box on the webpage (http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/caldecott/mailinglist.htm) for posting comments on the Draft EA/EIR for the project, but when I do so, all the formatting is lost.

Please let me know when they are posted. You can contact me at 510-459-5841 if you want any information on the problem I experienced.

Thanks for your help.

Leonard Conly
1252 Gilman St.
Berkeley, CA 94706

COMMENTS ON DRAFT EA/EIR FOR CALDECOTT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT BY LEONARD CONLY, 1252 GILMAN ST, BERKELEY, CA 94706

On page viii of the Summary of the Draft EA/EIR on the Caldecott Improvement Project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/caldecott/draft_ea_eir.htm), under the section titled "Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion," mass transit is eliminatedfrom further discussion as an alternative to building a fourth bore for the Caldecott Tunnel in order to relieve congestion.

The elimination of mass transit from further discussion is environmentally irresponsible. 1

Nowhere in this Draft EA/EIR is there any reference to global warming, climate change, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, or carbon dioxide. There is no discussion of the different amounts of GHG emissions that will result from any of the alternatives proposed. 2

For instance, according to the American Public Transportation Association ("Conserving Energy and Preserving the Air We Breathe" (http://www.publictransportation.org/reports/index_energy.asp) a passenger on a bus produces one half the carbon dioxide emissions per mile as a passenger in an automobile. Nowhere in the Draft EA/EIR is this fact mentioned.

The claims of the Draft EA/EIR that the problem of congestion cannot be solved by transit is simply unbelievable. It is time for Caltrans to begin practicing Transit Demand Management (TDM) rather than Business As Usual (BAU).

At the United Nations' World Environment Day conference in San Francisco on Wednesday, June 1, 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05, establishing California as a leader in the fight against global warming and he announced greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets for California. Executive Order S-03-5 establishes these GHG targets and charges the California Environmental Protection Agency secretary with the coordination of the oversight of efforts to achieve them.

The Governor said:

"California will continue to be a leader in the fight against global warming and protecting our environment. Today I am establishing clear and ambitious targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in our state to protect our many natural resources, public health, agriculture and

diverse landscape.

"The targets the Governor announced today call for a reduction of GHG emissions to 2000 levels by 2010; a reduction of GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; and a reduction of GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050."

A complete report of the Governor's remarks at the UN World Environment Day conference can be read at http://www.schwarzenegger.com/news.asp?id=2054. The full text of Executive Order S-03-5 can be read at http://www.schwarzenegger.com/news.asp?id=2055.

The Governor has declared that GHG emissions represent a serious threat to the health of California's environment, and yet Caltrans is proposing the expansion of our existing highway system which will only increase these emissions.

California is having a difficult time reconciling two conflicting goals: one is to curb the

production of greenhouse gases, and the second is to improve our transportation system by continued reliance on the automobile rather than on transit. It is time to re-order our priorities. If we build this tunnel, it will mean that we are committed to business as usual, and have decided to gamble with our future by risking the consequences of global warming.

American cars and pickup trucks are responsible for nearly half of the greenhouse gases emitted by automobiles globally, even though the nation's vehicles make up just 30% of the nearly 700 million cars in use, according to a recent report by Environmental Defense ("U.S. Emits Half of Carbon-Caused Greenhous Gas, Study Says" Los Angeles Times, June 28, 2006)

Given the fact that global warming may turn out to be the greatest environmental crisis which we have ever faced, it is difficult to understand how this problem is being ignored in the Draft EA/EIR. (Please read article on latest global warming research in MIT Technology Review, July/August, 2006 at http://www.technologyreview.com/read_article.aspx?id=17057 &ch=biztech).

There is also no provision in

this proposal for accommodating bicycles through the fourth bore. This is an inexcusable oversight. It perpetuates the short-sightedness that we have shown by not building our transportation systems to accommodate bicycle traffic. 3

If history is any guide, building another bore of the Caldecott Tunnel will simply increase automobile traffic and as a result greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions . I urge Caltrans to reject this Draft EA/EIR since it does not include data on the current production of GHG emissions on this corridor and how it would change as a result of the building of a fourth bore.

In the event that a second EIR cannot demonstrate a significant reduction in GHG emissions as a result of this proposal, I urge you to develop a new proposal which will solve the congestion problem at the Caldecott Tunnel through the increased use of transit, including BART, in Alameda and Contra Costa County or by imposing tolls to curb congestion at the existing Tunnel. We have a responsibility to our children to change the nature of our transportation system.

Leonard Conly
1252 Gilman St.

Berkeley, CA 94706
510-526-2548

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion
The following alternatives were evaluated and eliminated from further consideration based on
feasibility, costs, environmental and engineering considerations and failure to meet the Purpose and
Need of the project:
•Southern Alignment Tunnels;

a.Two-lane south of the existing bores (Alternative 2S);
b.Three-lane south of the existing bores (Alternative 3S);
•Four Lane Tunnel Alternatives;
•Street and Highway Operations Alternative;
•Mass Transit; and
•Bikeway Tunnel Alternative.

1-Please see the essays on "Alternatives Considered in the Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report (DEA/EIR)" and "Transit" in Chapter 1.

2- While climate change has been a concern since at least 1988 as evidenced by the establishment of the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the efforts devoted to "greenhouse gas"[2] (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy has increased dramatically in recent years. In 2002, with the passage of Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), California launched an innovative and pro-active approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change at the state level. AB 1493 requires the Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions; these regulations will apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009 model year.

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05. The goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the 2020 and 3) by the year 2050 to reduce GHG emissions to 80% below the 1990 levels. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that ARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve "real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases." Executive Order S-17-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the state's Climate Action Team. Caltrans strives to be a good steward of the environment and as a member of the executive branch of the state government, shares your and our governor's concerns regarding greenhouse gasses and global warming. This is reflected in our Director's Policy DP-23 which states, "(Caltrans) Coordinates with external agencies on cross-agency policy framework and provides support for clean transportation and (the) State's effort on climate change and global warming." The Department and its parent agency, the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, have taken an active role in addressing GHG emission reduction and climate change. Recognizing that 98 percent of California's GHG emissions are from the burning of fossil fuels and 40 percent of all human made GHG emissions are from transportation, the Department has created and is implementing the *Climate Action Program at Caltrans* (December 2006).

One of the main strategies to reduce GHG emissions is to make California's transportation system more efficient. The highest levels of carbon dioxide from mobile sources, such as automobiles, occur at stop-and-go speeds (0-25 miles per hour) and speeds over 55 mph. Relieving congestion by enhancing operations and improving travel times in high congestion travel corridors will lead to an overall reduction in GHG emissions. A transit alternative was analyzed for this project and found not to meet the purpose and need of the project (see the essay on "Transit" in Chapter 1). In addition, by helping improve the state highway system infrastructure the project will increase efficiencies for future motor vehicles which we assume will be fueled by less polluting petroleum based fuels and/or based on other less polluting technologies.

[2] Greenhouse gases related to human activity include: Carbon dioxide, Methane, Nitrous oxide, Tetrafluoromethane, Hexafluoroethane, Sulfur hexafluoride, HFC-23, HFC-134a*, and HFC-152a*.

The Caldecott Improvement Project will add a minimal amount of new impermeable surface area to an already urbanized area, which could theoretically add to global warming by increasing the heat island effect. However, trees reduce the heat island effect through the natural cooling process of shading and reducing evapotranspiration. Native trees removed by the project will be replaced at a 3:1 to 5:1 ratio, providing shade. Given the small amount of impermeable surface area to be added in an already urbanized setting, and the replacement of native trees and shrubs, the Caldecott Improvement Project is not expected to add to any existing heat island.

The No-Project Bay Area wide projected weekday VMT is 80,410,808 vehicle miles traveled. The two-lane bore projected VMT is 80,251,260 vehicle miles traveled. The small decrease in VMT in Alternative 2N, the Preferred Alternative, is likely due to travelers taking advantage of the decreased congestion in the Caldecott Tunnel to take more direct routes to their destination.

The amount of carbon dioxide produced by a given gasoline or diesel fueled motor vehicle is directly proportional to the amount of fuel that it burns. Motor vehicles get considerably better mileage and burn less fuel per mile traveled when they can travel at a uniform speed rather than in the kind of stop and go conditions caused by traffic congestion. Therefore, the reduction in congestion accomplished by this project should result in a reduction in the amount of carbon dioxide produced by motor vehicles.

As noted above, the project will provide a slight decrease in Bay Area wide projected weekday VMT. This coupled with the fact that vehicle emissions will decrease as a result of congestion relief, i.e. there will be more free flowing traffic and fewer engines idling while queuing up outside the tunnel portals thus producing fewer “greenhouse gasses”, indicates that the project will have a beneficial effect by reducing “greenhouse” gasses and any resultant climate changes.

3- See Option J in the essay on “Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements” in Chapter 1.

Cuff, Thomas

Tom Cuff
<cuvid2@yahoo.com>
07/28/2006 05:21 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Tunnel Expansion

I am writing to express my opposition to this project.
In general, the project is prone to cost overruns and 1
delays just as the Bay Bridge and 880 projects were.
Are toll payers and tax payer again going to have to
bail it out?
Secondly, I think more emphasis on public 2
transportation makes more sense.
If the project goes ahead, I think the environmental 3
report is inadequate and needs to be revised.
Secondly, I think the staging area needs to be on the
Contra Costa (inland side) of the tunnel and not the
Oakland side where a much greater population will be 4
affected by the work.
Thank you for your consideration

Thomas Cuff
6069 Rockridge Blvd.
Oakland, Ca. 94618
cuvid2@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com

1-The current project cost estimate was developed using a "bottom-up" approach, as if the Contractor were bidding on the project. In addition, escalation rates and risk contingency have been added to the cost estimate. The Department expects the current total cost estimate to be accurate, therefore there we do not foresee any need for tax and toll payers to cover additional future costs.

2-Please see the essay on "Transit" in Chapter 1.

3- Technical studies have been completed that incorporate project study limits that may have potential project impacts. The findings of these studies were summarized in the environmental report. All impacts related to the construction of the proposed project were included and mitigation/minimization of these impacts are also addressed in the report.

The FHWA and the Department believe that the DEA/EIR and the FEA/EIR provide an adequate analysis of both potential impacts and potential mitigation measures as discussed in Chapter 2, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures and fully meets state and federal requirements. The FEA/EIR will not be withdrawn. Please see the essay on "The Environmental Process; Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report ((EIS/EIR) versus and Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report (EA/EIR); and Criteria for Significance" in Chapter 1.

4- Please see the essay on "Constructing the Tunnel from the East Side Only" in Chapter 1.

Currie, Diane

"Diane Currie"
<dmcsales@comcast.net>
05/31/2006 06:47 PM

To <CALDECOTT_PUBLIC_COMMENTS@DOT.CA.GOV>
cc
bcc
Subject tunnel

I have lived in Orinda for 15 years. The reverse commute was tolerable 15 years ago but is now impossible. On any given evening it can take as much as 30 minutes for a 4 minute drive back to Oakland. The arguments from Oakland and Berkeley government officials in the past...too many people will move to the suburbs if there is easy access back to the urban areas is a bit shortsighted. I used to go through the tunnel for dinner on College Avenue at least twice a week. Now I refuse to fight the reverse commute on any given evening and go to Walnut Creek instead. So, the urban area's are actually losing much business from locals over here. I also rarely go to San Francisco as it's first a fight to get through the tunnel and then another headache to get over the bridge. If I just had to contend with the bridge I would definitely go more often.

The 680/580 bottleneck at Walnut Creek was repaired a few years ago. The 680/580 bottleneck out to Livermore was also repaired. It seems like all of the priority for improved roads is going to overbuilt outlaying areas...now it's highway 4 out in the Antioch. These outlying areas have greatly increased the traffic on highway 24 and the tunnel. The tunnel hasn't been improved since it was built in the 1930's. It's OUR turn!!! and I vote for alternative 3N. The more lanes the better in my book. 1

Regards,

Diane Currie

Diane Currie
American Packaging
dianec@amerpkg.com
510-877-9000----Main
510-877-9040----Direct
925-253-9481----Res. Fax

1- Please see the essay on "Preferred Alternative" in Chapter 1.

Darci, Tom

"Tom Darci"
<tom@nuws.com>
07/15/2006 09:51 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject pedestrian & bicycle access for caldecott tunnel

Hello There,

I am writing to ask that you strongly consider including access for bicycles and pedestrians in the additional section being added to the Caldecott Tunnel. Being able to make it from Oakland to Orinda on bicycle without having to ride the lengthy and tiring up and over would be a wonderful thing. The pedestrian/bicycle access would need to be separated enough from vehicle traffic to be comfortable, quiet and safe (NOT like the tunnel going from Oakland to Alameda). Thank you for your time, and I hope that this can be included in the plan. 1

Regards,
-Tom Darci
Oakland Resident

1- See Option J in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

De Benedictis, Bruce

Bruce De Benedictis
<bru1debenedictis@earthlink.net>
07/11/2006 09:59 PM

To <caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on building a fourth bore

I oppose building the fourth bore of the Caldecott tunnel for the following reasons:

1. It is not financially viable. It cannot generate enough funds from the taxes and fees paid by those who use it during the time that they use it to pay for its operations, let alone the cost of building it. If you took all the taxes generated by vehicles during the time that they use the Caldecott tunnel, it is not enough to pay for such things as operating the ventilation system for the tunnel, let alone police and other emergency services. A fourth bore, which by its very nature, would generate no more money than the other bores. 1

2. The benefit it would provide is too small and would go to too few people, when compared to the cost of construction, and when compared to other projects and services which are not being funded. 2

3. The shortfall between the amount of money that it generates and the amount of money that it takes to operate it has, and will continue to be made up by taking money from other sources, many of which are paid for by people who do not or indeed, cannot use the tunnel. As money is taken from the operating budgets of local streets and roads, that money is made up by taking it from other budgets for which there may be no voter control. As an example, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has admitted that it has been taking money from "self-help" counties to pay for shortfalls in other counties which have voted against paying additional taxes for streets and highways. 3

4. There are other transportation needs which have gone unmet, despite direct votes of the people. We in the AC Transit district have voted at least four times in the past 10 years to pay for additional service, and yet service remains at levels less than we have voted for. Service lost in my home area has cost me many times more time, health, safety and money than anyone has suffered from the Caldecott tunnel. The reduction in service from 15 minute headways to 20 minute headways during rush hours is more time per rider than would be saved by the construction of a fourth bore, and that is minuscule compared to the time lost by the cessation of weekend and evening service. Yet that service could be provided free, forever, from the interest on the money that it would cost to build the fourth bore. 4

5. The disparity between the criteria for this project and what other transportation projects and services are causing disparities in society. People now routinely travel through areas of high unemployment to get to jobs which might just as well be taken by the people in the high unemployment areas. The Caldecott tunnel has already turned neighborhoods which were once areas from which people commuted to jobs now taken by people who live farther out and turned them into neighborhoods of high un- or underemployment. This project will worsen this tendency, creating a deeper and deeper underclass. 5

Bruce De Benedictis
631 Boulevard Way
Oakland, CA 94610-1642
(510) 763-4657

1- Please see the essay on “Funding” in Chapter 1.

2- Please see the essays on “Purpose and Need” and “Regional Measure 2 and Contra Costa Measure J” in Chapter 1.

3- Please see response #1.

4- Please see the essay on “Scope of the Project” in Chapter 1.

5- Comment noted.

Del Beccaro, Edward F.

"Edward Del Beccaro" <edelbeccaro@colliersparrish.com>
07/05/2006 01:32 PM

To "Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov" <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Attention: Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner

July 5, 2006
Senior Environmental Planner Gregory McConnell
Mail Station 8B, P.O. Box 23660
Caltrans District 4, Environmental Analysis
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Dear Gregory McConnell,

Dear Mr. McConnell:

Traffic congestion is the leading concern of Bay Area residents, and the Bay Area's economic health and quality-of-life demand serious improvement to the regional transportation system. Adding a fourth bore at the Caldecott Tunnel is one of the most important projects, and I urge Caltrans to certify the project environmental document (EA/EIR) and construct the project as quickly as possible.

Rising employment and evolving commute patterns have created severe daily congestion in the off-peak direction. Addition of a fourth bore for the Caldecott Tunnel is the only effective way to provide balanced capacity in both direction, eliminating counter-commute congestion, dangerous merging, and idling emissions. The Caldecott 4th Bore is an important project that will improve regional mobility, employment access, and economic vitality. Residents and employers in Alameda and Contra Costa counties have shown strong support for the project, voting in overwhelming numbers to fund the project through two county sales tax measures and the Regional Measure 2 toll program.

The Draft EA/EIR is full and fair and includes a complete and comprehensive analysis of the project and its potential impacts to the surrounding community. Where impacts were found, the environmental document identifies appropriate and adequate mitigations. With all necessary analysis complete and traffic congestion continuing to worsen, Caltrans should approve the environmental report and quickly construct the project and any necessary mitigations.

In addition I think it important that an accomadation be made with the California Shakespeare Theater as to preserve access to the Bruns Theater and to the parking lot that they use. 1

Sincerely,

Edward F. Del Beccaro

55 San Gregorio Ct.
Danville, CA 94526-1507

1- The Traffic Congestion Management Plan to be prepared for the project during the design phase will include language regarding the need to reduce construction impacts, whenever feasible, during the events at the California Shakespeare Theater over its continuous operation from May to October of every year.

Della Santina, Judy

"judy"
<jdellasan23@comcast.net>
07/12/2006 11:11 AM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject EIR Caldecott Tunnel 4th Bore

PLEASE take the time to make a complete EIR report on the impact the 4th Bore project will have on the Rockridge neighborhood. I am very concerned that issues regarding noise and air pollution, traffic, etc. have not been fully studied. It sounds like those of us on the West side of the tunnel are going to take the brunt of the impact of this huge project. I urge more thoughtful consideration. 1

Judy Della Santina
6087 Rockridge Blvd.
Oakland, CA 94618
510-655-4746

1-Please see the essay on "Project Study Area Boundaries" in Chapter 1.

Dessert, Mark

"Mark Dessert"
<markd@powderhaus.com>

07/10/2006 01:58 PM

Please respond to
<markd@powderhaus.com>

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Tunnel

Dear Caltrans,

A regional matter is upon us in transportation. The Caldecott Tunnel is being forced forward with insufficient concern for other forms of transportation except motor vehicles. <?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

The concerns range from motor vehicle air, noise, and light pollution and increased congestion to invasive plant species, and decreased safety for those that walk or bike within 1 mile of on and off ramps. Traffic from on and off ramps interferes with children and their mothers walking and biking to school.

I would like to urge everyone to assist in ensuring that mitigations are properly negotiated when they bore a new hole in the 24 Hill. There is already a history of slicing, dicing and chopping up our cities to provide for automotive dominance. We need to ensure ped/bike transportation and the safety of everyone on the ground. 1

Seniors, children and disabled are the most impacted on our local city streets. There is little attempt to improve pedestrian or bicycle options in our transportation planning. There are many half completed bike lanes and paths that remain a vision years after they start. A bicycle travel route is safe when an 8 year old can go it alone without fear.

A pedestrian/bicycle path is under construction on the new east side of the Bay Bridge and engineering has been done for the western span. The cry is loud for the Alameda Tube and other bridges including the San Rafael Bridge to improve bicycle travel. There is a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge across I-80 in Berkeley and the Zampa Bridge in Vallejo. A big vision could see a spine from S.F. along 24 to the Iron Horse Trail and connecting the Bay Trail and future Delta Trail.

CalTrans intends to build a 2 or 3 lane tube, with shoulders, for cars through the Caldecott Hill. They say there is no need to allow for bicycles and pedestrians to use the shortcut. The distance by car is 0.6 miles and by bicycle or walking it is 7.5 miles up a 608-foot climb, on winding, narrow roads. I personally have ridden the route many times and it does not make for a convenient method of transit to the outlying communities where many people work on a daily basis. Having personally made this commute for over two years myself I would have more than loved to bike to work two to three times per week, but with the time it takes to ride over the hills it was not an option. Adding a bike friendly route to the Caldecott Tunnel would not only be good for commuters, but for the environment and the communities which they serve.

An acoustically separated, properly ventilated and properly lighted pedestrian/bicycle tunnel should be included in the project along with improved connections from Rockridge BART to Orinda BART. This would help to regionalize pedestrian and bicycle traffic by connecting Contra Costa County and Alameda County. If this tunnel is bored through the hill, it must contain pedestrian/bicycle elements and it will be used. 2

Please join me and get a better project that serves more people and provides for transportation options. If they are going to spend Public Money they need to provide for all the public, not just cars.

Sincerely,
D. Mark Dessert

D. Mark Dessert
Director
PowderHaus Studios, LLC
1565 Madison Street, Suite B
Oakland CA 94612
t 510.251.1616
f 510.217.9599
markd@powderhaus.com

1- See the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

2- See Option J in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

Dexter, Jim (USPS)

July 31, 2006

Jim Dexter
5591 Merriewood Drive
Oakland, California 94611

Gregory C. McConnell, Senior Environmental Planner
Attention: Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner
Dept. of Transportation, District 4, Environmental Analysis
Mail Station 8B
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660
(510) 286-6216

Re: Comments, Draft Environmental Impact Report, Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I am writing to provide comments to the Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24 Draft Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Report. I am a citizen, a member of the Oakland Bicycle/ Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), and a member of the Caldecott Corridor 4th Bore Coalition. After reviewing the Draft Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact report prepared for the Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24 in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, I want to focus on one major concern.

The project as currently scoped does not address bicycle or pedestrian facilities in any manner. There are no planned improvements to these modes of transportation, even though Caltrans, Contra Costa County, and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency together are fully responsible for ensuring that construction projects improves the full spectrum of multi-modal transportation and are not auto-centric. 1

Therefore, I call for a completely revised draft of the EIR/EI, or a new EIS that accepts the broader scope of activities that are required to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities in both north/south and east/west directions. 2

Sincerely,
Jim Dexter

1- Please see the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Improvements" in Chapter 1.

2-Please see the essay on "The Environmental Process; Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) versus an Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report (EA/EIR); and Criteria for Significance" in Chapter 1.

Dexter, Jim (e-mail)

JimDexter@aol.com
07/31/2006 04:54 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc asmulka@comcast.net, deverell@fluid.com, ar@landwater.com, fourthbore@nhphoenix.org, PHillier@ci.berkeley.ca.us
bcc
Subject Comments on Caldicott Tunnel EIR/EI

July 31, 2006

Jim Dexter
5591 Merriewood Drive
Oakland, California 94611

Gregory C. McConnell, Senior Environmental Planner
Attention: Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner
Dept. of Transportation, District 4, Environmental Analysis
Mail Station 8B
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660
(510) 286-6216

Re: Comments, Draft Environmental Impact Report, Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I am writing to provide comments to the Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24 Draft Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Report. I am a citizen, a member of the Oakland Bicycle/ Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), and a member of the Caldecott Corridor 4th Bore Coalition. After reviewing the Draft Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact report prepared for the Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24 in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, I want to focus on one major concern.

The project as currently scoped does not address bicycle or pedestrian facilities in any manner. There are no planned improvements to these modes of transportation, even though Caltrans, Contra Costa County, and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency together are fully responsible for ensuring that construction projects improves the full spectrum of multi-modal transportation and are not auto-centric. 1

Therefore, I call for a completely revised draft of the EIR/EI, or a new EIS that accepts the broader scope of activities that are required to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities in both north/south and east/west directions. 2

Sincerely,
Jim Dexter

1-See answer to letter above.

2- See answer to letter above.

De Young, Vicky

"DeYoung, Vicky"
<vdeyoung@ccarey.com>
06/07/2006 09:37 AM

To "Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov"
<Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject

Caltrans,
I want you to know that as an Oakland resident that works in Contra Costa County, I am all for the 4th bore of the Caldecott Tunnel. I only wish it was going to be more than 2 lanes so that it could help out more in the future because it will be a long time before you will be able to do this again. Four lanes would be so much more logical, in case of an emergency in a tunnel and a need to reroute traffic. But since no one listened to me and we have only 2 lanes planned, let's get moving on it.
I want to thank Caltrans for developing an excellent, comprehensive and fair DED that adequately identifies the impacts of the project andincludes an appropriate list of mitigations that will alleviate the impact of the project on the community;
I want to reiterate the ongoing need for completion of the 4thBore project NOW. The 4th Bore will reduce traffic and congestion, facilitate the flow of people and commerce and improve the quality of life for Bay Area Residents.
I want to ask Caltrans to approve the DED, finish the design and begin construction on the project as quickly as possible.

Vicky De Young
Vice President
Direct: 925.974.0128
Cell: 925.989.2493
Fax: 925.974.0123

CORNISH & CAREY COMMERCIAL
ONCOR INTERNATIONAL
1333 N. California Blvd. #343
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Main: 925.974.0100
Fax: 925.974.0123

www.ccarey.com

About C&C - A dominant regional real estate force since 1935, Cornish & Carey Commercial/ONCOR International provides a full range of services for both property owners and companies occupying buildings throughout Northern California. With more than 180 agents in nine strategically located offices - Santa Clara, Palo Alto, San Mateo, San Francisco, Walnut Creek, Emeryville, Pleasanton, Roseville and Sacramento - Cornish & Carey Commercial is one of the largest privately held commercial real estate service providers in the world. Our services have expanded throughout the United States and to major markets internationally in conjunction with the company's affiliation with ONCOR International, an organization of leading brokerage firms in North America, Europe and Latin America.

The information in this e-mail message may be privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this e-mail message in error, please e-mail the sender and delete all copies.

Thank you for your comments.

Dienstfrey, Ted

"Ted Dienstfrey"
<tdienstfrey@gb-a.com>
07/10/2006 09:42 AM

To "Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov"
<Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Attention: Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner

July 10, 2006
Senior Environmental Planner Gregory McConnell
Mail Station 8B, P.O. Box 23660
Caltrans District 4, Environmental Analysis
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Dear Gregory McConnell,

Dear Mr. McConnell:

With all necessary analysis complete and traffic congestion continuing to worsen,
Caltrans should approve the environmental report and quickly construct the project
and any necessary mitigations.

Sincerely,

Ted Dienstfrey
2824 Kelsey St
Berkeley, CA 94705-2302

Thank you for your comments.

Diller, Lawrence

lawrence.diller@ucsf.edu ()
07/27/2006 09:16 PM

To brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov, sheryl_dorado@dot.ca.gov, carl_weingarten@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
(lawrence.diller@ucsf.edu) on Thursday, July 27, 2006 at 21:16:39

Firstname: Lawrence

Lastname: Diller

Business: Physician

Phone: 925 945 6060

Fax: 925 256 7110

Address: 322 Blair Ave

City: Piedmont

State: CA

Zip: 94611

Comments: I have been driving the reverse commute route to Walnut Creek since 1980, first from San Francisco and for the last twelve years from Piedmont. I estimate I've been through the tunnel 24,000 times in 26 years. I read the fourth bore may be finished by 2014. I still figure I'll be working then. Go for it!!!!

Thank you for your comments.

Doherty, James

James Doherty
<jimisfun@mac.com>
07/14/2006 11:08 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject YES PLEASE Bike/Ped lanes in the Caldecott

> Subject: YES PLEASE Bike/Ped lanes in the Caldecott
>
> Unless there is a hidden agenda to make an oil depletion/global
> warming catastrophe come on as harshly and quickly as possible, I
> submit that it will be a very, very good idea to allow and
> encourage a PED/BIKE lane with the Caldecott tunnel. Life is easy
> for drivers today, and hell for walkers and bikers trying to low-
> impact/sustainably commute through this vital transportation
> corridor. This is very DIScouraging to transit and human powered 1
> transportation at a time almost ALL politicians are recognizing a
> DESPERATE need to ENcourage bicycling, transit, and walking.
> At some point the actions and architecture need to match the
> rhetoric, and this is a good place to bring it together.
>
> Respectfully sumbitted,
>
> James G. Doherty
> 575 Alcatraz Av.,
> Oakland, Ca, 94609
>
> "Bicycling is a big part of the future. It has to be. There is
> something wrong with a society that drives a car to work out in a
> gym." - Bill Nye
>
> James Doherty
> jimisfun@mac.com
>
>

1- See Option J in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

Duncan, Mara

mara duncan
<maraduncan@pacbell.net>
07/10/2006 04:15 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject bicylce and pedestrian way

Please please reconsider your decision to not include bicycle and pedestrian walkway. This is a horrible decision in terms of sustainability ... if it is does not include bicycle and pedestrian walkway I will work with others to hold both you and the politicians involved publicly accountable for your policies and the use of our money. Well there is still time do the right thing, 1
Sincerely,

Mara Duncan

1- See Option J in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.