Ellis, Damon

"damon ellis"
<damon_ellis@hotmail.com>
07/28/2006 10:24 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject

Hello, I think a pedestrian and bike lane makes absolute sense. The bay area should be a leader in creating alternative (gas free) routes. A connector will also create interaction and exploration between these two communities (which are currently divided by a mountain of sorts). Don't just do the minimum requried, do something great! Damon Ellis 3527 Harrison St. Oakland CA 1

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

Fischer, Kayte

Kayte Fischer
<kayte@berkeley.edu>
07/11/2006 10:29 AM
Please respond to
kayte@berkeley.edu

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott tunnel improvements

To whom it may concern:
I recently heard that the construction of a 4th Bore for the Caldecott Tunnel is not going to include a bike lane or a pedestrian lane. As a cyclist and a globally conscious citizen, I urge you to consider adding such a lane. Currently, it is quite difficult to get from Berkeley to Orinda or Walnut Hill on a bike, and I believe that having a lane on the Caldecott Tunnel would make it much easier and safer for cyclists. 1
Thank you for your consideration,
Kayte Fischer

****
UCB/UCSF Joint Graduate Group in Bioengineering
kayte@berkeley.edu

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

Fischer, Robert

RRFOak@aol.com
07/20/2006 10:37 AM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject lighting in tunnel

those of us with glaucoma need better lighting and better reflective buttons in order to avoid accidents. 1
thanks. robert fischer

1- The lighting for the fourth bore is being designed in accordance with the latest standards for tunnel lighting that take into account both the volume and traffic speed, and external luminance. The design of the lighting system includes a number of provisions aimed at improving the quality of lighting in the fourth bore, including:

- Reflective panels will be mounted on the walls of the tunnel;
- The position of lighting elements have been selected to optimize lighting relative to motorists;
- The light fixtures are more concentrated at the portal areas as compared to lighting towards the center of the tunnel to allow the eyes of motorists to gradually go from daylight at the portal to lower light levels inside the tunnel; and
- The light fixtures close to the portals are automatically adjusted through the lighting controller to match the outside day light intensity.

Floyd, Chesney

"Chesney Floyd"
<mademanifest@gmail.com>

07/10/2006 08:55 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott 4th Bore

Dear Caltrans,

Please include a separated, ventilated and lighted pedestrian and bicycle tunnel in any new tunnel construction at the Caldecott. 1

It is vitally important that we expand and regionalize our non-motor vehicle transportation network, and keep in step with current developments such as the integration of bicycle and pedestrian paths on the new Bay Bridge.

The benefit to cost ratio of adding bicycle and pedestrian paths to the Caldecott would be favorable, and the opportunity, once lost, will not arise again. 2

Thank you for your attention in this matter,

Chesney Floyd

Architectural Designer

1- A Bikeway Tunnel Alternative is not practical due to its inherent personal safety issues; law enforcement's inability to police such a long, isolated structure; and excessively high cost per user. The estimated cost of this alternative is $35-$40 Million. Please see Option J in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

2- In order for the bike/pedestrian benefit/cost ratio to be comparable to that of the auto users of the new tunnel, the number of bike/pedestrian users per day would have to be on the order of 6,000 per day.

Frankel, Aileen (7/11/06)

aileenfrankel@onebox.com
07/11/2006 09:56 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc eastman70sh@earthlink.net, matis@comcast.net, dkessler@library.berkeley.edu
bcc
Subject Please remove one (redundant) word "find" on Page 8 of the NHPA submittal

To: Gregory C. McConnell, Sr. Environmental Planner and Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 4, Oakland, California 94623-0660

Hello Gregory and Sheryl,

I'm a retired City of Oakland employee (who was involved with a lot of the Capital Improvement Projects for
the City of Oakland) and participated in the EIR/EIS reviews and the negotiations with Caltrans for the Replacement of the Cypress Freeway after the Loma Prieta Earthquake. *(Nice work on the landscaping of the Mandella Parkway! and we even got Lyle Oehler in this decade!!)*

I have been meaning to review the draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report prepared
by the US Dept. of Transporation ("FHWA") and Caltrans on May 2006 for the Caldecott Improvement Project
on State Route 24. Unfortunately, some serious family health issues have precluded me from sitting down and
reading this document. *[Maybe tomorrow after physical therapy for a degenerating spine and compressed nerve bundle, I'll try to stand up and look it over.]*

I understand that neighbors in the Oakland Hill area met and provided you with a 14-page letter, plus attachments, of comments on the draft document. It was on the North Hills Phoenix Association letterhead. A colleague who looked it over noticed one typo on page 8, under **PART II: OPERATION.** In section 2. AUTO TRAFFIC, in the sixth paragraph that starts,

"General experience shows that when a traffic obstacle....."

On the fourth line, please remove the word "find" because the word "face" is sufficient for that sentence, "Bicyclists and pedestrians, who at this time are challenged to use these roads, will find face many more obstacles."

If you want a member of the NHPA to e-mail you the corrected page, we could. Otherwise please "white out" the word "find" before you make copies for the Caltrans and FHWA staff and consultants that will need to read all the responses to the draft document.

If you have questions about any of the other comments or want to meet with a small group of the neighbors that collaborated on the submittal, please contact me at (510) 540-1155 or e-mail

me at aileenfrankel@onebox.com.

Thanks for embarking on this project with care.

Sincerely,

Aileen Frankel (resident of Hiller Highlands)

cc: John Eastman, Howard Matis, and David Kessler, NHPA President in 2006

-- Aileen

Thank you for your comments.

Frankel, Aileen (7/31/06)

aileenfrankel@onebox.com
07/31/2006 02:12 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on the May 2006 Draft EA/EIR

Attached are my comments. Please contact me to let me know if you received the attachment or not.

-- Aileen Frankel Personal comments on Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24.doc

Aileen Frankel
15 Binnacle Hill
Oakland, CA 94618

July 31, 2006

To: Gregory C. McConnell, Sr. Environmental Planner
Attn: Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner
Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") , Distrct 4,
Environmental Analysis

Comments on **Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24**

**May 2006 Draft Environmental Assessment/
Environmental Impact Report**

Overview:

Caltrans in its summary recognized that the Caldecott Tunnel has been the primary bottleneck on this major freeway (Page vi). It recognized voter support for remediation of this congestion (page vii) in the passage of RM2 in March 2004 and Contra Costa Measure J in November 2004. In the following year Caltrans should have worked with the regional transit agencies to secure funding for free shuttles to and from BART stations, more frequent BART service along the same corridor (which corresponds to the San Francisco – Pittsburgh/Bay Point line), and for rapid bus transit from the Walnut Creek area (where highway 680 and 24 meet, along highway 24 to downtown Oakland, to the West Oakland BART station (that does not have sufficient parking spaces to meet cross-Bay travel demand) and perhaps, all the way to the bus terminal that AC Transit uses for it's Transbay service from major arterials in the East Bay, across the Bay Bridge, to San Francisco's downtown. 1

It is now 2006 and the traffic backups have gotten worse. Gas prices are higher, and the perils of continued or growing automobile usage and increased emissions are more evident. Caltrans, using funds from the State of California, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or other agencies should fund free transfers and connections to local transit services. If BART is too full, Caltrans should pay to add on more trains and should either fund the Contra Costa Transit Service or AC Transit District to acquire or contract with private bus companies to provide this augmented service. Otherwise, Caltrans should pay for free shuttles to make BART use more successful. As points covered below, Caltrans should rewrite the draft environmental report and reissue it when other studies and recommendations have been considered.

An expansion of transit alternatives for motorists would
a) reduce vehicular back-ups;
b) reduce unnecessary emissions and pollution from idling vehicles that are visible on highway 13 and 24 every weekday; 2

c) would shorten persons' commute time for trips to work or for recreational and other purposes; and
d) might prove that an expensive project "to construct a new tunnel and build more freeway lanes" is **unnecessary. Adequate provision of increased public transit services would be the appropriate "No Build" alternative.**

Street and Highway Operations Alternative
On Page ix, Caltrans reports in the paragraph that "A State Route 13 auxiliary lane between **Broadway Terrace and the eastbound on-ramp to State Route 24 could be constructed to store tunnel queues off mainline State Route 13 and allow northbound traffic to flow unimpeded.**" That work should be started yesterday! It's inappropriate to state, "Although this would allow traffic to flow unimpeded on State Route 13, it does not meet the Purpose and Need of the Caldecott Improvement Project." Caltrans is allowing the traffic congestion because of the tunnel "bottleneck" to fester like a sore, requiring major surgery, rather than doing first aid (better transit and improving such access ways) that would ease the congestion, hasten travel times and prevent delays for those who merely need to travel along the Warren Freeway, highway 13, between east Oakland (perhaps from south Alameda County, Pleasanton, and even Piedmont) to Berkeley or downtown Oakland. Caltrans is willfully allowing the Caldecott congestion to cause daily back-ups for persons traveling on highway 13 who don't even intend to use the Caldecott Tunnel. 3

This admitted back-up that is every weekday, should not be allowed to continue when Caltrans already knows the cure.

Mass Transit
At the top of Page x, Caltrans, with no justification, alleges "with the transit improvements only a modest increase in transit patronage and minor congestion relief would be achieved and thus transit improvements would not meet the Purpose and Need of this project." Please discuss this matter with the City of Oakland's Public Works Department. Please pay attention to the response to the "free BART" on the "Spare the Air Days" we just had during the heat wave. There needs to be discounts to the use of public transit year-round. The BART stations were calmer and quieter than normal, because there was no clatter of machines or elbowing to rush to the turnstiles at each station. They were calmer and quieter, because all turnstiles were open; none were just How could Caltrans pay for free bus shuttles to and from major stations on the Pittsburgh/Bay Point – San Francisco route? Caltrans should be lobbying regional, state, and federal governments for a greater subsidy to make public transit clearly a more economical choice than using a private motorized vehicle. 4

While I concur generally with the comments provided to Caltrans in response to the Draft EA/EIR, I will go further along the subject of paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 on page x.

IF during the revisions to the thinking and analysis required by the draft environmental review process, Caltrans decides that there still is a need for a "fourth bore" and more lanes, than I strongly request that any new lanes be only for the following:

1) rapid transit and other bus and van services; 5
2) HOV lanes and for motorcycles and electric, hybrid, or low-emission vehicles; and 6
3) A bicycle and non-motor tunnel with its own ventilation, oxygen, noise-abatement treatment and safety/emergency stop provisions. 7

Ron Bishop, an architect who has worked on the enhancement of other regional transit systems, is a bicyclist who knows that a separate and safe bore is feasible. Neighbors who cycle to work and would like to cycle more for work, school and recreation and shopping realize that this project should be the opportunity that Caltrans uses to be a model builder of a safe bicycle route from Berkeley along Tunnel Road and highway 13 and from Oakland's north hill area to Piedmont and Montclair at Thornhill Road. There should a safe walking and bicycle path between Hiller Highlands to Lake Temescal, and the Montclair shopping village. 8

Essentially, people on foot, with a child in a stroller, or on a bicycle should safely be able to go across the four quadrants of open space and neighborhoods divided by highway 24 and highway 13.

If such a bicycle path went from the Uplands area (neighborhood west of Tunnel Road) that safely crossed Tunnel Road and went alongside highway 24 to Orinda, there would be many more cyclists on a daily and weekly basis. Frankly, this would be another way to ease congestion through the Caldecott Tunnel, to allow bicyclists to do shopping and other errands, as well as bike to work and school.

Those of us in Oakland could bike safely to the Orinda BART station and from there take BART to any of the Contra Costa destinations along the BART network. Similarly, folks from suburban locations can take BART to the Orinda station and then take a bicycle to get to locations along Mountain Blvd and the foothills of Oakland that are not along a BART line.

Bicycle Tunnel Alternative

It is wrong, and there are no facts to buttress the Caltrans statement that "providing bicycle access through a new bore would be very costly". <u>It can even be done as a tube over two other lanes and "within a single bore" being drilled and excavated for other vehicle lanes</u>. (The floor of the bicycle route could be the ceiling of the vehicle lane space.) That horizontal separation space could even house a number of utilities, venting ducts, sensors for temperature and smoke or gas or other chemical concentrations in the air that should be routinely monitored, and fire suppression (perhaps sprinkling) systems. 9

The community can generate substantial community support for a bikeway route through the remainder of the project planning period.

Incorporation of Regional and Municipal Goals of the Ridge Trail

If one alternative is eventually "green lighted" to proceed to full design and construction documents, then the mitigations must fulfill the goals of Oakland's various elements. The regional and Oakland plan for a Ridge Trail and a safe network of bicycle paths, should be built that meets the objectives of the OSCAR report and the connections of landscaped open space and fire-resistant corridors in the hills of Oakland in conjunction with the open space of the East Bay Regional Park District. 10

Other comments on the first part of the draft report dated May 2006.

Page xv. In the discussion of geographical composition of the soil, mention is made that "if Serpentine asbestos is found, best management practices would be implemented." There has been significant asbestos found in the rock along Skyline Boulevard in Oakland. It was abundant in the rock at the Oakland Hills Tennis Club and Swimming Pool hill at Redwood Road and Skyline Blvd. It was so plentiful (but not disclosed to the public) in the rock pulled out of the Gallagher and Burke quarry at the top of Edwards Avenue above highway 580 (that when it was used for fill on a neighborhood park, the City had an expensive job years later to excavate out the "hazardous soil" and pay for it to be trucked to an appropriate landfill site). Caltrans should not underestimate the cost this may bear on the project with the heightened public awareness of environmental safety and the mandate to dispose of such contaminated substances in a specially certified and monitored landfill site. 11

Page xvii **Tree Removal**
Because a "build" alternative will increase the capacity of the roadways and will generate more, not less, car use, Caltrans as mitigation for any "Build" alternative should mitigate the cumulative and increased pollution by planting many-many more trees, such as oaks, laurels and redwoods than have been observed here before and since the 1991 Oakland Hills Fire. Such trees are fire-resistant and will help absorb the fine particulate matter as well as generate oxygen for people and other animals and insects and will help as a cooling factor. Such planting should far exceed the "substantial re-vegetation of areas affected by construction, " mentioned on page xxii. 12

Page xxiii **East of the Tunnel Landscape Unit**
University of Ontario researchers at Toronto have shown that in an urban area, any man-made structure, whether it is a building, parking lot, or roadway and sidewalk, should have compensatory planting to prevent the warming of absorbed and reflected surfaces (such as asphalt and concrete). To that end, Caltrans should explore ways of providing a trellis or space-frame structure over the lanes on the Oakland side of the tunnel and a planting scheme to provide for vines or other plants to go up the sides of such a structure and over the top. This could be a model "hallway of plants" that is a transition from the open area to the tunnel. 13

I strongly support the bermed and landscaped soundwalls, and where the frontage is too narrow, the irrigation system and landscape planting should support vines or other narrow trees grow along the soundwalls and retaining walls (during the plant

establishment period and in times of draught or heat waves).. This strongly supports mitigation measures suggested on page xxiii.

Page xix **Vibrations**
The North Hills residents appreciates that the Caltrans engineers realized the vibrations of the blasting and drilling could have an adverse impact on the stability of the homes and public infrastructure (roads, culverts, cable lines, telephone and utility poles) above and just beyond the Caldecott & Grizzly Peak hills. Beyond the "before and after" photography and monitoring, Caltrans should establish an insurance fund from the project, in an interest-bearing account to pay for repairs that may be needed years from now for the immediate or cumulative impact of such drilling. Because we have seen that these soils are vulnerable to erosion, the combined effect of Caltrans drilling and rains; and the combined effect of Caltrans drilling and earthquakes may be quite expensive. 14

Table S-2: Impacts and Mitigation Issues

In keeping with the concern about asbestos, on page xxvii, across from the affected resource, **Hazardous waste/materials** the alternative should specify that testing of lead contamination and aerially deposited lead (ADL) should be performed not only prior to construction, but also, intermittently during and after construction. 15

In regard to the affected resource **Hydrology/Floodplain,** on page xxix, the new drainage facilities should convey roadway storm water and tunnel wash water not in the same manner that currently exists, but in a better manner, so that less pollutants end up going into groundwater or the drainage system that makes its way into Lake Temescal and the creeks and streams that eventually go into the San Francisco Bay. Again, this is an opportunity for Caltrans to make the design and maintenance of the I-24 corridor on the east side of the Caldecott Tunnel to be a model for best practices and a more environmentally responsible highway than has ever before been constructed in California and perhaps along the Pacific Coast. 16

Noise Abatement

Caltrans should consult with the University of California faculty to learn if any other solutions may be incorporated into the construction equipment to reduce the noise generated during the drilling and trucking for the fourth bore (if the "build" option is selected), and if certain measures may absorb and contain freeway noise during and after construction for long term noise reduction. Now, standing anywhere in sight distance of the existing tunnel opening on the east side of the ridgeline there is a loud din. 17

Page xxxvi. The City of Oakland should refuse to sign a new Freeway Agreement until the NO BUILD, Increase Affordable, Plentiful Public Transit option is tried. Moreover, if the "Build a fourth bore" solution is selected, the City of Oakland should refuse to sign a new Freeway Agreement until all its requests for conscientious design and staging, "best management" practices of construction, and mitigations are spelled out and promised.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EA/EIR for the Caldecott Improvement Project.

Aileen Frankel
Ami009@hotmail.com

1- Please see the essay on "Scope of the Project" in Chapter 1.

2- Please see the essay on "Transit" and "Scope of the Project" in Chapter 1.

3- Please see response #7 in the essay on "Traffic Operations", and the essays on "Project Study Area Boundaries" and "Scope of the Project" in Chapter 1.

4- Please also see the essay on "Scope of the Project" in Chapter 1.

5- Please see the essays on "Transit" and "Scope of the Project" in Chapter 1.

6- Please see response #5 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

7- A Bikeway Tunnel Alternative is not practical due to its inherent personal safety issues; law enforcement's inability to police such a long, isolated structure; and excessively high cost per user. The estimated cost of this alternative is $35-$40 Million. Please see Option J in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

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

9- There are a number of safety and security issues related to using the air duct for bicyclists and pedestrian access through the tunnel. The ventilation systems produce up to 100 mph winds when in use, and there is the risk of asphyxiation during fires. Securing the systems against vandalism would also be problematic. Please also see the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

10- Please see the essay on "Methodologies used for the Impact Assessments/Local Ordinances" in Chapter 1.

11-Comment noted. Should any serpentine asbestos be found, Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented and included in the project costs.

12- The proposed project would result in a facility that will be smaller and less congested than comparable facilities with in the same Air District. Since comparable facilities are in an area that meets air quality standards, this project will also meet microscale air quality requirements and will therefore have no significant impact on air quality or cause exceedances of state or federal carbon monoxide (CO) standards. A No-Build Alternative is likely to have negative air quality impacts; it will continue to have heavy congestion in the reverse commute, and therefore is likely to result in higher pollutant levels as compared to Alternative 2N, the Preferred Alternative.

Tree replacement will occur at a 5:1 ratio for oaks. All other native trees with a diameter breast height of 6 inches will be replaced at a ratio of 3:1. Native, such as oaks, or non-invasive, non-native vegetation will be used in the planting scheme. Any tree replacement that cannot occur within the impacted areas will be planted off-site in areas identified for invasive species removal.

In reference to tree removal noted under page xxii of the DEA/EIR, State Senate Resolution 17 applies to the replacement of native oak trees in respect to the mitigation and re-establishment of habitat values and does not preclude additional landscaping necessary to mitigate the visual impacts associated with the project. An additional 2.5 million dollars has been identified to landscape the areas at both sides of the tunnel. In addition to the replacement of oak trees at a 5:1 ratio for aesthetics, an increased level of landscaping (trees, shrubs, groundcover) will be provided to visually integrate the widened freeway, tunnel portal and ancillary features into the surrounding environment. The level of replacement highway landscaping will be substantially greater than what currently exists. During the design phase of the project, the landscape architect will consider tree and shrub species selection and design strategies to provide a beneficial effect on air quality.

13- The idea of the "hallway of plants" would not only provide a limited beneficial cooling effect but a very unique and visually pleasant experience for motorists as they approach the tunnel portals. It would also be functional in another way. You will notice an overhead metal screen structure at the entrance /exit of the No.1 and 2 portals. These structures allow time for the motorist's eyes to adjust to low light levels of the tunnels. Conceptually, the same could be done utilizing a space frame or trellis and allowing vegetation to grow over the top. However, steel structures have to be periodically sandblasted and painted, and any pruning work would require complete shutdown of the traffic lanes and removal of the vegetation. There would also be a potential for vegetation falling from the overhead structure and striking vehicles. Aside from the high cost of building such a structure, maintenance and public safety preclude any consideration for installing a vegetative covered overhead structure.

14- The Caldecott Improvement Project does propose an approximate 5-year construction period. It is anticipated that blasting will be required only in limited areas along the tunnel. The construction specifications will include limits on the peak vibrations associated with blasting and these limits will be established to prevent damage to any residential structure. Blasting will not be permitted during nighttime hours.

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

The State is self-insured and there will be no special insurance fund established for the project.

15- Chemical contaminant mitigation issues are very different from other environmental impacts in that once the extent of the contamination is defined and the contaminant source eliminated, the efficacy of the

remediation work that takes place will not decrease with time. For example, the lead contamination alongside an existing freeway, when removed by a new construction project, will not be replaced by yet more lead-containing vehicle exhaust because lead additives were eliminated from gasoline more than twenty years ago. For the Caldecott project, this makes repeated sampling events in the same areas for the same contaminants unnecessary.

If engineering controls are used to isolate contaminants within the project, under pavement covers for example, routine maintenance inspections will monitor the integrity of the engineering controls. If an engineering control is ever compromised, the subsequent repair and cleanup work could include soil or water sampling to define the impact of any contaminant release. However, without the release of contaminants via a new source or failure of an engineering control, there will not be any soil or water sampling work after the fourth bore construction work is completed.

16- Tunnel wash water is conveyed to a City of Oakland sewer system. Tunnel wash water is not conveyed to Lake Temescal, Temescal Creek, or San Francisco Bay. Tunnel wash water is not allowed to percolate into the groundwater table. No stormwater runoff from State Route 24 reaches Lake Temescal. Stormwater runoff generated within Department right-of-way is presently conveyed to an Alameda County Flood Control District and Water Conservation District (ACFCD&WCD) storm drain system, which ultimately discharges into the San Francisco Bay (please see Section II of the "Water Quality Report for Caldecott Improvement Project", dated January 9, 2006). The Department understands your concern regarding the importance for addressing the potential for downstream water quality impacts during construction and the importance of protecting water resources. The Department is required, under its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Construction General Permits, to consider the appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) with the Best Available Technology (BAT), to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) as mentioned in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). As such, the Department shall include in the contract specific water pollution controls to be deployed during construction year round for the full duration of the contract. Additionally, the Contractor is required to prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for approval by the Department. The SWPPP shall include BMPs to address any, or all, of the following to the MEP: soil stabilization, sediment control, tracking control, wind erosion control, non-stormwater management, and waste management and materials pollution control. Hazardous Waste, Solid Waste, Liquid Waste, and Contaminated Soil Management Construction Site BMPs shall also be required. In general, the choice of methods of construction and materials used would be dictated by the Contractor. Department site inspections would ensure adequate implementation of those BMPs identified within the SWPPP. Further, a sampling and analysis plan shall be prepared as part of the SWPPP to verify and ensure that no materials or wastes may be released from the construction site, effectively monitoring and protecting downstream water resources. These BMPs address operations during the construction phase of the project. To address your concern regarding post-construction water quality improvements, the Department will consider Treatment BMPs as noted in the DEIR, in compliance with the Department NPDES Permit with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The selection of appropriate treatment controls must be based on effectiveness, practicability, feasibility, safety and maintainability. Future meetings will be scheduled with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to discuss proposed treatment of stormwater runoff to address the Project's impacts.

17- Comment noted.

Fraser, Ellen

Ellen Fraser
<ellensfraser@yahoo.com>
07/19/2006 09:58 AM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject comments on 4th bore

We absolutely need the 4th bore, and have needed it
for years. I live in the area that will have to hear
the sound of construction, but it will be more than
worth it to be able to get thru the tunnel easily
whenever needed, as well as to not look out the window
and see the stopped traffic 1/2 the day (and breathe
the fumes).
To those opposing the project because they live close
to it, I argue that they moved in next to something
that already existed, and should expect improvements.
It's sort of like moving in near an airport and then
not expecting them to add flights. It's part of
progress.
I am crossing my fingers that this gets done. It's so
overdue!
thank you,
Ellen Fraser
Broadway Terrace resident, Oakland

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

Thank you for your comments.

Fredrickson, Karen

karen fredrickson
<fredricksonski@yahoo.com
>
07/10/2006 03:58 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject tunnel needs bike/walking lane

Please include a way for those of us on foot or
bicycle to use the tunnel. 1
Thanks - Karen Fredrickson

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

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

Freethy, Jack

Jack Freethy
<cfjf@pacbell.net>
07/28/2006 06:38 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Public comments for completion of the Caldecott Tunnel

As a almost daily user of the Caldecott Tunnel, I encourage that every effort be undertaken to speed up the completion date of this project. The enviroment is suffering for every day this project is delayed.

As a Contarctor familiar with engineering construction similiar to this, I feel this project can be expedited efficiently and quickly. You have chosen a reputable design engineering firm to design this tunnel and I applaud Cal Trans for seeking out a speciality design engineering firm for this project. I feel this project should be fast tracked in order to prevent cost overruns similiar to the Bay Bridge. This tunnnel is not that difficult to build. The faster you build it , the better chance you have of completing the proojct on budget and ahead of time.

I have not seen all the Design documents, but what I did notice, that no where in the documents was identification of a disposal site for the excavated material of the tunnel. As a Contractor,I caution you not to totally leave it the contractor to determine the disposal site. It appears to me that a nearby site could be developed for the disposal of the excavated material on the East Side of the tunnel near the Gateway project. If a disposal site could be included in the design, the cost savings could be major. Plus if the disposal site were near the tunnel , the enviroment can benefit also. Please give this disposal site some thought and planning now so that everyone is aware ahead of time. 1

Thank you for the opportunity of allowing me to make these comments.

Jack Freethy
1044 Pine Lane.
Lafayette, Ca. 94549

1- The disposal of excavated material will be determined by the Contractor. The Contractor will be able to explore potential uses for the excavated material and disposal sites. The Contractor will be required to adhere to all state and federal regulations in disposal or use of the excavated material.

It is expected that the material resulting from the tunnel excavation will be free of anthropogenic contamination since it has never been previously exposed, thereby making it a very likely candidate for unrestricted reuse at other developments in need of imported fill. There is a chance that a small percentage of the excavation spoils will be impacted by the naturally occurring hydrocarbons (e.g., tar) observed in the geologic formations during the boring of the earlier tunnels. The excavation spoils will be screened for the presence of hydrocarbons and other chemicals (e.g., metals) to fully characterize the spoils' constituents and determine suitability for types of reuse.

Whether the spoils are reused as imported fill or disposed of at a landfill, the material will be handled in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations promulgated by federal, state, and local agencies. For example, landfill waste characterization will be governed by Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and the federal parameters defined under the Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); additionally, reuse as imported fill should satisfy guidelines established by, amongst others, the State Water Resources Control Board acting through its regional water quality control boards.

Fry, Jeff

Jeff Fry
<nothingbutjeff@yahoo.com
>

07/12/2006 01:13 PM

Please respond to
Jeff Fry
<nothingbutjeff@yahoo.com>

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Bicycle access in the Caldicott Tunnel

Dear Caltrans,

I am writing to ask that you include a safe and viable option for bicycles in your plans for a new Caldicott Tunnel. I write to you as someone who alternates my commuting between bicycle, bike+BART, and my car. I prefer the experience, health, economic, and environmental benefits of using my bicycle both for my regular commute and for my around-the-bay recreation, and ask that you consider not only the many people like myself who know we would actively use this tunnel if given the opportunity, but the even greater number who will ride more and drive less (reducing gas-prices, congestion and air-quality hazards) when they find cycling made easier for them through actions like this. 1

Please provide for safe bicycle and pedestrian access through the tunnel. I like the idea of it being separated by a sound wall, if possible, but at the very least I would expect there to be some safe way through for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Thank you for your time, please keep me abreast of your decisions.

Sincerely,

Jeff Fry
Manager of Quality Assurance
Lyris Technologies * 5858 Horton Street, Suite 270 * Emeryville, CA 94608

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

G., Kenneth

July 31, 2006

Dear Caldecott Improvement Project Manager

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Caldecott Improvement Project EIR. My comments are provided below.

1. "Alternative 3N," would have serious impacts on the residents of the Rockridge area of Oakland and others further west of the tunnel, which are not adequately addressed in the EIR, nor adequately mitigated. It would add a fifth westbound lane. The result would be that the morning westbound log jam that currently occurs at the east portal to the tunnel would be shifted out of Orinda, which is lightly populated adjacent to Highway 24 east of the tunnel, and heavily populated adjacent to the freeway on the Oakland side. The tunnel currently has the effect of "metering" the morning westbound traffic into Oakland and the main logjam west of the tunnel usually occurs anywhere from the Bay Bridge toll plaza to the 580 interchange. With a fifth westbound lane, more traffic could flow through the tunnel, but it would still back up at the bridge, so it would not really speed up the commute to San Francisco. In the future, we could expect solid backups from the bridge through Rockridge. So who would benefit if there is there is still a backup at the bridge? Possible some residents of Orinda and other points eastward in Contra Costa County, since the morning backup that presently occurs in Orinda would shift to Oakland. But the fact that their commute logjam would only move westward rather than be reduced would appear to belie Caltrans' misleading claims about the purported traffic benefits of the project. 1

2. The Rockridge area would bear the brunt of the resulting noise and pollution since much of it is in a canyon with hills on both sides of the freeway. Noise levels and the duration of increased noise during the morning commute hours would increase substantially. And other than adding a few hundred feet of sound wall right near the tunnel, benefiting a few dozen parcels, the EIR proposes Caltrans do NOTHING to mitigate the increased noise levels to Rockridge residents. The EIR does not even address noise impacts west of the immediate project zone. 2

3. The EIR says an increase of noise level by 10 decibels represents a doubling of noise to the human ear. It also says that noise levels will increase not more than 12 decibels with or without the project, therefore "the project causes no substantial noise increases, and no noise mitigation will be necessary" (Ref. Section 2.8 of the EIR, page 152). The <u>frequency</u> and <u>duration</u> of these extraordinary noise increases is not addressed. The project would substantially increase the duration of the morning noise peak during the morning westbound commute. 3

4. Caltrans' standard for noise at residences is 72 decibels, compared to 52 decibels for motels, hotels and auditoriums. 72 decibels is four times as loud as 52 decibels! The fact that the Caltrans criteria sets fairly quiet standards for motels and hotels but the sky is the limit for homes. The EIR itself compares 70 decibels to the sound of a 4

nearby vacuum cleaner, 60 decibels to a normal conversation, and 80 decibels to a big motorcycle at 50 feet. This is all in Section 2.8 (Noise impacts) of the EIR. So freeway noise levels between those of a vacuum cleaner and a Harley at 50 feet are good enough for residents, according to Caltrans, while only one fourth of those noise levels are considered appropriate for motels. This is environmentally unjust and an outrage to residents.

5. Rather than acknowledging and mitigating the noise impacts in the Rockridge area, the EIR essentially says the sky is the limit for noise along the freeway west of the tunnel. Minimal mitigation, which is economically and technically feasible, would include sound barriers on both sides of the freeway from the tunnel to at least College Avenue, since the area along that stretch is most subject to noise impacts due to the canyon effect of the hills on both sides. 5

6. The EIR fails to address the huge traffic impacts west of the tunnel that would result from increased morning traffic flow into those areas, particularly for Alternative 3N. The 580 interchange already experiences major traffic problems. This project would make it much worse, with gridlock likely for hours. Along the same lines, the project would add to the severity of traffic congestion at the 580/880 interchange, the Bay Bridge toll plaza, and all other points between the tunnel and the bridge. 6

7. The EIR does not adequately address local traffic and public transportation impacts in the vicinity of Rockridge BART station. The project, particularly Alternative 3N, would make it easy for commuters living east of the tunnel to clog the Rockridge BART station by parking there and taking BART the rest of the way to San Francisco; increase pollution and traffic in Rockridge; and put a big, solid traffic jam between the Rockridge freeway entrance and points west. It would add to local traffic, which is already difficult due to narrow major streets such as College Avenue. 7

8. Alternative 2N appears to be the more just of the two alternatives, and the fifth westbound lane in Alternative 3N would not speed up westbound commutes in the morning, it would just shift the delays to the 580 interchange, 880 and the toll plaza as discussed above. So the very purpose of Alternative 2N is dubious. Alternative 3N would shift the backup from Orinda to Oakland in the morning, but no fifth lane eastbound is proposed, so there would be no similar shift from Oakland to east of the tunnel in the evening commute. 8

In my opinion, the EIR is biased to justify a poorly thought-out project which appears to be politically motivated, making current residents and developers east of the tunnel think that the project would materially shorten their commute. In the unlikely case that Alternative three would do so, it would favor Contra Costa County at the expense of Oakland, for the reasons given above. I request that Caltrans reassess the proposed project. If it is still found the be worthwhile, the EIR should be modified to address noise, traffic and environmental justice concerns east of the tunnel and mitigation for the noise levels in the Rockridge canyon area from the tunnel to at least College Avenue should be provided in the form of traffic barriers and quieter Highway 24 paving, including quieting the sections on concrete bridges which produce greater tire noise than the freshly-paved on-grade sections. And if you are going to add a fifth westbound lane, a fifth eastbound lane should also be added.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kenneth G.
Oakland, CA

1- We acknowledge your comment that Alternative 3N will not provide significant benefit and your concern that it may have impacts beyond those of Alternative 2N. Alternative 2N, the two-lane alternative, has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Although the three-lane alternative would provide an additional fifth westbound lane, it has been determined that the operational benefit of a fifth lane would not be sufficient to warrant the added expense and impacts. However, we need to point out that improving the commute to San Francisco is not the primary purpose of project. The project is intended to improve off-peak direction congestion- eastbound in the morning and westbound in the afternoon. Constructing the Preferred Alternative would provide congestion relief in the off-peak direction.

Please see the essay on “Preferred Alternative” in Chapter 1.

2- Noise abatements are considered only at locations where noise impacts are identified within the Project Study Area Boundaries. Caltrans has no program to provide noise abatements for areas currently subject to freeway traffic noise, or where there is no new freeway or reconstruction of an existing freeway.

3- Noise impacts are assessed with the predicted worst (noisiest) hourly condition that may occur on a typical day. As explained in the response to City of Orinda, for receivers outside the Project Study Area Boundaries, the increase in noise levels would be imperceptible. Depending on the traffic conditions on any given days, noise levels may peak at different times of the day and may have different durations as well.

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

4- Residences and hotels are in the same category and having the same thresholds in NAC.

5- Please see response #22 above.

6- Please see response #7 in the essay on “Traffic Operations” in Chapter 1.

7-Please see the essay on “Transit” and response #2 in the essay on “Traffic Operations” in Chapter 1.

8-Please see the essay on “Preferred Alternative” in Chapter 1.

Gabel, Jonathan

"Jonathan Gabel "
<jongabel@rcn.com>
07/21/2006 10:03 AM

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

I live in the Rockridge district of Oakland, one block from Highway 24. I looked at the Caldecott Draft EIR at the Rockridge Library. I do not see any mention made of the impact on my neighborhood. The impacts of construction and of increased traffic on HWY 24 are not addressed. 1

My opinion is that any "improvements" to the freeway system will just encourage the construction of more houses in the suburbs and will result in the "improved" freeway being just as clogged as it is presently. I would much rather see the large sum of money that might be used for a fourth bore be used instead to improve public transit. 2

Regards,

Jon Gabel
5800 Ocean View Drive
Oakland, CA 94618

jongabel@rcn.com

1- Please see the essays on “Construction Impacts” and response #2 on the essay on “Traffic Modeling/Forecasting” in Chapter 1.

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

Gans, Lydia (6/28/06)

lydia gans
<lydiagans@juno.com>
06/28/2006 08:19 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject fourth bore a really bad idea

As long time Rockridge residents -- and voters -- we want to add our voices of protest to the proposed addtion of a fourth bore to the Caldecott Tunnel. There are many reasons why it's a bad idea, I'm sure you've heard all the specifics. Basically our objections are a) regarding it's impact locally -- it would have a deleterious effect on the quality of life of all of us who live here and who have invested in our homes and our community and b) on a broader level -- responsible leaders should be encouraging projects that are good for the environment, such as improved public transporation so there will be less need for driving, rather than promoting further degradation of our surroundings.
Lydia Gans and family

Thank you for your comments.

Gans, Lydia (7/22/06)

lydia gans
<lydiagans@juno.com>
07/22/2006 10:10 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject fourth bore a bad idea

As long time Rockridge residents -- and voters -- we want to add our voices of protest to the proposed addtion of a fourth bore to the Caldecott Tunnel. There are many reasons why it's a bad idea, I'm sure you've heard all the specifics. Basically our objections are a) regarding it's impact locally -- it would have a deleterious effect on the quality of life of all of us who live here and who have invested in our homes and our community and b) on a broader level -- responsible leaders should be encouraging projects that are good for the environment, such as improved public transporation so there will be less need for driving, rather than promoting further degradation of our surroundings.
Lydia Gans and family

Thank you for your comments.

Garretson, Alan

Alan Garretson
<alangarr@yahoo.com>
07/19/2006 04:14 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Bicycle and Pedestrian Access - Yes

Dear Caltrans,

I think we have a great opportunity to expand bicycle and pedestrian access between Contra Costa and Alameda counties by creating bicycle and pedestrian way in the new 4th bore! We won't have another chance. A bike/pedestrian commute lane in the 4th bore has my vote! 1

Alan Garretson
Berkeley, CA

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

Gehring, Charles

gehringhouse@yahoo.com ()

06/16/2006 01:59 PM

To brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov, Caldecott_Public_Comments@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 (gehringhouse@yahoo.com) on Friday, June 16, 2006 at 13:59:51

Firstname: Charles

Lastname: Gehring

Phone: 510-841-8376

Address: 6677 Charing Cross Road

City: Oakland

State: CA

Zip: 94618

Comments: I support construction of a fourth tunnel bore. For the last 14 years, I have commuted through the tunnel. For the last 7 years, I've lived above the tunnel and looked directly at it and heard it. Thanks for a great plan. Implement it without delay. I primarily support the 3 lane bore and support the 2 lane bore secondarily. I am against the no bore alternative. 1

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

Gilkey, M.

m gilkey <mwgilkey@yahoo.com>

07/18/2006 12:11 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Tunnel Improvements

I would suggest adding an AM?FM antenna inside all the existing bores, an if adding a fourth bore, which would be extremely helpful, adding a man sized escape tunnel in case of fire, or collapse in an earthquake. Lastly the existing entries are not direct enough, and the lighting should be improved, because so many drivers slow down measureably when approaching the dimmed interior of the tunnels presently. 1

1- Seven cross tunnel passages from the fourth bore to the third bore to be used in an emergency are included in the design.

The current project will not involve modifying the lighting within the existing tunnels. However, the lighting for the fourth bore is being designed in accordance with the latest standards for tunnel lighting that take into account both the volume and traffic speed, and external luminance. The design of the lighting system includes a number of provisions aimed at improving the quality of lighting in the fourth bore, including:

- Reflective panels will be mounted on the walls of the tunnel;
- The position of lighting elements have been selected to optimize lighting relative to motorists;
- The light fixtures are more concentrated at the portal areas as compared to lighting towards the center of the tunnel to allow the eyes of motorists to gradually go from daylight at the portal to lower light levels inside the tunnel; and
- The light fixtures close to the portals automatically get adjusted through the lighting controller to match with outside day light intensity.

The existing three bores currently have AM/FM antennas. In addition, when the new bore is completed, the new AM/FM system in the fourth bore will be designed to enhance the existing systems in the existing three bores.

Glass, Anita

"Anita Glass"
<anitaglass@gmail.com>
Sent by: anika.nui@gmail.com

06/10/2006 01:36 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Tunnel - New Bore

Regarding: Motorists and residents have until July 12 to file public comments. Submit comments via e-mail to caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov; or attend the next public hearing, which is at 6 p.m. Thursday at Oakland's Claremont Middle School, 5750 College Ave.

I am against the proposed addition of a new tunnel at the Caldecott **tunnel.**

I have listened to very intelligent, respected friends who make persuasive arguments about the need for an additional tunnel. Yet, I still,"If you build it; they will come."

These are my main points:

1. The entire Livermore Valley and eastern Contra Costa County are **not fully built out**, biut they will be when shortened commute times puts more dollars in developers pockets because it will be easier to sell houses at higher prices. It will be built out when there is a new tunnel. 1

2. This would be a **public work project** that should have partial funding from real estate developers. Building additional infrastructure at taxpayer expense is **giving free benefits to for-profit businesses**. Infrastructure concessions need to be made at the STATE level for new developments, not just at local levels. 2

3. By the time a new bore is completed, **there will be a need for two more**. It means a new route over the hill. Those people at the top of the ridge over the tunnel are not going to let you take a direct route. Longer routes over different terrain will cost more to build than a new tunnel. 3

4. The current tunnels are **geologically unstable,** not just due to the earthquake faults that run through the area. The tunnel is a collector of water, seepage of water is ruining the tunnels. Hire a geologist who is a professor at Cal and you will find this out. 4

5. **Sound barriers don't work**. All they do is concentrate the sounds and distribute them elsewhere. Perhaps at my house, where I can always hear the noise from the Highway 24, as is.. I live one mile away and there is a tall hill between my home and the freeway. Ask people along the 680 corridor. 5

6. There was a time when CalTrans (or whatever it was at the time) built highways and **freeways directly through populated areas**. Some thought it would be beneficial to the local business communities. I remember vividly, even though I was still in elementary 6

and middle school, the damage that this did to communities in both **Oakland and Visalia** (San Joaquin Valley. Piedmont was ruined and the College Avenue shopping district now requires moving your car or having a very long walk. Visalia became like two towns. Formerly a pleasant place with lots of shade trees and a nice shopping street, Visalia must now be navigated by map to find the overpasses. **San Francisco did not rebuild freeways after Loma Prieta , it tore them down. West Oakland demanded the Cypress structure be moved. Don't Add to Prior Mistakes. Think outside the box.**

I know long-winded messages do not enhance public comment. so Just go with reason Number One!

Respectfully,

Anita Glass
32 Robert Road
Orinda, CA 94563

1- The growth inducement analysis examined this effect and concluded that the lack of travel time savings in the primary commute direction (the tunnel improvement would affect only the "reverse" commute direction) would not result in a substantial growth inducing effect on residential development in the Livermore Valley and eastern Contra Costa County.

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

3-It is true that this project will not address all of the existing and future capacity concerns through the tunnel. However, it will address a major source of delay for many travelers for the foreseeable future.

4- The three existing tunnels were reviewed by Department engineers in 1990, as part of the State's seismic retrofit program following the Loma Prieta earthquake. All the engineers agreed that the 3 tunnels were not seismically vulnerable and that a retrofit of the tunnels is not warranted.

The tunnels are inspected every 24 months by Department maintenance engineers as part of a statewide inspection program. Seepage of water is common in many tunnels in the United States and it does not necessarily indicate a structural problem with the tunnels. Most water that is draining towards the tunnels is directed into a drainage system that flows out of the tunnel. Some seepage does occur inside the tunnels and this has been noted in the inspection reports. The inspection reports do not indicate issues with the tunnel that would warrant retrofit or replacement of the tunnels. The Department feels that these tunnels are structurally sound and do not pose a safety hazard in terms of structural or geological instability. The tunnels were designed and constructed for the geological conditions of the site.

5- Sound barriers are mainly intended for receivers within a close range of freeway where noise levels are the highest. Their effectiveness diminishes for receivers at a greater distance. A study was done on sound walls in the I-680 corridor and found that reflected noise increased noise levels by only 1 to 2 dBA at vulnerable receivers. These studies also showed weather conditions can cause variations in noise much higher than this in these same locations.

6-Comment noted.

Goldenberg, Jan

<jannyig@sbcglobal.net>
06/25/2006 04:02 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject The 4th Bore

Ladies/Gentlemen:
As a homeowner in the Parkwoods (right near the tunnel on the Oakland side) I am very concerned about the impact the 4th bore project will have on our lives. I am particularly concerned about the level of noise and air pollution this project will present to our lives. Also, as a homeowner, how will this construction project affect the price of our homes? And where will be keeping your trucks and equipment for this project during the weekend? I am told it will be on the north (Parkwoods) side of the highway, further disrupting our lives! Furthermore, I am not convinced that this 5-year project will at the end of the day effectively accomplish what it sets out to do - reduce traffic. As things stand now, there are some backups created by closing off one lane during non-peak hours, but this impacts the non-peak traffic only, so it seems to me the disruption (when compared to what the 5-year project will create) isn't that bad. 1 2 3

I hope you will better address the concerns I have raised above and others that have been raised by other East Bay residents.

Sincerely,
Jan Goldenberg
320 Caldecott LN, #319
Oakland, CA 94618

1- We realize that there will be construction impacts. Mitigation, minimization, and avoidance measures will be enacted to keep construction impacts to a minimum. Real estate values are determined by many factors including transportation facilities. The difference in future traffic with and without the project is slight. The slight increase in traffic brought about by the project should have little, if any, effect on real estate values except that by reducing congestion properties in the project area may be seen as more desirable.

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.

2- All construction equipment and trucks will be kept within the designated staging areas and parking or storing of construction vehicles, equipment and materials on public streets will be prohibited by the contract specifications.

3-Please see the essay on “Purpose and Need” in Chapter 1.

Goldengaterescue@sbcglobal.net

"goldengaterescue @sbcglobal .net" <goldengaterescue @sbcglobal.net>
07/23/2006 12:55 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Pro fourth bore

As one who has had two different jobs over the years in which I had to commute from Oakland to Contra Costa County, I would be heartily in favor of a fourth bore. My commuting direction is ALWAYS limited to one bore and it's not fun.

As my present employer (Kaiser Hospital) doesn't support mass transit and has moved my job further away from me at least once, I now work somewhere mass transit doesn't serve. To get to my job on time, I am required to drive my car to work. I would heartily support a mass transit alternative but until that day I need to drive.

Put me down as "YES" to a fourth bore! As far as those NIMBY whiners who live near the tunnel, they can't have it both ways: Have a convenient commute location, and not allow others access to commuting.

Thank you for comments.

Gordon, Cary

Cary Gordon
<carymgordon @yahoo.com>
07/24/2006 02:22 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comment on Proposed Fourth Bore

I approve of the idea of constructing a new three lane tunnel. 1

If we could magically make a new three lane tunnel appear today, the current volume of traffic between the west and east sides of the tunnel would already justify it.

Back to reality, by the time the proposed fourth bore is completed, the traffic will be heavy at virtually all daytime hours, and the new tunnel will be a welcome relief. I predict that it will be heavily used from the start.

I live in Oakland, and I know many people who live east of the tunnel. I have heard them and others say that they rarely drive to San Francisco for meals or entertainment, because it is too much trouble. They are talking about evenings and weekends, not weekdays. Thus, the communities east of the tunnel are already somewhat isolated by the very idea of traversing the tunnel.

On a different note, I would not be surprised to learn that you had received comments from some people who might prefer that the tunnel not be built as a way of creating a disincentive for people to continue using their automobiles. However, I firmly believe automobiles will continue to be our primary method of transportation for decades beyond the projected completion date of the fourth bore. I believe that because no rational alternative yet exists. Rational policymaking demands that we decide on the basis of future conditions as we expect them to be, not as we might wish them to be.

As for the negative aspects of construction, I say there is no way to avoid it, so there is no point complaining about it. It is part of the cost of the project. We must bear it until the tunnel is done.

I do wonder why it must take so long, and whether a somewhat faster construction method might be identified. If there were a reasonable way to construct a surface road to alleviate some of the traffic, or to dig a tunnel at a somewhat higher elevation to minimize the length of the tunnel, I would consider that a superior alternative. (In that case, I would say, build a four lane tunnel!) But to my knowledge, no such alternative has been proposed. We must work with what we have.

Good luck.

Cary M. Gordon
Oakland, California
carymgordon@yahoo.com

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

Grbich, Lauren

"Lauren A. Grbich"
<laurengrbich@comcast.net>
07/29/2006 05:24 PM

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

Dear Caltrans,
I am a resident of Parkwoods community. This project is going to make a huge impact on our community. From what I understand of the project, the new lanes are going to be built on the side of the freeway close to our residences. Was building on the other side, where there are no homes, ever considered? 1

Lauren Grbich
320 Caldecott Lane #218
Oakland, CA 94618
laurengrbich@comcast.net

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

Greenhut, Marcy

"Marcy"
<imgreen03@comcast.net>
07/09/2006 06:01 PM

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

Dear Caltrans,

The public voted for Regional Measure 2, but how those funds were to be used to build the Caldecott 4th bore was not voted upon. Many who voted for RM.2 are now feeling that their tax money is being put to unfair use. Cars are being accomodated for, business as usual. However, it is more widely recognized now that ever before, that we must think beyond the car. We must encourage everyone to walk, bike and use transit more and use their gasoline-powered vehicles less. 1

It has become apparent that the Caldecott Tunnel 4th bore is being forced forward with insufficient concern for other forms of transportation except motor vehicles. Alternative transportation modes were not even addressed in the EIR. This is extremely short-sighted. 2

Existing concerns from residents that I have heard 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 all pedestrians, children and their mothers walking and biking to school and other vulnerable populations included. It is clear that traffic will impact adjacent local streets and local residents will be impacted by the additional traffic the extra travel lanes will accomodate and attract. 3
<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />
Mitigations and accomodations for pedestrian and bicyclists, as well as connections to and augmentation of transit must be included in the bore plans for the additional tunnel. If we are to ever reduce our dependence on the automobile and fossil fuels, we must start accomodating for transportation alternatives at every opportunity. Every plan for transportation must include alternatives, including transit, bicyclists and pedestrians. 4

Please consider re-drawing the plans for the Caldecott, to include an acoustically separated, properly ventilated and properly lighted pedestrian/bicycle tunnel 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. This bike-ped tunnel would be well-utilized, an attractive alternative to using the motor vehicle. 5

Sincerely,
Marcy Greenhut
Tranpsortation Commissioner

3210 King St.
Berkeley 94703

"We will not believe that this is happening to us, that 200 years of modernity can be brought to its knees by a world-wide power shortage."
James Howard Kunstler

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

2- Please see the essay on “Alternatives Considered in the Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report (DEA/EIR)” in Chapter 1.

3- Please see response #2 in the essay on “Traffic Operations” in Chapter 1.

Bentley School is located on Hiller Drive west of the Tunnel Road/Hiller intersection. ACCMA's Feasibility Study (Option A1) concluded that provisions for an at-grade bicycle/pedestrian crossing at this location could be a viable option. The cost would be $400,000-$500,000. Traffic signal studies are required to determine operation adequacy if implemented. A bike/ped overcrossing was also investigated for this location (Option A2), estimated to cost between $3.2-$3.8 million, and recommended for follow-up with the City of Oakland to pursue additional studies and funding. In addition, the Caldecott project is investigating the potential rehabilitation of sidewalk and shoulder on westbound Tunnel Drive where erosion has inundated the sidewalk. Other schools along the corridor are not impacted by the Caldecott project and those improvements should be coordinated with the appropriate agency having jurisdiction. See Options A1 and A2 in the essay on “Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements” in Chapter 1.

4 & 5- See Option J in the essay on “Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements” in Chapter 1.

Gregory, David

XDMGX@aol.com
05/31/2006 12:58 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Improvement Project....

Your scheduled public hearings are a waste of time. Anybody that has to use the Caldecott Tunnel knows we need an additional bore. Don't waste anymore time. Don't be shortsighted like the engineers who came up with the "brilliant" idea of only two more lanes and switching traffic. You have spent, no wasted, more money studying this than two more lanes would have cost when the third bore was built. This project should have been completed years ago. Quit wasting our time and money and GET TO WORK! 1

Thank you,

David Gregory
P. O. Box 3237
Oakland, CA 94609

1-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.

Hack, Nadine

"nadinehack"
<nadinehack@earthlink.net>
05/30/2006 08:07 PM

To <caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Alternative 3N

I'm strongly in favor of Alternative 3N to relieve congestion and save energy with fewer idling engines. 1

Nadine Hack
42 Honey Hill Rd.
Orinda

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

Heller, Dave

MrPlutocrat@aol.com
07/11/2006 01:01 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject What about bikes?

It's high time we start thinking about alternative means of transportation. How high does the price of gas have to go before we start considering the obvious.

If you're going to add a forth bore, please make room for bikes and pedestrians. 1

Sincerely,
Dave Heller
Berkeley, CA

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

Hemphill, Pam

Pam Hemphill
<sgoofoo@yahoo.com>
07/10/2006 11:27 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject bicycle/pedestrian

To Whom It May Concern:
I am writing in support of a bicycle/pedestrian pathway in the proposed addition to the Caldecott Tunnel. We need to be as petroleum-independent as possible, now and in the future.
As a bicyclist, living in SF, I have ridden the Ironhorse Trail from Pleasanton to its end and back several times. Soon I will be able to ride across the Bay Bridge and hopefully, then on through the Caldecott tunnel and to the Ironhorse, leaving my car at home. It would seem to me to be very shortsighted to let this opportunity to provide a non-automobile-dependent passage simply go by. Additionally, bicycling and walking provide health benefits to our overweight nation. 1

Thanks,
Pam Hemphill MD

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

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

Henn, Michael

calstep2@aol.com ()
06/22/2006 11:11 AM

To brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov,
Caldecott_Public_Comments@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
(calstep2@aol.com) on Thursday, June 22, 2006 at 11:11:27

Firstname: Michael

Lastname: Henn

Phone: (510) 834-7128

Address: 226 Wildwood Avenue

City: Piedmont

State: CA

Zip: 94610

Comments: Dear Sir or Madam,
As a veteran professional city planner and CEQA practitioner, I am in shock that Caltrans could possibly conclude that this growth-inducing, energy wasting, sprawl promoting, road-only project could not have a significant effect on the environment, under CEQA.

I live in Alameda County and work in Contra Costa County. I am one of those whose commute is allegedly going to be benefited by this project. Other than when major accidents occur, the present level of delay is not that great during the AM-PM commutes. There is BART and some "over-the hills" alternatives that most people figure out. Alameda County, the assumed beneficiaries of this project generally does not support the 4th bore. Instead, it is Contra Costa residents who already have two bores in the peak-flow direction, and won't be gaining anymore bores during the commute times, who are behind this boondoggle. Why are they behind it? Because on Saturday and Sunday evenings when they want to go to the City or to Oakland or Berkeley, they get stuck in some really serious back-ups. 1

Are we actually contemplating spending $300 +/- million because of traffic congestion for maybe 5-6 hours a week out of the 168 hours in a week. This is the most ridiculous mis-prioritization of public resources I can imagine.

While the politics of the 4th bore is not a CEQA issue, adding this extra lane capacity will be growth-inducing which is a CEQA issue. The Bay Area is a non-attainment area in meeting State and Federal air quality standards. The increased traffic that will be generated from this extra capacity will undermine attempts to improve our substandard air quality. 2 3

Reducing traffic congestion where there is a viable BART alternative will reduce BART ridership and promote more single-occupant commuting. This will reduce BART ridership and revenues causing a lower level of service. 4

In light of our nation's energy dependence, our unhealthful air, the global warming caused by auto pollution, and the need to promote alternatives to a drive-everywhere mentality, I believe the 4th bore is a gross violation of CEQA basic philosphy of "maintenance of a quality environment for the people of this state now and in the future". The project is also the antithesis of

Smart Growth planning.

Sincerely,
Michael Henn, AICP

1-Please see response #5 in the essay on “Traffic Modeling/Forecasting” and response #3 in the essay on “Traffic Operations” in Chapter 1.

2- The growth inducement analysis examined this effect and concluded that the lack of travel time savings in the primary commute direction (the tunnel improvement would affect only the “reverse” commute direction) would not result in a substantial growth inducing effect on residential development in the Livermore Valley and eastern Contra Costa County.

The Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2N) of this project is included in the 2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (which conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP)) and the 2005 Regional Transportation

Plan (RTP), and thus is in conformance with all related federal air quality requirements. The SIP is designed to be protective of human health.

3- The statement is only partially correct. The Bay Area is in attainment for the federal standards of all criteria pollutants with the exception of Ozone and PM 10 (24-hour), the latter being unclassified. The Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2N) of this project is included in the 2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (which conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP)) and the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and thus is in conformance with all related federal air quality requirements. The SIP is designed to be protective of human health. The analysis done by the MTC takes into account increases in vehicle emissions region-wide, not just from this project.

Ozone is addressed through the BAAQMD Ozone strategy (2005).

4- Please see response #3 in the essay on "Traffic Modeling/Forecasting" in Chapter 1.

Hightower, John T.

"John T. Hightower"
<jthightower@sbcglobal.net
>
07/14/2006 06:28 PM

To <caldecOtt_public_cOmments@dOt.ca.gOv>
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Project

To Whom It Concerns:

It is regrettable to see continued opposition to the 4th bore Caldecott Tunnel project. I am a Rockridge resident who will undoubtedly be inconvenienced by the project. Nevertheless, this is a basic infrastructure need that was evident 30 years ago. Further obstruction of this palpably necessary project should not be indulged. Let's get it done, for the good of all.

John Hightower
6419 Mystic Street
Oakland, CA

Thank you for your comments.

Hines, Lori

"Lori Hines"
<lorhines@hotmail.com>
07/31/2006 08:57 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott fourth bore Project

Greetings,

Please make sure to include pedestrian and bicycle access in the Caldecott Tunnel fourth bore plans. This access should be acoustically separated as well as properly ventilated and lighted. 1

Regards,
Lori Hines
2431 Oregon Street
Berkeley, CA 94705

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

Hoffman, Carol

Carol Hoffman
<choffman@uhs.berkeley.edu
>
07/28/2006 01:14 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc jbrunner@oaklandnet.com
bcc
Subject caldecott improvement project

Hi-

I live in Rockridge, Oakland, California. After my recent experience with the new paving of Highway 24 to reduce noise, I object to any further construction on Highway 24.

Unfortunately, I can hear highway 24 at my home. The recent paving on Highway 24 not only did not reduce the noise, **it increased the noise level!**!! The noise level is such now that one has to yell to be heard to someone a few feet away. Has this been monitored? 1

I am very concerned about more traffic on Highway 24 and the impact that will have on the air quality and noise level in the Rockridge neighborhood. It will not solve the traffic problem of commuters from east of the tunnel for more than the immediate future. I suggest that there be an increase in public transportation projects instead of highway/tunnel expansion. 2

I would be happy to tolerate the temporary nature of tunnel construction if I thought it was for the greater good over the long term. But i don't think that the benefits will be sufficiently long lasting to address the severe consequences in the short and long term.

Thanks,
Carol Hoffman
Lawton Ave, Oakland, California

1-The open-graded asphalt paving on State Route 24 should not have increased the ambient noise level, since the use of open-graded asphalt typically shows a reduction in noise levels.

The noise level has not been monitored.

2-Please see the essays on “Transit”, and “Project Study Area Boundaries” in Chapter 1. Please also see response #5 in the essay on “Traffic Modeling/Forecasting” in Chapter 1.

Howard, Kathy

Kathy Howard
<kathyhoward@earthlink.net
>
07/09/2006 07:19 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Tunnel - includes bikes and pedestrians

Dear Caltrans,

The new Caldecott Tunnel, if it has to be built at all, should be planned and built with access for bicycles and pedestrians.

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. 1

In fact, I would prefer that ONLY a bicycle and pedestrian tunnel be built, and that more attention and money be spent on public transportation, to help people to get out of their cars.. Once we have a new tunnel for cars, we will have more cars -- the Bay Area roads are already approaching grid-lock. 2

Sincerely,
K. Howard
717 9th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

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

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

Hunt, David

davehunt26@gmail.com ()
06/28/2006 11:44 AM

To brigetta_smith@dot.ca.gov,
Caldecott_Public_Comments@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
(davehunt26@gmail.com) on Wednesday, June 28, 2006 at 11:44:02

Firstname: David

Lastname: Hunt

Phone: 925-285-2123

Address: 95B Oakvue Rd.

City: Pleasant Hill

State: CA

Zip: 94523

Comments: I love the idea of a new 3 lane tunnel! Building a 2 lane tunnel only meets current demands, 3 lanes is smart planning for the future! 1

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

Hyman, Richard D.

"Richard Hyman"
<eyez4yu@hotmail.com>
05/31/2006 08:40 AM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject support bore four

We desperately need a 4th bore...please expedite

Richard D. Hyman
221 Hemme Avenue
Alamo CA 94507-2146

(925) 820-8661
eyez4yu@hotmail.com

Thank you for your comments.

Jackson, Jennifer

Jen Jackson
<cjenniferjackson@yahoo.com>
07/05/2006 04:36 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Bike/Ped access in tunnel

To Whom It May Concern:

It has come to my attention that the Caldecott Tunnel improvements do not include any kind of access for bicyclists or pedestrians to go through the tunnel. Not including access for this community is a huge opportunity lost, given that hopefully CalTrans will not be looking at reconstructing the tunnel anytime soon again.

Given the need to reduce our consumption of oil, reduce the production of climate changing gases and encourage our ever-fatter population to get more exercise, a bike/ped access lane in the tunnel would be a win-win for all.

I urge CalTrans to incorporate bike/ped access in the Caldecott Tunnel plans. 1

Thank you,
Jennifer Jackson
419 Vernon St
Oakland, CA 94610

C. Jennifer Jackson
cjenniferjackson@yahoo.com

"For all that divides us, we have but one planet." -- M. Gorbachev

"Water is H2O , hydrogen two parts, oxygen one,
But there is also a third thing, that makes it water
And nobody knows what that is." -- D.H. Lawrence, The Third Thing

How low will we go? Check out Yahoo! Messenger's low PC-to-Phone call rates.

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

Jolliffee, Barbara

"Barbara Jolliffee"
<barbarajolliffe@hotmail.com>
06/26/2006 07:25 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject /cakdecitt cinnebts

The 4th bore is at least 20 years late. The concept of a 3rd bore instead of a 4th bore from the beginning was ill-conceived. How much time and state resources have been spent on moving barriers, etc. and commuter time wasted in lines? You aren't going to keep people from moving. What has happened by the delay is that Walnut Creek has developed its own fine restauraants, theatre, arts etc. They may not be in a class with SF yet, but given another 10 years, they will be. So SF and perhaps the East Bay (Oak/Berk) have been the losers because people have developed their own arts centers, thank you.

As for those who fear more noise, what can be worse than the fumes accumulating from thousands of vehicles daily, engines idling, stop and go, emissions by the tons. I didn't read any comments about the interminable time it took to build the 13/24 interchange on the Oakland side of the Caldecott. A bad design, but it did stop a lot of traffic from neighborhoods. We can't always have the take in one direction. The interchange has been finished, it moves traffic more smoothly, far fewer delays and has cut emissions and traffic on surface streets immensely in the Rockridge and nearby areas. Bldg. a 4th bore is not going to cause more traffic on surface streets because there aren't any surface streets that really effectivley lead to the Caldecott. 1

What I would like to see is the CHP doing bigger shifts at cutting off those illegally exiting @ Gateway to cut in front of the line. The CHP could probably fund its budget for the local office just from fines if they did sweeps at various times of the day. It seems to me they could scoop up 10 or 15 cars at a time by bottling them up at both ends. Those who cut in break the law, make it hard to remain law-abiding and encourage others to do the cheating also.

Barbara Jolliffe

P.S. Build the bore--the sooner, the better.

1-Please see response #2 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

Johnson, Cynthia

"endogals"
<endogals@pacbell.net>
06/16/2006 10:47 AM

To <caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott 4th bore

I just read the article in the Alameda Journal about the Caldecott Tunnel. I am a commuter and have been for a number of years. I will probably be retired by the time the 4th bore will be finished but I feel it is definitely needed. I will still need to use the tunnels but on my own time schedule. Anyone who complains about the noise from the tunnel traffic should not have moved so close to them. If they want quiet they should have moved to a different location. The bay area will always have traffic congestion and noise. I moved to a quite location and I pay for that by commuting but I would not have moved closer to work and then complained about the noise. People need to get their priorities straight. They can not have it both ways.
Cynthia Johnson

Thank you for your comments.

Karch, Donna (7/20/06)

Donna Karch
<donna_karch@yahoo.com>
07/20/2006 02:59 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Support for fourth bore

We live on the Oakland side of the Caldecott Tunnel
and full support the need for the three-lane tunnel
(bore) to be located north of the present structures.

Unlike some of our neighbors, we the the Caldecott
Tunnel on a regular basis; and feel the additional
lanes will easy congestion. 1

Thanks,
Donna Karch

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

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

Karch, Donna (7/20/06)

donna_karch@yahoo.com ()
07/20/2006 02:41 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
(donna_karch@yahoo.com) on Thursday, July 20, 2006 at 14:41:44

Firstname: Donna

Lastname: Karch

Comments: We live on the Oakland side of the Caldecott Tunnel and fully support the construction of a three lane tunnel (bore) north of the current structures.

Thank you for your comments.

Kearney, Karen

Karen Kearney
<karen@newvillage.net>
07/12/2006 03:16 PM

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

Dear Caltrans,

I would like to add my voice with those who oppose the 4th Bore addition to the Caldecott Tunnel. Last week I saw Al Gore's movie, "An Inconvenient Truth," and I highly recommend that anyone proposing to enlarge our freeway system and increase automobile dominance see this movie.

The inconvenient truth is that the transformation of our environment that has taken place in the last 50 years is now threatening our world in ways not even imagined when the oil companies and automobile industry began dismantling our public transportation system and replacing it with the blight of ever expanding freeway systems. The "car culture" that has destroyed communities, hurt small locally owned businesses and made our streets and neighborhoods unsafe, now threatens the future of the planet. In the long run, if we continue expansion of our automobile dominant transportation system we not only risk global warming (which is happening more rapidly than expected), but we will also run out of oil.

And yet it seems that "progress" demands the building of ever larger freeways, and the Caldecott 4th Bore is only the latest "improvement." I strongly oppose building this new tunnel, but if is is going to happen there must be significant concessions to at least partially offset the harm caused by this project.

If this tunnel is built it will increase the number of cars on the road, and the amount of pollution, noise and congestion particularly in Oakland. A full Environmental Impact Report should be done, and mitigations based on the findings in the report must be provided. 1
Pedestrian, bicycle and public transportation alternatives need to be included. The 4th Bore Tunnel should be designed with the capacity to add rail transport in the future, and it must include a safe segment in the tunnel for bicycles and pedestrians. 2

Please consider the lives of our children and grandchildren before proceeding mindlessly with this project.

Sincerely,

Karen Kearney
--
Karen Stewart Kearney
NEW VILLAGE PRESS
P.O. Box 3049, Oakland, CA 94609
(510) 420-1361
http://newvillagepress.org

1-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.

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

Keck, Kevin

J KECK
<jkkeckk@yahoo.com>
07/11/2006 03:12 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc jeffrey_weiss@dot.ca.gov
bcc
Subject Caldecott Public Comment Time Extension

Dear Mr. McConnell,

I just called Mr. Jeff Weiss to obtain information about the hours that the supporting technical materials cited in the DEIR may be reviewed at District 4 Headquarters.

Mr. Weiss informed me that the public comment time for the Caldecott DEIR has been extended beyond the initial closing date of July 12, 2006. If this is not the case, please let me know ASAP so I can submit my comments before the close.

If you could share this information about the Library Hours with me, by e-mail I will be able to plan a visit to your Grand Avenue Facility to review these materials.

Thank You,

Kevin Keck

Oakland, CA
(510) 547-3052
jkkeckk@yahoo.com

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

Kevin Keck
5516 Kales Avenue
Oakland, CA 94618

July 31, 2006

Gregory C. McConnel
Senior Environmental Planner
Attention: Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner
California Department of Transportation, District 4 Environmental Analysis
Mail station 8B, Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Caldecott Improvement Project

Dear Mr. McConnell and Ms. Dorado:

This letter responds to the call for public comments concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Caldecott Improvement Project on State Route 24. I appreciate Caltrans' efforts to find solutions that will improve mobility and improve safety for the motoring public and Caltrans maintenance Personnel in the immediate vicinity of the Caldecott Tunnel. However, I feel the DEIR as it is presented, fails to present and evaluate a set of reasonable alternatives, and more importantly I feel it fails to meet all but one of the project goals identified in the project purpose section. Furthermore the traffic and safety portion of this DEIR consistently overstates the problems in the immediate vicinity of the tunnel and understates or dismisses problems of an equal or greater magnitude when they occur outside the immediate study area. Given the amount of up front planning and public outreach efforts conducted, I was sorely disappointed by the final DEIR for a number of reasons. 1

My family and I reside approximately .25 mile away from SR 24 and we rely on this freeway for mobility to and from various locations in and around the Bay Area. While we are fortunate to have the ability to walk our children to their schools, we are fearful to let them walk to their schools by themselves in the morning or return in the afternoon because of problems directly related to the uncontrolled design of the on and off ramps at Broadway and at Patton and the 1960 era Caltrans design standards that were used when this freeway and its ramp and adjoining frontage road facilities were constructed. The outdated, un-sensitive design of these facilities and the on-going lack of resources (aside from the earthquake retro-fit of the seldom used pedestrian overpass) to modify the configuration or reduce the excess capacity of these ramps in order to reduce the associated speeds, places a greater number of individuals closer to what the DEIR refers to as "live traffic" when its in the vicinity of Caltrans' maintenance workers. Unfortunately, many of these individuals that will are already impacted by this facility have none of the protection that Caltrans provides their own when facing live traffic like orange vests, attenuator devices, public information campaigns and doubled traffic fines zones. 2

FAILURE TO MEET STATED PURPOSE

I have attended many of the meetings about this project over the past few years and reviewed the DEIR. After reviewing this document, I am not convinced that the DEIR adequately demonstrates how this key regional project meets its stated purposes. The project sponsors have not responded to many of the concerns raised over the past five during

the course of this project in both counties and they have failed to at identify and evaluate a reasonable set of alternatives to this project.

Of particular concern to me has been the project sponsors unwillingness to conduct an analysis of an all-lane tolling option that could identify the elasticity of demand. Would motorists alter their travel patterns if it cost fifty cents to travel through the corridor? Would such an all-lane tolling plan help fully fund this partially funded project and help fund needed capacity and safety improvements on congested Lamorinda and East Bay arterials paralleling the SR 24 corridor. This is not an unreasonable request and it deserved serious consideration. Unfortunately, in the course of this study when congestion pricing strategies have been raised, they are in the context of tolling new capacity, or in the context of physically adding an additional new HOT lane, which like most of the bore utilization strategies in practice now and under consideration for the future, all serve to ultimately expedite the vehicular traffic westbound in the morning and eastbound in the evening. To me, this is a bias approach and not one supported by reason. 3

While the DEIR demonstrates that a tunnel project is geo-technically feasible, the DEIR does not adequately demonstrate how a new forth bore would meet of the pared list of objectives in the purpose and need section of the DEIR. There is no question that a new forth bore would eliminate the need to reverse the direction of the center bore. It is a tenuous argument to imply that this project is responding to the will of the people when it would appear to ***respond*** primarily to the wishes of the politicians who included this project in the all or nothing list of projects included in the Regional Measure 2 and Contra Costa Measure J. 4

The DEIR also fails to demonstrate how this extravagant and costly fourth bore would meet the stated primary purpose of State transportation projects, namely to be cost effective and environmentally sensitive. The analysis as it is presented in the DEIR, unreasonably focuses on the minimal adverse "incremental" impacts of a new, unmanaged fourth bore and by arbitrarily constricting the project study area. The document avoids directly addressing the obvious spillover impacts associated with the relocation and ***incremental*** expansion of a set of existing bottlenecks from a set of sparsely populated locations to a set of densely populated areas with countless sensitive receptors…all of which have been conveniently located just beyond the project's study limits. 5

FUTURE OPTION? = 3 (+1 HOV)

Apparently politically constricted to a three lane configuration, the alternative 3N bore with its two 10' "shoulders" is nonetheless constructed wide enough to accommodate a mysteriously cloaked "***future option***" which would ultimately allow an additional fourth lane within the envelope of the 3N option. The DEIR indicates that for this fourth lane to be built in the tube, an undefined set of "***additional costs and widening***"[1] would be necessary.

In the interest of fairness and disclosure, the DEIR should discuss the political history of this fourth bore effort and identify the local legislative sponsors and supporters of this project and the associated measures that mandate that new HOV facilities be created from anew and not by converting existing mixed traffic lanes. These are political measures that severely constrain Caltrans' ability to effectively manage their existing freeway facilities, and these policies are at the heart of the 3N option. 6

[1] DEIR p. 26

The DEIR mentions in passing that an additional lane could be added, but remarks that such a project would require additional costs and widening. It is not clear in the DEIR where the widening will occur and if this could be accomplished with a simple restriping. Since this future option is identified, the DEIR should clearly present the magnitude of the costs of this conversion, and what the safety impacts of an "auxiliary lane" or a HOT lane would be. One would be justified to wonder why after spending so much for a project, why additional widening and costs would be needed…unless there is a purposeful segmentation of the project to avoid a full environmental review of this ultimate configuration. The DEIR should clearly identify the relatively minimal construction costs and minimal widening requirements of this "future option" and clearly indicate whether this "future option" project will be subject to an environmental review or if this project will be presented as a the congestion pricing HOV/HOT lane project in the near future which may be pushed as being "statutorily exempt" from the environmental review process.

The DEIR dismisses excessively extravagant new bike tunnels, a simple combination bike/road tunnel and the spurious Concord Line to Fremont BART service alternatives due to cost and feasibility concerns[2], yet it retains in the DEIR analysis an alternative that would be constructed with excessively wide fallow shoulders. On one hand the project description indicates that the tunnel complex can accommodate four lanes, but then it states that a four lane bore is eliminated from further discussion. This inconsistent approach and limited discussion is deceptive, it strikes of avoidance, and it seriously compromises the objectivity of the report.

FUNDING SHORTFALL

The DEIR does not describe the top-down role that the California Transportation Commission has played in this project, or how this regional 'wish list' project has managed to trump the regional transportation "blueprint" priority lists and leapfrog to the top. The bore's construction designs started before the alternative analysis was complete and the DEIR has been presented before the project is fully funded. The DEIR identifies only $245.6 million of available funds for this $285 – to $375 million project. Such a shortfall at the start of a project does not demonstrate a cost effective solution to the mobility problems identified in earlier reports. The pie charts presented at the public meetings identified the various funding sources but they misleadingly excluded the missing $100 million slice. 7

If this project is relying on securing future funds through a future, voter approved State Bond Measure, the DEIR should clearly indicate the probability of not getting these funds, and what would happen to this project and the other fully funded Contra Costa Measure J projects if this particular gamble loses.
Is the project moving forward with the assumption that State gas tax revenues will remain at current levels?

In the context of forecasting the future, it would be interesting to note what the travel demand model assumed existing and 2035 gas prices and BART tickets between Orinda and SF are and how these inputs compare with the current gas prices? 8

SHRINKING PROJECT LIMITS

Despite six years of public meetings and the promise of a corridor-wide study between I-680 and I-580 to look at the mobility needs of people as well as vehicles, the project's limits have

[2] DEIR p.26

been arbitrarily constricted to suit the new tunnel proponents needs and to avoid addressing the "***incremental***" spillover traffic that the DEIR mentions only in passing. In the MTC's 2001 Analysis, the Study's intent was defined as a "corridor" study to study the broader issues of congestion in the SR 24 corridor between I-580 and I-680. Since the initial findings, the project limits have been reduced to exclude the areas where the project's impacts will be the greatest.

This reduction in the project limits is consistent with the summary findings of the traffic and transportation section of the DEIR which tends to emphasize and overstate the localized delay reduction benefits of the new tunnel, and to minimize, dismiss and purposely exclude identifying the larger project impacts that will occur on the local arterials and residential streets. 9

FAILURE TO MEET PURPOSE AND NEED

Reduces delays within the vicinity of the tunnels, through the year 2032;

The DEIR paints the delays at the Caldecott as "different than other Bay Area freeway bottlenecks". Perhaps this is because the delays are less than significant when compared to other regional bottlenecks. According to the Caltrans Year 2002 Bay Area Freeway Congestion Data published by Caltrans, the congestion at the Caldecott does not even rate in the top ten. In the DEIR summary, the existing delays at the Caldecott are described as "***dramatic***", "***bi-directional***", "***constant***", "***unpredictable***" and occurring "***all-day***"[3]. This statement in the summary exaggerates and contradicts the concise description of the nature of the delays presented in Chapter 2 of the DEIR.[4]

The DEIR states that the purpose of the project is reduce delays in the vicinity of the tunnels, and refers to the Caldecott bottleneck as the "primary bottleneck" for the entire corridor during the weekdays and weekends. However, the DEIR states the "***The Caldecott Tunnel acts as a bottleneck predominantly because of its uphill grade just before entering the tunnel.***"[5] The report acknowledges, but does not address the impacts associated with relocating these "primary bottlenecks" to the next downstream bottleneck. 10

Eliminates the need for daily tunnel reversals and thus reduces the amount of time Caltrans maintenance personnel are exposed to live traffic.

A new bore would eliminate the need for daily tunnel reversals. I agree with this statement. As a parent and pedestrian I can understand Caltrans concerns about having their crews exposed to live traffic. However, I wonder if this statement can be backed up with empirical evidence, and it strikes me as a prime example of overstating the problems at the tunnel and understating the problems beyond. If this elimination of this operation is cited as a purpose and need of the project…I think it is fair to examine the tunnel reversal operations more closely and quantify the impacts of these reversals and see if there are more cost efficient ways to address these delays. 11

[3] DEIR p. vi
[4] DEIR p.63
[5] DEIR p. 69

1. It this reversal operation must occur up to five times on a weekend, I think it would be appropriate to quantify the delays associated with this antiquated operation, and determine if the frequency and procedures and potential mismanagement of the reversal operations itself, a greater contributor to the perceived congestion problems than the other contributors combined. 12

2. Given the importance placed on this purpose, it would be informative to know if there have been any non-geotechnical efforts aside from the attenuator truck to reduce this "live traffic" risk to Caltrans workers since the lane reversal operations were instituted in 1964. 13

3. How many maintenance personnel are assigned to this duty during the weekday? 14

4. Are there additional crew members working on Saturdays to handle the increased workload? 15

5. On average, how many times a year does the remote control fail requiring a crew member get out of their truck to manually put a key in the control box? 16

6. There had been talk during the earlier outreach efforts in 2000 that Caltrans intended to improve this reversing operation by installing cameras that would allow Tunnel crews to see further east beyond the portal. Have these cameras been installed and are they operational? 17

7. When these lane reversal crews are at work, are traffic fines doubled in the vicinity of their work zone? 18

8. If the safety of the tunnel reversing crews is paramount and a reason for a new tunnel is this particular duty more or less dangerous than the other duties these crews may be expected to perform if this particular task is no longer required? 19

9. Considering the tunnel crews, is the accident rate for the reversal operation higher than the accident rate for non-reversal tasks. 20

Improves mobility for the traveling public and emergency crews;

The mobility "improvements" beyond the immediate vicinity of the tunnel are not clearly quantified.

Because of the adjacent bottlenecks at the connecting ramps and interchanges on either end of the SR 24 corridor, that are not planned on being expanded, will the project's goals for improved mobility depend on the capacity local arterials and residential streets to handle the capacity deficit? 21

Wouldn't the mobility improvements be limited to the "driving public"? Will the transit dependant, walking and bicycling component of the "traveling public" share the same mobility improvements? Or is there a chance that as more people drive, fewer people will take BART and that fares and service could be reduced. The addition of the BART SFO extension has created a shortage of BART cars that serves to reduce the number of seats during the rush hour. If there are fewer commuters on reverse commuting on BART is there a chance that BART could decide to further reduce the number of trains and seats traveling on the Concord Lime? 22

How many times have emergency crews reported "mobility" problems at the tunnels and how many times have they reported problems accessing the corridor's ramps? 23

What kind of emergency crews aside from the CHP and Caltrans need to traverse the tunnel and how frequently do they use the tunnel? 24

Will there be any impacts to emergency crew mobility if a fourth lane (auxiliary/HOT) is eventually constructed in the 3N option? 25

Couldn't a bikeway (like the one Caltrans will be constructing on the East Approach) provide a better and dedicated emergency access than any mixed use lane option (HOT/Auxilliary) variation under consideration? 26

The report indicates that many of the Oakland intersection facilities will be operating at LOS F, which would make it difficult for these crews to get on and off the freeway. The report does not identify how the additional traffic using the new bore could directly impact the existing mobility of emergency crews in the vicinity of Children's Hospital, or potentially reduce the response times of the Oakland Fire department in the vicinity of the Patton off-ramp. 27

Reduces the potential for congestion-related accidents at the queues that form at the tunnels' approaches, thus increasing safety for the public and Caltrans maintenance personnel;

Here again the report makes broad unsupported statements about congestion related dangers at the tunnel, and how a small incremental increase in capacity would improve safety, but it dismisses and fails to evaluate the same type of "congestion-related accidents" that could occur at intersections in the vicinity of the impacted on-ramp entrances and off-ramp terminals that could be directly attributable to the undefined and understated "***incremental***" growth of traffic on local streets.

In terms of safety, accident rates are given, but the analysis in the DEIR analysis does not provide enough information about these reported accidents that would indicate they were truly congestion-related, or indeed occurring at the tunnel's approaches. 28

It would be informative if the 640 accidents cited were summarized by the following factors;

1. primary cause,
2. location,
3. severity (fatality/injury or property),
4. type,
5. time of day,
6. impairment related and
7. direction of travel
8. vehicle make.

Because the analysis in the DEIR does not associate a causality to these accidents, it is difficult to determine if the proposed project has the real potential increase safety, or if the if the planned additional capacity and increased "mobility" could serve to increase the total annual vehicle miles traveled and actually increase the accident rate rather than reducing it. The additional 2N, 3N and "future option" 4N all add additional "downhill" capacity which could all serve to increase the frequency and severity of accidents when they occur, which would be contrary to the studies stated purpose.

K. Keck Page 7 July 31, 2006

Based on my own experience, I would expect that most of the severe, injury causing accidents in the corridor were not due to the congestion at the queues. I would expect that many of these collisions were directly attributable to excessive speed and aggressive, unsafe lane changes occurring in the peak direction. The 3N option's "future option" 4-lane auxiliary/HOV lane variation could double the number of lane changes and exponentially increase the accident rate rather than improving it. Here too, the accident rate used to justify this project was determined by the "limits of the project" but the potential benefits are focused on the tunnel approaches. Are these both the same areas? If they are different areas, they are not comparable. And what other "similar" facilities were used as a comparison. Were other facilities with summit grades and summit tunnels considered, or was this rate compared to a general statewide freeway average that included segments like those on I-5 in the Central Valley. 29

When the word public is used here, it does not include the transit dependant, or those walking and bicycling.

OTHER ITEMS

The DEIR implies that general population growth in the Tri Valley area has impacted of the congestion levels at the Caldecott, but neglects to identify how specific, more recent capacity expansion projects like the SR24/I-680 interchange improvements have impacted the queues at the Caldecott. 30

Sincerely,

Kevin Keck
Oakland, CA

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

2- Please see response #2 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

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

3- Although there are studies and proposals to install an individual SMART lane or toll lane, the comment is suggesting that congestion pricing be evaluated and to charge a toll on all mainline traffic on the freeway, effectively converting the freeway into toll road. Converting the freeway into a toll road would require legislative action and is beyond the scope of this project.

Please see responses #5 and #9 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

4-Please see the essay on "Regional Measure 2 and Contra Costa Measure J" in Chapter 1.

5- Please see response #7 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

6- Please see the essay on "Regional Measure 2 and Contra Costa Measure J" in Chapter 1. Also, please see Section 1.1.2, Background, in Chapter 1 of Vol. 1 of the FEA/EIR.

Alternative 2N was selected as the Preferred Alternative. Please see the essay on "Preferred Alternative" in Chapter 1.

7-Please see the essays on "Regional Measure 2 and Contra Costa Measure J" and "Funding" in Chapter 1.

Projects of this magnitude are often not fully funded from the very beginning of the project, but the fact that $245 million was specifically programmed prior to the circulation of the DEA/EIR did show local, regional, state and federal commitment to the project. The design of the two-lane alternative started prior to the

completion of the final environmental document, with the understanding that either a three-lane or a No-Build Alternative could be selected, and then the design of the two-lane alternative would be shelved.

8- Please see response #6 in the essay on "Traffic Modeling/Forecasting" in Chapter 1.

9- Please see the essay on "Project Study Area Boundaries" and response #1 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

10- In the peak commute direction, the uphill grade is a contributing factor to the bottleneck problem. Other contributing factors include lane and ramp configurations, tunnel constraints, etc. However, in the off-peak direction, the lack of capacity (merging from four lanes to two lanes) is the main factor.

Please see response #7 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

11- The tunnel reversal operation has been examined many times. Our traffic department, consultants, California Highway Patrol (CHP), Bore #4 engineers, safety personnel, and many others have examined it. It does expose Caltrans personnel to traffic but there is no other solution given the present three bore configuration. Even so, tunnel personnel have strived to make the tunnel change the safest lane/tunnel change method in the State of California.

12- There is no mismanagement in the reversal operations. It takes approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete the reversal utilizing a two-person crew.

The direction of operation of the center bore of the Caldecott Tunnel is changed on a dynamic basis by Caltrans staff. Tunnel personnel, who continuously monitor traffic conditions and volumes on State Route 24 near the tunnel, make the decision as to which direction the center bore operates. This is accomplished primarily by monitoring with closed-circuit television cameras, and in consultation with the District 4 Traffic Management Center and the California Highway Patrol.

During the week the tunnel direction is changed between the hours of 11:00 am and 12:00 noon.

Because traffic demand in either direction through the Caldecott Tunnel on weekends varies depending on whether nearby special events are occurring, the weather, or if there are traffic incidents on adjacent facilities, the switching of the center bore is not performed on a pre-established schedule. Instead, the center bore is switched to best accommodate the traffic patterns and volumes at any given point in time.

This is especially challenging on weekends, where for most of the day the traffic demand in both directions exceeds the capacity of a single bore. In the westbound direction, the demand usually exceeds the capacity of a single bore from 9:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m.. In the eastbound direction, the single bore capacity is usually exceeded from 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.. Consequently, with only three total bores (each with two lanes) available, some congestion inevitably occurs in the direction with only one bore in operation.

The weekend demand in either direction seldom is much more than the capacity of a single bore. However, because of this slight imbalance, the direction which has two bores in operation will often appear to be well under capacity, which leads motorists waiting in congestion in the opposite direction to believe that the center bore is being operated in the wrong direction. Our experience has been that this is rarely the case, and that our tunnel operators are quite adept at selecting the best time to switch direction of the center bore. In fact, the direction of the center bore is switched many times per day on a typical weekend because of these conditions.

13- The lane reversal procedures have been studied and modified over the years. The amount of time to complete a closure has been shortened, we believe as much as possible. We know of no other method to accomplish the task.

14- It takes a two person crew and two vehicles to accomplish the center tunnel change, whether on the weekend or during the week.

15- In general, there is no additional crewmembers working on Saturdays.

16- The remote control devices fail when the median box is hit by a moving vehicle, or suffers some other mechanical failure. This occurs approximately six times a year.

17- Yes, the cameras have been installed and are operational. They are controlled by the Transportation Management Center at the Department's Oakland office.

18- Traffic fines are doubled only when the maintenance crews are doing night maintenance work. They are not doubled during the daily lane reversals.

19- The lane change operation is much more dangerous than other tunnel maintenance duties. This operation exposes Caltrans Maintenance crews to considerably more traffic.

The lane change operation can be completed as many as three to ten times a day. The pop-up crew will not be needed after the fourth bore is completed. That crew will be reassigned to work on tunnel electrical and mechanical problems, which require few lane closures.

20- The accident rate for the tunnel crews is not available, however, several accidents involving tunnel crews have occurred over the past 43 years.

21- We acknowledge the comment and agree that, from the motorists' perspective, mobility includes the entire transportation infrastructure. Surely there are deficit links in other facilities that could inhibit mobility. Constructing a fourth bore will improve mobility for some but is not intended to provide unrestricted mobility for all.

22- Please see responses #3 and #4 and #5 in the essay on "Traffic Modeling/Forecasting" in Chapter 1.

23- Emergency crews have not had problems accessing ramps in the corridor.

24- Other emergency crews include, but are not limited to, the Berkeley Bomb squad, Ambulances, Fire Departments, Private towing operations, Emergency Medical personal, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Guard, and the Coast Guard. There are at least ten incidences per month.

25- Emergency crew mobility should be enhanced no mater what the design of the fourth bore.

Currently both the Orinda and Oakland fire departments respond during an incident. The CHP and fire departments will continue to respond using the same method. They may choose to respond in the reverse traffic direction or another tunnel depending on the nature of the emergency. With the fourth bore emergency response will be quicker and safer.

Alternative 2N has been chosen as the Preferred Alternative. Please see the essay on "Preferred Alternative" in Chapter 1.

26- Emergency crew mobility should be enhanced no mater what the design of the fourth bore.

Now both the Orinda and Oakland fire departments respond during an incident. The CHP and fire departments will continue to respond using the same method. They may choose to respond in the reverse traffic direction or another tunnel depending on the nature of the emergency. With a fourth bore emergency response will be quicker and safer. A bikeway would not provide a better and dedicated emergency access. Emergency equipment needs extra room both on the roadway and pavement.

The purpose of a bikeway is not intended as emergency access. Hypothetically, it is possible that an emergency crew would utilize whatever means are available during the course of action.

27- The report examined the relative difference between constructing a fourth bore and not constructing a fourth bore. As discussed elsewhere in the report, traffic growth will continue to occur even without a fourth bore. As such, the year 2032 No-Build condition is used as the base of comparison. There is a slight increase of traffic demands at those intersections and facilities being studied. Please see response #2 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1 regarding general local impact discussion. It is an apple-to-orange evaluation to compare year 2032 Build condition to the existing condition.

28 & 29- The report examined the relative difference between constructing a fourth bore and not constructing a fourth bore. As discussed elsewhere in the report, traffic growth will continue to occur even without a fourth bore. As such, the year 2032 No-Build condition is used as the base of comparison. There is a slight increase of traffic demands at those intersections and facilities being studied. Please see response #2 in the essay on

"Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1 regarding general local impact discussion. It is an apple-to-orange evaluation to compare year 2032 Build condition to the existing condition.

Following are the accident data for State Route 24 within project limit (Ala-24-PM R5.282 to CC-24-PM 1.30, including ramps), obtained from Caltrans Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) for the three years period between January 1, 2003 and December 31, 2005.

Actual Number				Actual Rates			Average Rates		
Year	Total	Fatal	Injury	Fat.	F+I	Total	Fat.	F+I	Total
01/01/03-12/31/05	649	0	168	.000	.43	1.66	.008	.34	1.04

A total of 649 accidents occurred in the vicinity of the Caldecott tunnel. 65.9% of the accidents (428) occurred outside tunnel and 34.1% (221) occurred inside tunnel.

43.8%(284) of the accidents occurred in the eastbound direction and 56.2%(365) in the westbound direction.

86.3% of the accidents occurred between 6 a.m. to 7 p.m..

The accident collision types are as follows:

A. Head-on (0.0%)
B. Sideswipe (27.7%)
C. Rear End (55.9%)
D. Broadside (1.5%)
E. Hit Object (16.6%)
F. Overturn (1.7%)
G. Auto Pedestrian (0.0%)
H. Other (0.8%)

The primary collision factors are as follows:

1. Influence Alcohol (3.2%)
2. Follow Too Close (7.4%)
3. Failure To Yield (0.0%)
4. Improper Turn (10.9%)
5. Speeding (51.2%)
6. Other Violation (21.7%)
7. Other Than Driver (1.4%)

Rear-enders and sideswipe type collisions, which generally are due to driver's inattention, unsafe speeds, and lane changing in recurring traffic congestion, account for 83.6% of all the accidents.

The accident rate in this section of State Route 24 (1.66) is equal to 160% of the average for similar highway facilities (1.04).

The accident data shown above indicates that a significant factor causing the higher than average accident rate at State Route 24 within project limit is congestion. The proposed tunnel project will reduce congestion within the vicinity of the tunnel, and as a result, will reduce the number of congestion type of accidents.

The slight increase of traffic volume due to this project could theoretically slightly increase the number of accidents. However, the benefits the of reduced congestion type accidents and accident rate, will be greater than the negative impact of the traffic volume increase.

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

30- The information regarding population growth and current congestion levels are included as background information but not the base of comparison. The recent completion of State Route 24/680 interchange improvement is included as part of the forecast modeling in its network assumption. Given that, it has no effect on the alternative comparison.

Keenan, Gerry

TO: Mr. Gregory C. McConnell
Senior Environmental Planner
California Department of Transportation, District 4
Mail Station 8 B
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, California 94623-0660

FROM: Gerry Keenan, NHPA, Fourth Bore Coalition

DATE: July 10, 2006

RE: COMMENTS ON THE CALDECOTT TUNNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (D-EA/EIR of 5-12-2006) (Expansion of statements made at June 15, 2006 public hearing)

Dear Mr. McConnell:

My name is Gerry Keenan. I am a trained biologist and a member of the North Hills Phoenix Association and the Fourth Bore Coalition. My home is situated in the canyon to the immediate right as one exits the Caldecott Tunnel in the westward direction. I have lived there since 1970.

I will begin by stating that I support the goals articulated by the North Hills Phoenix Association and by the Fourth Bore Coalition. However, my particular concern is with the noise that will be generated by the project. I am outraged that CalTrans has paid scant attention to the plight of thousands of people who will be subjected to five years of around the clock construction noise. It is even more incredible that CalTrans has glossed over the effects induced demand will have on neighborhoods along the entire corridor of Highway 24 west of the tunnel, once the project is completed. 1

An invisible and pervasive pollutant, noise can and does negatively affects human health and wellbeing. Unremitting noise leads to problems including sleep loss, distraction, lost productivity and high blood pressure and is responsible for a general reduction in the quality of life. Physiological and psychological deterioration are direct results of sustained, short bursts of high decibel noise or long periods of low and/or high frequency noise. The air in which noise travels is considered a 'commons,' and when exposed to noise it is experienced it the same way that second hand smoke is experienced – as being assaulted, without consent. The Latin derivative for the word noise is the word nausea.

Page 2 of 3

The D-EA/EIR is inadequate, in every respect, when addressing the issue of unrelenting noise and the effect it will have on the people who live in proximity to the proposed project, as evidenced by the following:

- Construction, as outlined in the report, is expected to take place, around the clock, for five years. Yet, incredibly, there is no analysis of construction noise, except to say "noise generated during construction could at times reach levels higher than existing traffic noise." Perhaps CalTrans can explain just exactly what that means. 2

- The document fails entirely to address single-event noise impact, a particularly glaring omission with respect to single-event noise associated with nighttime heavy construction activity. 3

- The report is completely wrong when it speaks of "affected receptors," (people?) stating that there are "88-90 residences that have predicted noise levels higher than 66dBA." The standard model for assessing roadway noise, and its impact on the surrounds, addresses topography, geology, meteorology and traffic operations. Had this model been used the number of "affected receptors" would have increased dramatically. For example: the canyon the freeway runs through as it exits the tunnel in the westward direction is, geologically speaking a natural amphitheatre with its terminus to the north of the freeway. As such, every home in the canyon up to the ridgeline houses "affected receptors." Noise, in general, rises up the walls of the canyon – and, due to the nature of sound, is greatly amplified on foggy or rainy days. 4

- No mention was made of 80 hillside residences to be built just south of the tunnel (the grading is in place and easily seen), the soccer field-park to the immediate south as one leaves the tunnel traveling west, building 180 of the Parkwood Complex, which is literally at ground zero, Chabot Elementary School or Claremont Middle School. I believe that it would be fair to state that the World Health Organization guideline values for school grounds and the effect of noise levels on children's learning were not taken into account. 5 6

- While there was mention of sound walls, no data was presented that addressed the issue of the sound wall echo/ bounce affect. 7

I suggest that many of the construction noise issues would be moot if all construction and staging were done from the east side of the tunnel. I would also suggest that CalTrans has the opportunity to do a world-class job, if and when it takes into account the lives of the people who live, work and recreate along the corridor in question. 8

Page 3 of 3

I, therefore, respectfully request that CalTrans withdraw this document and prepare an EIS/EIR that meets all CEQA and NEPA requirements and standards. And, that this document includes construction and post construction noise study/abatement plans that comply with the City of Oakland's Noise Standards and California Noise/Land Use Compatibility Standards. I further request that this document address all issues outlined in comments put forth by the Fourth Bore Coalition, the North Hills Phoenix Association and by attorneys Stuart Flashman and Antonio Rossmann. 9

Sincerely,

Gerry Keenan
7038 Buckingham Blvd.
Berkeley, California 94705
510-843-0577

1- Please see response #2 in the essay on "Traffic Modeling/Forecasting" and the essay on "Construction Impacts" in Chapter 1.

2- With the implementation of the measures listed 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.

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

3- 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 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, 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.

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.

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

4- Noise receivers were identified according to the Activity Categories defined in the FHWA regulation 23CFR772. In the case of this project, affected receivers are residential properties and some outdoor activities areas. This study uses the methodology and the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) adopted by FHWA for all highway projects nationwide; and it is the only computer model currently allowed for this purpose. TNM takes into account the roadway configuration, terrain, ground features and the traffic conditions that yield the worst hourly noise in a typical day. The results from the model were calibrated to reflect site-specific conditions that shape the overall acoustic environment of the area. Actual noise levels measured for the area's residences are in line with the TNM results of this study. Special meteorology conditions are not considered in the noise model since

they become tangible factors in noise propagation only to distance receivers where traffic noise generally falls below the threshold of impact, or where the locally generated noise rivals freeway noise.

5- The Mayer Luce and Baca developments you refer to do not have environmental documents available for review. Caltrans has requested information on these developments from the City of Oakland, but the information the City has is very preliminary. Thus there is no basis for analysis in the context of the Caldecott Improvement Project EA/EIR.

6- Sensitive receivers subject to traffic noise impacts were studied and included in the report. No noise impacts were found beyond the first row residences having direct view of State Route 24. At the time of this report, no known residential developments south of State Route 24 have progressed to the point that they have to be included in this study. In our discussions with the City of Oakland Planning department we were informed that there were plans for 38 single family units in the location described by the commenter. We were informed that the plans were in pre-approval and any building permits would be years away. Should a building permit be approved before the final environmental document is approved, the noise study will be revised. Also see response #5, above.

The soccer field park was included in the noise study.

The State's approach to operational noise abatement is to determine the receptor that would be most likely to exceed the noise abatement criteria or reach a predicted noise level determined to be significant. The rationale is that once we have determined the existence or non-existence of traffic noise impacts at these critical receptors in a given area it becomes unnecessary to analyze all the other receptors, which are physically less exposed to the freeway, and thus will have lower predicted noise levels. #320 Parkwoods has a greater exposure to the freeway than #180 Parkwoods. Our mid-day noise readings at #180 Parkwoods were substantially lower than those at #320 Parkwoods. Since traffic noise impacts have been determined at #320 Parkwoods, we do not have to analyze the noise at #180 Parkwoods as we know those predicted noise levels will be lower. It is not necessary to show traffic noise impacts at #180 Parkwoods because traffic noise impacts have already been determined to exist in the area and the next step is to analyze appropriate abatement.

In regards to the analysis of appropriate abatement, the State determines critical receptors in any given area to represent those areas. Again, as in the determination of traffic noise impact, the State does not analyze every single receptor and federal guidance does not require that every single receptor be analyzed. The fact that #180 Parkwoods was not included in the analysis does not mean that abatement is not being considered for that building, just that under the federal guidelines, if noise abatement has been shown to qualify for #320 Parkwoods, it becomes unnecessary to further analyze other residences that are more shielded from freeway noise. Please also see the essay on "Methodologies Used for the Impact Assessments/Local Ordinances" in Chapter 1.

The schools in question are outside the project study area boundaries.

7- Noise reflection is not expected to be a problem for this project. The ideal conditions for reflection to occur would be for the barrier to be directly adjacent to traffic and be located so as to create a new noise pathway (a new "line of sight" to the noise source) to potential receptors. On this project the proposed barriers are set back away from traffic and will be on top of landscaped earthberms. Noise emanating from the traffic will drop due to normal dissipation over a distance, with some absorption from the earthberm. There will also be some absorption by the wall itself, which is not a perfectly reflecting surface.

Also, for any given receptor to be affected by reflected noise it would have to have no direct view of the freeway, but only a view of the soundwall. The reason for this is that the main traffic noise will always drown out the small contribution from the noise bouncing off the barrier. The effect is even less detectable as one moves farther away from the freeway.

On this project all the residences on the opposite side of the freeway from the soundwall are too far away to be affected by reflected noise. Residences that live this far from the freeway are currently experiencing variations in noise much greater than any potential reflected noise effect (a perfectly reflecting surface will increase noise by 3 dBA) due to weather conditions.

Caltrans has done "before and after" studies in areas where the conditions stated above were true and no detectable difference in noise levels were documented.

8- Please see the essay on “Constructing the Tunnel from the East Side Only” in Chapter 1.

9- Please see the essays 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” and “Methodologies used for the Impact Assessments/Local Ordinances” in Chapter 1.