Kelly, Tom

"Tom Kelly"
<kyotousa@sbcglobal.net>
07/17/2006 03:56 PM

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

If we're going to build a fourth bore, then let's have the foresight to add access fro bicyclists and pedestrians. Doing so would allow those of us who do not drive (and there will be more of us as energy prices soar and the planet heats up) the ability to get back and forth through a much shorter distance. Building such a structure today without that type of access for pedestrians and bicyclists no longer makes any sense. Let's do it right this time. 1

Sincerely,

Tom Kelly

Visit us at: www.kyotousa.org

KyotoUSA
800 Hearst Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94710

(510) 704-8628 (w)
(510) 684-6484 (c)
e-mail: kyotousa@sbcglobal.net

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

Kim, Caroline

Caroline Kim
<carhkim@earthlink.net>
07/11/2006 09:44 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject fourth bore on Caldecott Tunnel

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I live in Oakland and there have been times that I have been caught in slow moving traffic in the late afternoons when returning home from Contra Costa Co. It is clear to me that the traffic pile-up comes because the lanes narrow in such a way to encourage it. That is, the people who move to the right lanes early on do not get to go when they should because others are still using the left lanes and cutting in at the last minute. If you could arrange the lanes so that people would have to move more fairly, it would be a big help. Once inside the tunnel, there is never a problem. 1

In the long run, it does no good to continue adding lanes and capacity to subsidize cars and developers. People living near freeways suffer from inordinate noise, particulate matter, poor air quality and reduced pedestrian safety. There is also the ethical question of continuing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on projects that will help very few people while much less money redirected into city buses would create a far greater good.

The area where the bore is proposed impinges on park land that forms a corridor for animals. Instead of building another bore and further degrading the environment, why don't you make Highway 24 a toll road? Let the people who use it the most pay for it and take the tolls and funnel them to public transportation, including having buses go through the tunnel. There needs to be better financial accounting of what long distance commuting costs society. Building a fourth bore is not looking at the true cost. 2

In the future, the US will not be able to be so oil and car dependent. Building a fourth bore is equivalent to the mentality of the 1950's and is sorely behind the times for the challenges we are facing now.

Sincerely,
Caroline Haas Kim
631 Boulevard Way
Oakland, CAA 94610
(510) 763-4657

1- The new fourth bore tunnel will eliminate the slowdown due to merging. It provides four travel lanes in both the eastbound and westbound directions.

2- The project does not impinge on park land and is consistent with the Resource Management Plan for the Caldecott Wildlife Corridor. Please see Section 2.3.5, Resource Management Plan for the Caldecott Wildlife Corridor, in Chapter 2, Vol. I of the FEA/EIR. Also, please see responses #5 and #9 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

Kiplinger, Allysyn

"allysyn@arthasoaps.com"
<allysyn@arthasoaps.com>
07/09/2006 05:57 PM
Please respond to
allysyn@arthasoaps.com

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject

Please include options for non-autos to safely pass through the Caldecot Tunnel. 1

I've been passing through the tunnel since I was born (1962). I own the family property in Contra Costa County. Reside in Alameda County (Oakland).

With peak oil and unknown consequences of global warming you must act as wise elders to the people of the future who will appreciate your forward thinking with your brilliant design solutions for planning for pedestrians, bicycles, and public transit (buses, trains) to use the tunnel.

For the Future,

Allysyn Kiplinger
Oakland, CA

---
mail2web - Check your email from the web at
http://mail2web.com/ .

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

Kitchen, Lisa

lisa kitchen
<lisakitchen@earthlink.net>
07/11/2006 01:28 PM
Please respond to
lisa kitchen
<lisakitchen@earthlink.net>

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject I oppose Caldecott Tunnel construction

I am writing to oppose constructing an additional bore (fourth bore) to the Caldecott Tunnel. As a long-time resident of the lower Rockridge area I feel it would be detrimental to our quality of life to have the constant noise and also to potentially very damaging to our health. I have a young son and we live very close to hwy 24. I urge you to do a more thorough environmental review and take into consideration the impact over the next 5 years on the local community. 1
Lisa Kitchen
5727 Vicente Street
Oakland, CA 94609

1-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 "Construction Impacts" in Chapter 1.

Koski, Paul

pkoski7@netscape.net
07/10/2006 09:12 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Bike & Pedestrian Access

Calif Trans Planners:
In light of the dire need for improving transportation options for the Highway 24 corridor, adding a 4th bore to the Caldecott without a bike and pedestrian lane is very short sighted. I cannot understand why the design for this new tunnel does not address much needed acccess for pedestrian and bike traffic. Ignoring the need for a foot and bike lane by not including one in the plan will be pointed for years as an example of poor planning and decision making process. Please let this opportunity demonstrate foresight in transportation design that allows alternatives to car, bus and other vehicular by including a pedestrian and bike llane in the plan. 1
Thanks.
Paul Koski
1075 Rollins Road #211
Burlingame, CA 94010

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

Kovel, Kathy

kathy kovel
<kekbabylu@yahoo.com>
07/10/2006 01:50 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject bike lane!

****
****

Dear Caltrans,

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

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

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

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

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

CalTrans intends to build a 2 or 3 lane tube, with shoulders, for cars through the Caldecott Hill. They say there is no need to allow for bicycles and pedestrians to use the shortcut. The distance by car is 0.6 miles and by bicycle or walking it is 7.5 miles up a 608-foot climb, on winding, narrow roads.

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

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

Sincerely,
Kathy Kovel

Talk is cheap. Use Yahoo! Messenger to make PC-to-Phone calls. Great rates starting at 1¢/min.

1- See the essays on “Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements” and “Cumulative Impacts/Enhancements” in Chapter 1.

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

Krieger, Royal G.

ROYAL G. KRIEGER

6/5/06

Gregory McConnell
Dept of Transportation
District #4

Dear Mr McConnell -
Please know that I strongly support a 4th Bore for the Caldecott Tunnel. (Frankly, I'd be delighted if we had a 6 tunnel system.
Also, I urge work to begin ASAP.
Thank you
Royal Krieger

KRIEGER - CAMPBELL, INC.
3608 GRAND AVENUE ● OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94610
OFFICE (510) 444-2800 ● FAX (510) 444-3854
E-MAIL: RKrieger@KriegerCampbell.com

Thank you for your comments.

Krause, Ronald

July 18, 06

Dear Ms. Dorado

I still can't seem to get thru the website so I'm reduced to snail mail. I just wanted to add my voice to the discussion about the 4th bore Caldecott tunnel.

As a driver and a biker, I am grateful for all the improvements towns like Berkeley and Alameda have made to accommodate bicyclists and make no drivers more secure at the same time.

If the new Bay Bridge can have a bike lane why not other tunnels and bridges? 1
I realize that larger organizations like D.O.T. must also step up to join the effort to encourage non-auto modes of travel also.

Thank you.
Ronald Krause
44 Woodcrest Circle
Oakland 94602

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

Lack, Steven

info@pleasanthillchamber .co m ()
07/20/2006 05:26 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 (info@pleasanthillchamber.com) on Thursday, July 20, 2006 at 17:26:15

Firstname: Steven

Lastname: Lack

Business: Pleasant Hill Chamber of Commerce

Phone: 925-687-0700

Address: 91 Gregory Lane

City: Pleasant Hill

State: CA

Zip: 94523

Comments: The Pleasant Hill Chamber of Commerce has passed a resolution supporting CalTrans' efforts to construct and complete the Caldecott 4th Bore Tunnel Project.
There is a tremendous ongoing need for the completion of the 4th bore project. It will not only reduce traffic congestion and facilitate the flow of people and commerce to and from the east bay. The 4th Bore will also provide additional emergency response capabilities in the event of closures of any of the other bore's due to catastrophic failure due to earthquake or other natural or man made disaster such as a fuel tank explosion as occurred several years ago.
We encourage CalTrans to approve the Draft Environmental Document, finish design and begin construction of the 4th Caldecott Tunnel Bore as soon as possible.

The Pleasant Hill Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the construction of the 4th Caldecott Tunnel Bore on behalf of numerous Pleasant Hill consumers, businesses and workers who will significantly benefit from project.

Sincerely

Steven M. Lack Ph.D.
Vice President -Government Affairs

Thank you for your comments.

Lackey, Lisa

"Lisa Lackey"
<lisa@mark-works.com>
07/09/2006 12:20 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject The Caldecott Tunnel NEEDs pedestrian/bicycle access

Dear Caltrans,

The Caldecott Tunnel is being forced forward with insufficient concern for other forms of transportation except motor vehicles. Gas is dwindling. Global Warming is real. To ignore other forms of transportation besides motor vehicles is true folly and a waste of our tax payer money.

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

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

A big vision could see a spine from S.F. along 24 to the Iron Horse Trail and connecting the Bay Trail and future Delta Trail.

CalTrans intends to build a 2 or 3 lane tube, with shoulders, for cars through the Caldecott Hill. They say there is no need to allow for bicycles and pedestrians to use the shortcut. The distance by car is 0.6 miles and by bicycle or walking it is 7.5 miles up a 608-foot climb, on winding, narrow roads. This is unacceptable.

An acoustically separated, properly ventilated and properly lighted pedestrian/bicycle tunnel should be included in the project along with improved connections from Rockridge BART to Orinda BART. This would help to regionalize pedestrian and bicycle traffic by connecting Contra Costa County and Alameda County. If this tunnel is bored through the hill, it must contain pedestrian/bicycle elements and it will be used. 1

Sincerely,

Lisa Lackey
2504 Webster St.
Berkeley CA 94705

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

Lambert, Glenneth

Glenneth Lambert
<glenneth@TheFINE-ARTcafe.org>
07/08/2006 09:13 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject bike lane

Dear Sirs,

PLEASE ... it is CRITICAL to include in ANY plans for an expansion of the Caldecott tunnel a BIKE & pedestrian lane. In this day of oil shortage & NEED for more public transportation ... we can NOT overlook ANY transportation not dependent on cars !! 1

THANKS, Glenneth Lambert

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

Latham, Hannah

Hannah Latham
<hannah@peachpit.com>
06/28/2006 02:38 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Concern about plans for expanded Caldecott Tunnel

Dear Sir or Madam,

I'm a resident of Rockridge and just learned about the plan for a 4th bore to expand the Caldecott Tunnel. I have a 5-year old son and am concerned about the environmental impact and the potential for adverse health effects from the construction of this tunnel--not to mention additional pollution from the cars using it.

I am strongly opposed to this expansion and would prefer to see a mass transportation option instead. 1

Thank you,
Hannah Latham
Rockridge resident
453 59th ST
Oakland, CA 94609

****
This email may contain confidential material.
If you were not an intended recipient,
please notify the sender and delete all copies.
We may monitor email to and from our network.
****

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

Lavoie, Kimberly

Kim Lavoie
<kdlavoie@pacbell.net>
07/28/2006 03:47 PM

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

We just want to voice our support and eagerness to see this project underway and completed soon. We travel through the tunnel pretty much seven days a week to work, church, and other activities. Many of these activities are driven by what traffic at the tunnel will be like, and while we do try to plan ahead and use alternate routes when possible, we still often spend a lot of time in gridlock one direction or the other waiting for people to merge together and move through the tunnels...this almost continuous gridlock at one side or the other of the tunnel is far more detrimental to the environment than the completion of a fourth bore.

I think the most important thing to keep in mind with this project is to be far-sighted for once. Probably no one imagined how much traffic the tunnel would have to handle in both directions when its current configuration was planned and built. Of the two options that I saw presented in the brochure, I prefer the plan that has as much lane space as possible in the new bore to carry traffic load that maybe seems excessive now. As people continue to move East of Oakland for the better schools and in some cases less expensive homes, it seems imperative to plan to meet that load. 1

Regards,

Kimberly Lavoie
Lafayette resident

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

Lipsetz, David

David Lipsetz
1644 Clay Street, #10
San Francisco, CA 94109

June 5, 2006

Gregory C. McConnell, Senior Environmental Planner
Attention: Sheryl Dorado, Associate Environmental Planner
Dept. of Transportation, District 4, Environmental Analysis
Mail Station 8B
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660
VIA EMAIL: Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov

RE: Comments on the Caldecott Improvement Project EIR, Growth Inducements, and the "Affected Environment" Findings.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept the following comments on the Caldecott Improvement Project ("the project") *Draft Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report* (EIR). I write to you as a concerned citizen, and as a Member of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission Advisory Board. Do note that the Advisory Board does not collectively adopt positions on projects such as this.

I write to point out that EIR does not conduct the CEQA-required growth inducements impact analysis, and instead bases its findings on an incomplete and inaccurate reading of the literature on this subject. I strongly urge that the EIR be rejected. At a minimum, Caltrans should pursue the "No-Build Alternative" until an acceptable analysis of the growth inducement impacts has been conducted. 1

The EIR reviews the potential impact of a new Caldecott tunnel bore, "to alleviate traffic pattern along State Route 24 through the Caldecott Tunnel (which) reflects commute trips from the residential communities east of the tunnel in Contra Costa County to employment opportunities in Alameda County and San Francisco west of the tunnel." (Pg. 47) For this type of project, CEQA requires that growth inducement impacts be analyzed. 2

Unfortunately, an empirical analysis of the project's growth inducements was not conducted for the EIR. Instead, the EIR includes a terse review of academic literature related to the subject. And worse yet, the EIR ignores a vast array of literature to cite papers which actually dispute its findings. In other words, the EIR relies on research that directly contradicts the finding that the project will not induce growth in the surrounding area, while ignoring a recent and well-developed collection of studies on the subject.

Caldecott Improvement Project EIR
June 6, 2006

Sections 2.1.2.2 and 2.1.2.3 of the Caldecott Improvement Project *Draft Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report* report on the growth inducement effects of the project. The EIR finds that,

> *"the Caldecott Improvement Project would not induce unplanned growth in the (project) area; therefore, no minimization or mitigation measures are recommended."*

The EIR bases this finding entirely on a literature review of three studies, two of which directly contradict it. The main source quoted by the EIR is a 1990 presentation by Lathrop and Cook[1]. This remarkably obscure source consists of a "discussion" at a professional conference, and was never published. The discussion is on a generally related topic, the "Effects of Beltways," and a full review of the work shows that the presenters do not directly discuss the potential impacts of large scale auto infrastructure on residential development patterns. 3

It is also important to note that Lathrop and Cooks presentation has rarely been considered by industry professionals. Meanwhile, there is a wealth of widely read work on this subject that would be more appropriate for the EIR, including: Banister, 2000[2]; Boarnet and Haughwout (2000)[3]; Ryan (1999)[4]; Cervero and Wu[5]; and Ingram (1998)[6]. In general, these works find that transportation infrastructure has a significant impact on future land use patterns. 4

The other two studies quoted in the EIR directly contradict the finding of *no significant impact* include Zondag and Pieters[7] and Wachs, et al[8]. Based on empirical analysis,

---

[1] 1 G.T. Lathrop and K.E. Cook, The Effect of Beltways on Urban Development: A Discussion of US Experience, ORBITAL MOTORWAYS, Proceedings of the Conference sponsored by the Institution of Civil Engineers, Transportation Research Board, etc., and held in Stratford-upon Avon on 24-26 April 1990.

[2] Banister, D. and Berechman, J. (2000) Transport Investment and Economic Development. London: UCL Press.

[3] Boarnet, M & Haughwout, A. (2000) Do Highways Matter?: Evidence and Policy Implications of Highways' Influence on Metropolitan Development Brookings Institution Central.

[4] Ryan, S. (1999) Property Values and Transportation Facilities: Finding the Transportation-Land Use Connection, May, Journal of Planning Literature, Vol. 13, Issue 4, pp. 412-427.

[5] Cervero, R. and Wu, K-L. (1998) Sub-centering and commuting: evidence from the San Francisco Bay Area, in Urban Studies, Vol. 35, pp. 1059-1076.

[6] Ingram, G.K. (1998) Patterns of metropolitan development: what have we learned? in Urban Studies, Vol. 35, pp. 1019-1035.

[7] Barry Zondag and Marits Pieters, Influence of Accessibility on Residential Location Choice, Transportation Research Record 1902, Transportation Research Board 2005

[8] Martin Wachs, et al, The Changing Commute: A Case Study of the Jobs/Housing Relationship Over Time, University of California Transportation Center (UCTC) No 167 Working Paper, 1993

Caldecott Improvement Project EIR
June 6, 2006

Zondag and Pieters found that, "the role of accessibility is ***significant*** (emphasis added) but small compared with the effects of demographic factors, neighborhood amenities, and dwelling attributes in explaining residential location choices." The research by Wachs quoted in the EIR also found that auto infrastructure projects significantly impact surrounding development patterns. In fact, Wachs has spent his entire career at the University of California Berkeley pointing out that transportation and land use are interrelated, and have significant and compounding effects on one another at a local and regional scale. 5

Because the EIR does not conduct the CEQA-required growth inducements impact analysis, and instead bases its findings on an incomplete and inaccurate reading of the literature on this subject, I strongly urge that the EIR be rejected. At a minimum, Caltrans should pursue the "No-Build Alternative" until an acceptable analysis of the growth inducement impacts has been conducted. 6

Thank you for considering my comments on the Caldecott Improvement Project.

Sincerely,

David Lipsetz

1- Please see the response #1 to the BAAQMD's letter of July 28, 2006, and response #1 to Grasetti Environmental Consulting's letter of July 10, 2006, #61.

2- Please see the response #1 to the BAAQMD's letter of July 28, 2006, and response #1 to Grasetti Environmental Consulting's letter of July 10, 2006, #61.

3- This finding to which the comment refers was not based on a review of literature references but on a project-specific growth analysis, which was subsequently reviewed by an expert panel, as reported in Section 2.1.2, Growth, in the DEA/EIR. Please also see the response #1 to the BAAQMD's letter of July 28, 2006, and response #61 to Grasetti Environmental Consulting's letter of July 10, 2006.

4- The approach applied to the growth inducement analysis performed for the Caldecott Improvement Project was consistent with the literature referenced in this comment. A project-specific growth inducement analysis was performed, as described in Section 2.1.2, Growth, of the DEA/EIR. Please note that the analysis did not conclude that transportation infrastructure cannot have an important effect on future land use patterns but focused on estimating how much effect the proposed Caldecott improvement would have under the specific conditions of the corridor. See also the response #61 to Grasetti Environmental Consulting' letter of July 10, 2006.

5- The findings of the growth analysis and expert panel review summarized in Section 2.1.2, Growth, of the DEA/EIR are not inconsistent with the research cited in this comment. The findings in the environmental document addressed the degree of impact to be expected from the specific situation of an improvement in the reverse commute direction of the Caldecott Tunnel. See also the responses to #1 and #4 above.

6- The Department and FHWA as the lead agencies for NEPA and CEQA have determined that the project will not have any significant environmental effects and fully complies with CEQA and NEPA regulations and guidelines. 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.

Magganas, Athan

By: **Athan Magganas** 2550 Appian Way STE 201 Pinole CA 94564 (510) 223 4483
magganas@prodigy.net

Comments on Draft EIR of the 4th Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel submitted to

Gregory C McConnell et al Cal Trans D4, Environmental Analysis Mail Station 8B
PO Box 23660 Oakland, CA 94623-0660 and to
Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov

July 6, 2006

We are residents at 158 Caldecott Lane and we are primarily interested on impacts to our street and the proposed work and impacts on the west side of the proposed 4th Bore and its proposed alternatives

1) The EIR does not offer any study of impacts of increased vehicular traffic of Caldecott Lane, particularly on the portion from the point the westbound off ramp meets Caldecott Lane back to the entrance of the Operations Maintenance and Control (OMC) facilities gate at the far end of Caldecott Lane. 1

   I expect more vehicles ending up in front of our houses more so than the extent they do now, such as parking as carpoolers, seekers of relief from congestion, lost and seeking directions, emergency exiting for malfunctioning, cell phone drivers seeking temporary relief as they exit the tunnel and forced to carry on their conversations, Cal Trans vehicles, small and larger, entering/exiting the OMC and other typical short term(minutes) and longer term (hours, days) parkers. In a typical day, a good number of vehicles originating from the freeway off ramp use our driveways to turn around as they adjust to park somewhere on Caldecott Lane or they are lost and seek solutions. I see this number increasing with the new Bore and also during the construction period

   As minimal improvements to this section of Caldecott Lane, a) it needs to be widened to accommodate the additional traffic and parking of such added vehicles, b) the present concrete curb, from the point where the at grade shoulder begins at the off ramp point, needs to be eliminated or moved back eight feet in such a way to extend the shoulder to the end of the street all the way back to the entrance to the OMC , c) relocate the freeway fence 8 to 10 feet towards the roadway to allow these vehicles and pedestrians in need to park on that side of the street and not interfere with resident parking of the other side of the street 2

2) **MAINTAIN** the present scissor ramp configurations for the proposed alternatives. "Hook" type (L-6 intersection) as proposed will DUMP all the off ramp **and** on ramp traffic onto additional portions of Caldecott Lane, namely the portions where residential uses presently exist, **whereas** under the present scissor type of off amp/on ramp all this additional traffic is bypassing these residential portions completely. Under the hook type of the interchange, you will need to 3

widen the street to four lanes and with traffic lights as you will slow down all the faster moving traffic and channel it to additional portions of Caldecott Lane. The hook type adds approximately 600 feet to the ramps, which means, more noise, more congestion, more visual impacts

3) The Freeway agreement between City of Oakland and Cal Trans needs to incorporate all the needed improvements on Caldecott Lane 4

4) On the proposed new OMC building, the electrical substation and the electrical building, presumably next, in front of or behind the portal : its architectural design is not shown anywhere; the design needs to be reviewed for aesthetics by the City of Oakland or by someone in the public; will this new building create any new traffic on the portion of Caldecott lane we live on? 5

5) Page 25 of Chapter One calls for additional improvements to the intersection of Caldecott Lane and Kay (adding a right turn lane); where is Kay street? No such name exists; we do not understand where this intersection is 6

6) Design of the Sound Barriers and of the Portal: to incorporate the beauty of the existing hillside landform to these structures and hopefully add beauty, artistic elements and architectural features together with landscaping. The face of the sound barriers on the freeway side should afford lots of design attention for aesthetic appeal as these elements will immensely impact all viewpoints. Artistic and architectural design attention will hopefully result in an improved visual terrain (the present visual of the northernmost portal on the west side of the tunnel is not very attractive-why support further mediocracy). The face of the sound barrier elements facing Caldecott Lane should have a residential and pedestrian feel. Add a sidewalk or a walkway and move the fence towards the barriers to add to a residential look and also allow use of that side of the street for pedestrians. New portal need not look like the existing Atr Deco. 7

7) Rubberized surfaces on the new pavements greatly reduce noise. Are the new surfaces rubberized as are the section of the freeway one mile down the road? 8

8) No problem removing existing vegetation and existing trees. The trees are 95% eucalyptus. Please, do NOT replace them with eucalyptus again. 9

1- In the Preferred Alternative, the maximum demand increase of the westbound off-ramp to Caldecott Lane is only 40 vehicles and less during other hours. With congestion constraining the amount of traffic that could be delivered, the volume increase at the off-ramp is 30 vehicles per hour or less. It is not expected to have a significant impact.

Also, please see response #2 in the essay on “Traffic Operations” in Chapter 1.

2- This project has no plans to widen Caldecott Lane. However, the Contractor's employees will not be allowed to park on Caldecott Lane.

3- The hook ramp configuration at Caldecott Lane is no longer being considered. The existing scissor ramp design will remain with a slight realignment on the westbound off ramp to accommodate the additional lanes from the fourth bore.

4- We do not expect local street closures during construction and thus a Freeway Agreement is not necessary. Freeway Agreements are required when a State project or action entails the closure, alteration or otherwise similarly affects a city or county road. (Sts & Hwy Code secs. 100.2, et. seq.)

5- When the computer simulations showing the different tunnel alternatives were prepared for the DEA / EIR, Caltrans was in the very early stages of project development. The computer simulations were used to assess the potential visual impacts of substantial project features. The simulations were modeled according to accurate 3-dimensional survey data, and the appearance of the portal structures, retaining walls, sound walls were “painted in” based on sound aesthetic principles, i.e. scale, orientation, historical context, visual consistency of the entire portal complex and so on. Except for functional attributes of the OMC, little consideration was given to OMC aesthetics at that time. Although still preliminary, aesthetic features for these structures are presently being developed by both Caltrans and CCTA consultants. Caltrans will make a final determination of structure aesthetics in conjunction with input provided by CCTA and ACTIA.

The existing OMC, which houses the traffic monitoring / control room emergency response and museum facilities will be replaced by a new two-story building within the foot print of the present building. Maintenance of the new bore may require several additional employees. Traffic impacts on Caldecott Lane are expected to be minimal.

6- The Kay Street Overcrossing Bridge, and corresponding named street, is the first bridge crossing on westbound State Route 24 after the tunnel.

7- Caltrans is currently developing the architectural and aesthetic treatments for the east and west portals, electrical equipment buildings, the Operations and Maintenance Center (OMC) sound walls and retaining walls. Although in the conceptual stage, facility design will be based on the premise that the appearance of the entire complex should be unified and share some of the common Art Deco forms of the existing structures. The two options that are currently being explored consist of a more traditional appearing Art Deco look while the other would be a more contemporary look. Computer simulations of the proposed facilities and more detailed discussion will be included in the Final EA/EIR.

Caltrans will explore methods for creating a more pedestrian friendly area between Caldecott Lane and the proposed sound wall during the project development phase. Landscape architects will work closely with Parkwoods residents to integrate the new facilities into the adjacent community through a comprehensive landscape effort.

8- New approaches to and from the fourth bore tunnel will be constructed with rubberized asphalt concrete (RAC), open graded asphalt concrete (OGAC), or grooved portland cement concrete.

Installing asphalt concrete (AC) overlay to the existing concrete pavement is undesirable due to the following reasons: Based on the soil samples recently taken from various locations on the westbound route within the project study area boundaries, and the subsequent laboratory soil tests, the majority of the basement soil appears to be of sedimentary rock having high levels of R-values. This is the basement condition favorable for concrete pavement, which would perform the expected long life service with low maintenance cost. Cracked and seated overlay will transform the existing rigid concrete pavement into a flexible AC pavement, thus requiring more frequent maintenance and more disruptions to the public. Furthermore, the existing concrete pavement is generally in good condition and is not a qualified candidate for a cracked and seated rehabilitation.

9- The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is replacing removed vegetation with native or non-invasive species, no eucalyptus will be utilized in the planting plan.

Matis, Howard (7/04/06)

HOWARD MATIS

6824 Sherwick Drive
Berkeley, CA 94705
matis@comcast.net

July 4, 2006

Gregory C. McConnell
Senior Environmental Planner
Department of Transportation
District 4
Environmental Analysis
Mail Station 8B
PO Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Dear Mr. McConnell:

The following is a comment on the Draft EA/EIR analysis on the proposed Fourth Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel.

In almost all cases, every highway project induces demand. When you remove a bottleneck, people will change their plans and thus go to the easier way. If your model, does not predict increased demand for a fourth bore, then your model is faulty. If you do not believe, it will have an induced demand, then there must be a detailed publication so that others can examine the assumptions. 1

I will start with the obvious statement that the fourth bore will increase traffic around the proposed neighborhood of the North Hills. Traffic on Tunnel Road from Claremont Avenue to Caldecott Lane to the Kay Street over crossing will increase. Right now crossing the streets is very difficult for pedestrians and cyclists. The increased demand will make crossing the street safely very difficult. Therefore, Caltrans needs to increase the facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The places that need to have better access for pedestrians and cyclists are: 2

1) Have a safe way to cross the street by the light at Hiller Drive 3

2) Have an easy way to go to BART at Hiller Drive light. Provide a path through Caltrans property at that light and turn that vacant and unused lot into a small tot park. 4

3) Have a pedestrian light by the "Uplands" 5

4) Have full bicycle lanes from the Hiller light to Claremont Avenue on the westbound lane. 6

5) Reunite Montclair and the North Hills Neighborhood by providing a bike and pedestrian bridge from the Hiller Light to Lake Temescal. 7

6) Provide a light for left turning traffic on Tunnel Road (by Gateway Garden), going down the hill at its intersection with Caldecott Lane. 8

There needs to be a study on the impact on the neighborhood when a tunnel is temporarily blocked. 9

Because of the induced demand, effects of a traffic blockage will be much worse

Highways 13 and Highways 24 have separated the North Hills neighborhood from Montclair and Berkeley. This is the time for Caltrans to reunite them. If nothing is done, the increased traffic from the proposed fourth bore will make conditions more miserable for the neighborhood. 10

Sincerely,

Howard Matis

Howard Matis

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

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

3- 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. See Options A1 and A2 in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

4- ACCMA's Feasibility Study (Option F) concluded that provisions for an ADA compliant walkway and bike path from Chabot Road to the intersection would cost in the range of $4-$5 million. The steep grades in this area combined with a 150-ft elevation differential, renders this option undesirable. This option was dropped from further study. The steep hillside in this area is not conducive to providing a "small tot park." See Option F in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

5- Traffic studies indicate that a pedestrian light at the intersection of Tunnel/Uplands is not warranted.

6- The traffic operations analysis does not show a significant impact on peak hour traffic on Tunnel Road/Ashby Avenue between the Hiller traffic light and Claremont Avenue. The appropriate agencies having jurisdiction in this area should be contacted for upgrades to Ashby Avenue west of this intersection. Please refer to Options A1, A2, and H in the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1 for potential improvements near the intersection.

7- This option was investigated by the ACCMA-led 13/24 Bicycle/Pedestrian Feasibility Study. That study concluded that the potential environmental impacts, combined with a cost of $6-7.2 million, significantly reduces its viability as a regional bikeway improvement. It is identified as future project on the Vision Network in ACCMA's Final 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan. The Vision Network is equivalent to a Tier 3, unfunded project and is not on ACCMA's Financially Constrained (Tier 2) or High Priority Networks. See the essay on Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/ Improvements in Chapter 1.

8- Caltrans will perform traffic counts at Caldecott Lane/Tunnel Road intersections to study the possibility of adding a traffic signal at this intersection. If results of the traffic counts show that signal warrants are satisfied, installation of a traffic signal will be included in this project.

9- At this time, some weekend closures may be anticipated. However, the number of closures is expected to be limited to a few occurrences. Detours are expected to maintain alternate access.

There will be extensive public outreach during construction. In order to communicate with those in close proximity to the project site, Caltrans will implement a construction information/community outreach program. There will be a public information phone number for community members to call to ask questions, voice concerns or to make a comment. A project website with construction information will also be updated on a regular basis. The Caltrans construction Resident Engineer (RE) will coordinate closely with the Contractor to ensure there are responses to comments/concerns, and to make sure that the Contractor is following contract requirements to mitigate and/or abate and minimize construction impacts. The Contractor will be required to implement abatement procedures and to work closely with the RE to minimize disturbance to the community.

10- Please see the essay on "Cumulative Impacts" in Chapter 1.

Matis, Howard (7/31/06)

HOWARD MATIS

6824 Sherwick Drive
Berkeley, CA 94705
matis@comcast.net

July 31, 2006

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

Dear Mr. McConnell:

The following items are comments on the Draft EA/EIR analysis on the proposed Fourth Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel. I wish to add two points to my previous letter.

1) **No study should be made of any tolls for use of the Caldecott Tunnel.** Our neighborhood can be used to bypass the Tunnel. People do that when the Tunnel is backed up. If there were to be a toll, many people would use our neighborhood to avoid the Tunnel. Almost all of our roads are substandard, narrow, steep, and dangerous. Adding traffic to our area would cause great safely hazards. Any quick analysis shows that a toll would be disastrous to our neighborhood, so a study is unnecessary. Furthermore, such a study would generate great hostility from our neighborhood, which will hear, see and suffer the suggestion from building the new fourth bore. 1

2) **A light for traffic to cross the street at Uplands.** It is very difficult for people in our neighborhood to go to and from BART at Uplands. Uplands is the most direct way to go to BART. The increased traffic on Highway 13 will make crossing even harder. A traffic light on Highway 13 at Upland will make an important improvement to our neighborhood and serve as mitigation to the increased traffic from the Fourth Bore. 2

Thank you for considering these items.

Sincerely,

Howard Matis

1- This project does not propose any tolls for use of the Caldecott Tunnel. Please also see response #5 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

2- Installing a traffic signal at the Tunnel Road/Upland intersection will cause traffic backup at Tunnel Road.

Caltrans recently also studied the option of installing a pedestrian crosswalk with self-activated flashing beacon at the intersection of Tunnel Road and Uplands. Based on the traffic data, accident history, vehicular approaching speed and pedestrian volume at this location, we concluded that installing a crosswalk at this location is not desirable. Installing a crosswalk at this location may provide a false sense of security for the pedestrian and cause more accidents.

McCauley, Alison

"Alison McCauley "
<AMcCauley@xojet.com>
07/31/2006 09:33 AM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject 4th Bore: Insufficient study of Impact

I am protesting the lack of preparation that went into understanding whether the desired benefits of this project will actually be achieved. Also, today, gas prices are rising--air quality is worsening--why do we not emphasize beefing up the BART system and other methods of mass transportation rather than increasing motor vehicle traffic. 1

We need to understand the potential impact to the students in the six schools close to the construction--Chabot Elementary--Rock La Fleche--College Prep--Bentley School--Kaiser Elementary--and Claremont Middle School. 2

The 4th bore will not help the commute in both directions--it will actually only benefit r***everse*** commuters because there are already two bores going in the peak commute direction (westbound in the morning, eastbound in the evening). The evening backup heading toward the tunnel will not be alleviated, and may actually get worse if the tunnel creates more traffic demand, because no new capacity is being added in that direction. In the worst case scenario they may build a 3-lane bore westbound, which will create an unbalanced effect, with more morning traffic backed up in our backyard as traffic will no longer be slowed on the Eastern side, but at the maze.

Caltrans has delivered a completely inadequate environmental

impact report that borders on negligence in its use of bad data and inconsistent findings. There is a superficial analysis at best of the issues that most impact Rockridge: noise, impact on schools and parks, and bicycle and pedestrian safety. Contra Costa County will receive the vast majority of the benefits of this project. The Berkeley and Oakland neighborhoods on the Western edge of the tunnel will bear the brunt of the construction, and downstream noise and traffic once the 4th bore opens. 3

A tax-paying Oakland Citizen,
Alison McCauley

Alison McCauley
Senior Director Marketing
XOJET
959 Skyway Road, Suite 300
San Carlos, CA 94070
P > (650) 594-6328
C > (415) 640-7662
F > (650) 594-6301

XOJET
A New Approach to Private Aviation
Learn more at www.xojet.com

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

2- Please see response # 36 of the Rockridge Community Planning Council, July, 10, 2006 letter.

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

The project will benefit the residents on both the east and west side of the tunnel, by eliminating the daily reversals of the bores, and adding additional lanes congestion will be relieved especially in the reverse commute direction.

Middleton Jr., Robert A.

robtachapl@aol.com
08/01/2006 12:10 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Draft EA/EIR

115 Highland Avenue
Piedmont, CA 94611-3707
July 31, 2006

Mr. Gregory C. McConnell
Senior Environmental Planner
Dept. of Transportation, District 4
Mail Station 8B, Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

RE: Caldecott Improvement Project
Draft EA/EIR

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I have two concerns regarding the 'fourth bore" of the Caldecott Tunnel:

• I support the inclusion of pedestrian and bicycle access as proposed by the organization Architects, Designers and Planners for Social Responsibility; and 1

• I urge that more detailed study be made of the tunnel's impact on the City of Piedmont, where I reside. Two residential Piedmont streets, Highland Avenue and Moraga Avenue, bear very large volumes of commuter traffic moving to or from the existing tunnels. 2

This observation is based on the stark contrast of weekday traffic on these streets with their use during the same hours on weekends and holidays, which is light. The obvious inference is that tunnel-using commuters regularly take Highway 13 and a detour through Piedmont as an alternative to remaining on Highway 24, the direct route to and from San Francisco or downtown Oakland.

Neither Highland nor Moraga were designed to handle the excessive traffic that results. Piedmont in the past 10 years installed additional signs, striping and gauntlets of pavement "dimples," the intent of which was to slow the pace of the weekday influx to 25 mph and preserve at least minimal safety for residents.

However, commuters' aggressive, irresponsible driving makes a mockery of such measures. Only peak-hour police presence appears to have any effect at all.

For this reason it is impossible for me as a Piedmont resident not to view the Caledecott tunnels' expansion with profound alarm; and it is only realistic to for the Department of Transportation to provide in some way for more robust Piedmont traffic enforcement as an element in this project's design.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Middleton, Jr.

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

2- We recognize that existing traffic utilizes city streets due to freeway congestion in the Oakland area. In this vicinity, given that westbound State Route 24 is relatively free flowing both in the morning and afternoon peak, the traffic you referenced are presumably eastbound traffic. Although building a fourth bore would not provide any eastbound congestion relief during the afternoon peak, it would provide relief during the morning peak and should reduce traffic diversion on to local arterial streets.

Weekdays and weekends have very different travel patterns. On weekdays, trips to and from workplaces and schools form a large part of the travel. On weekends, Shopping and Social/Recreational trips are far more important. Therefore, it is not a reasonable conclusion that the added weekday traffic in Piedmont is due to diverted traffic from the Caldecott Tunnel.

See response #1 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

Mignano, Linda R.

July 26, 2006

Gregory C. McConnell, Senior Environmental Planner
Department of Transportation, District 4
Environmental Analysis
Mail Station 88, P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Dear Mr. McConnell:

Re: Caldecott Improvement Project

As the owner and resident of a condominium impacted by the above referenced project, I am responding to the Public Comment Notice I received in the mail this week.

My home overlooks Caldecott Lane and is in the nearest residential building to the proposed 4th bore. Across the street from me, there is a narrow strip of land, and the freeway exiting the Caldecott tunnel is on the other side of that strip of land. The project proposed creates another tunnel 50 to 100 feet closer to my building than the existing one, shifting the freeway that much closer in my direction. It also calls for the strip of land to be a staging area for the tunnel's construction.

Yet, conspicuously, the draft EA/EIR leaves my building out of its report, and claims there will be no environmental impact on the other buildings in my complex that also border Caldecott Lane.

Obviously, anyone who takes this EA/EIR as a serious piece of research is either being flim-flammed, or is biased and has another agenda. The idea that you can take a freeway and move it over fifty feet closer to the buildings that lie across the street, without any environmental impact on them, is simply absurd.

I ask that you get a real, thorough environmental study done by an unbiased and qualified professional before embarking on this project, with its likely impact on the health of those who live nearby. 1

Thank-you for your time and anticipated effort.

Sincerely,

Linda R Mignano, MD.

Linda R. Mignano, M.D.
180 Caldecott Ln. #316
Oakland, CA 94618

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

Miller, Dave

"Dave Miller"
<dave@thosemillers.com>
07/11/2006 01:12 PM

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

I am writing to say that I am in support of the 4th bore, but I am very concerned about the construction process. My family and I live in Rockridge and because of our proximity to Broadway and highway 24, I am concerned about the impact that the construction will have. Specifically, I am concerned about excessive noise, significantly increased dust/dirt/pollutants in the air around our home and Chabot elementary school, and heavy truck travel on Broadway. 1

I would like to participate in some kind of dialog with the construction managers to hear about how they plan to make the 4th bore and to hear about their environmental report. Please contact me with a web address or send to me any information that you have regarding the environmental impact of this project on Rockridge.

Regards

Dave Miller
5945 Ocean View Drive
Oakland, CA 94618

dave@thosemillers.com
Home: 510.658.1413
Fax: 510.658.5503
Mobile: 510.435.9696

winmail.dat

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

Miller, Laura

Laura Miller
<millernp@pacbell.net>
07/11/2006 02:10 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Public Commentary in support of Pedestrian/Bike Lane in tunnell

Dear Caltrans,

It is my understanding that Cal Trans currently intends to build a 2 or 3 lane tube with shoulders, for cars through the Caldecott Hill. It is my understanding that currently there are no plans for bicycles and pedestrians inside the Caldecott tunnel. The distance from the West (Oakland/Berkeley) to Contra Costa/Walnut Creek area by is 0.6 miles through the tunnel. If going by bicycle or walking currently the only means is by taking the 7.5 mile, 608-foot climb, on adjacent winding narrow roads.

An acoustically separated, properly ventilated and properly lighted pedestrian/bicycle tunnel should be included in the project which will help with improved connections from Rockridge BART to Orinda BART. As a Nurse Practitioner, as well as an avid bicyclist, daily I am treating the effects of obesity, and chronic diseases due to people not getting enough exercise. This also does not address the issues of global warming due to our dependence on oil. Encouraging bicycling is imperative. If this tunnel is bored through the hill, it must contain safe pedestrian/bicycle routes which commuters and other bicyclists can use. 1

Please consider supporting provisions which would benefit bicyclists and pedestrians when re-designing the Caldecott tunnel. Now is our chance to offer a healthy alternative to solely automotive transport, which would benefit many people's health, as well as the environment.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Laura Miller FNP

968 Regal Rd

Berkeley,CA 94708

millernp@pacbell.net

510-525-6658

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

Miller, Phillip

"Miller, Phil"
<Phil.Miller@worldheart.com
>
07/12/2006 02:45 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Bike/Pedestrian Commute Lane

If a 4th bore is added to the tunnel, it should include a lane suitable for bicycle and pedestrian use. This will greately facilitate alternate means of travel betreen the Eastern East-Bay, and the Bayshore and San Francisco regions. I would use such a lane for bicycle travel between my home in Berkeley and points East. 1

Respectively,

Phillip J. Miller
968 Regal Road
Berkekey, CA 94708

World Heart Corporation. All rights reserved.
www.worldheart.com

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

Miller, Susan

Susan Miller
<smiller@cgl.ucsf.edu>
07/12/2006 08:29 AM

To "Warren Chick" <shepsdad@comcast.net>
cc Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov, "Mark K. Yowe" <myowe@spencerstuart.com>, "'Mimi Hancock'" <mhancock@spencerstuart.com>, "Paula A. Mulhall"
bcc
Subject Re: Caldecott Public Comment re The Draft Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report dated May 2006

I am writing to confirm my support of Warren Chick's letter. Susan Miller 1

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My comments and supporting documents are attached.

Please be so kind as to send an immediate receipt.

Thank you,

Warren Chick

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

were not actually included

Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:Caldecott Tunnel draft 1 2.doc (WDBN/MSWD) (008E80E6)
Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:Caldecott 013003 letterScan.pdf (PDF /CARO) (008E80E7)
Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:Caldecott comment card Scan.pdf (PDF /CARO) (008E80E8)
Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:Caldecott commentsLET.pdf (PDF /CARO) (008E80E9)
Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:Caldecott expertCVfjh.pdf (PDF /CARO) (008E80EA)
Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:Caldecott FHABROCH.pdf (PDF /CARO) (008E80EB)

--

Susan M. Miller
Associate Professor
Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry
University of California - San Francisco, UCSF MC 2280 *note new mail code line*
600 16th St., GH S-512B
San Francisco, CA 94158-2517 *note new zip-code*

1-Comment noted.

Mizell, Andrew

Andrew Mizell
<andrewmizell@gmail.com>
07/10/2006 09:41 AM

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

I would like there to be pedestrian and bicycle access through the tunnel. Please. 1

Thank you,
andrew.

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

Mollet, Matjin

Martijn Mollet
<martijn@molletphoto.com>
07/08/2006 08:08 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Public Comment

Dear Caltrans,

It would be great to see access for pedestrians and bicycles through the tunnel. 1

Thanks for reading,

Martijn Mollet

http://www.molletphoto.com
Mobile: +1.917.319.4857
Studio: +1.510.787.2971
733 Loring Ave
Crockett, CA 94525
USA

© This email and any attached files are confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution, or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this email. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore is in no way liable for any errors or omissions in the content of this message, which may arise as a result of email transmission. If verification is required, please request a hard copy.

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

Mone, C.E.

cemone
<cemone@humboldt1.com>
07/09/2006 07:23 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Bike lanes in tunnel

Dear decision makers,
Here are a few ideas I would take into consideration:
1. People who commute by bicycle really DO want to take the shortest route to work and to be safe on that route. Bicycling is actually a form of TRANSPORTATION (the T in DOT) which is nonpolluting, healthful, and does not destroy our roads as much as, say, your neighbor's hummer. Most cyclists would really rather go through a dank old tunnel than go 5 extra miles. 1
2. Maybe Al Gore is right and this silly global warming thing might affect our choices in transportation in which case we will not need more CAR lanes. Maybe a special bore for a busses only lane or nonmotorized transport only (there would be no noxious fumes that way). 2
3. Maybe just skip the whole idea and put the money into alternate transportation. Soon many people will not be able to afford to drive cars, but we'll have lots of roller skating space. 3
Respectfully,
C. E. Mone
Box 223
Trinidad, CA 95570

1- We agree that bicycling is an important part of transportation. Please see the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

2- While climate change has been a concern since at least 1988 as evidenced by the establishment of the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the efforts devoted to "greenhouse gas"[3] (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy has increased dramatically in recent years. In 2002, with the passage of Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), California launched an innovative and pro-active approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change at the state level. AB 1493 requires the Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions; these regulations will apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009 model year.

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

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

Housing Agency, have taken an active role in addressing GHG emission reduction and climate change. Recognizing that 98 percent of California's GHG emissions are from the burning of fossil fuels and 40 percent of all human made GHG emissions are from transportation, the Department has created and is implementing the *Climate Action Program at Caltrans* (December 2006).

One of the main strategies to reduce GHG emissions is to make California's transportation system more efficient. The highest levels of carbon dioxide from mobile sources, such as automobiles, occur at stop-and-go speeds (0-25 miles per hour) and speeds over 55 mph. Relieving congestion by enhancing operations and improving travel times in high congestion travel corridors will lead to an overall reduction in GHG emissions.A transit alternative was analyzed for this project and found not to meet the purpose and need of the project (see the essay on transit in Chapter 1). In addition, by helping improve the state highway system infrastructure the project will increase efficiencies for future motor vehicles which we assume will be fueled by less polluting petroleum based fuels and/or based on other less polluting technologies. Please also see response #5 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" regarding a "busses only lane" and the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian access/Improvements in Chapter 1.

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

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

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

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

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

Moos, Walter

Walter Moos
<moosmiller@earthlink.net>
07/11/2006 09:55 PM

To Warren Chick <shepsdad@comcast.net>
cc <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>, "Mark K. Yowe" <myowe@spencerstuart.com>, "'Mimi Hancock'" <mhancock@spencerstuart.com>, "Paula A. Mulhall"
bcc
Subject Re: Caldecott Public Comment re The Draft Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report dated May 2006

I am writing to confirm my support of Warren Chick's letter. wm 1

On Jul 11, 2006, at 2:14 PM, Warren Chick wrote:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My comments and supporting documents are attached.

Please be so kind as to send an immediate receipt.

Thank you,

Warren Chick

Warren Chick (warren@shepsdad.net)

Tel.: (510) 843-3556

<Caldecott Tunnel draft 1.doc>
<Caldecott 013003 letterScan212, July 11, 2006.pdf>

Comment noted.

Moser, Mark

<m.moser@rcmbiothane.com>
07/22/2006 02:49 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Build the tunnel

Time to quit wasting money studying this. Build a new tunnel or two.

Mark Moser
Oakland,CA

Thank you for your comments.

Muzzy, Bob

"Bob Muzzy"
<bob.muzzy@planitax.com>
07/10/2006 10:27 AM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject bicycle & pedestrian access to new Caldecott tunnel

Just a quick note to say I'm absolutely appalled that Caltrans made the horrible mistake to proceed with a fourth bore to the Caldecott tunnel. All this does is to facilitate and legitimate personal car driving at the expense of mass and alternate transit. In light of our spending billions of dollars a day in Iraq for oil it is obscene to do anything to further personal car use.

Having said that, given your apparent intentions to proceed with the fourth bore, it is absolutely vital to include decent (clean & safe) access for cyclists and pedestrians. Failure to do so is, in my opinion, offering indirect support for the Al Qaeda, whose membership continues to swell with our militant aggression for control of oil. 1

While you're at it, why not re-open the old tunnel that goes through to the lower hair pin turn on Pinehurst Rd in Canyon? 2

Sincerely,

Bob Muzzy
Director of IT

Planitax, Inc.
5980 Horton St. Ste. 300
Emeryville, CA 94608
Direct: 510.450.6238
Cell: 510.681.7492
Main: 800.606.3080
www.planitax.com

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

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

Nakadegawa, Roy

Roy Nakadegawa
<rnakadegawa@myfastmail.com>
06/23/2006 01:59 AM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Comment on Caldecott project

Comment on Caldecott 4th Tunnel

On August 1999 MTC began the Route 24 / Caldecott Tunnel Corridor Study, for which I served on the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) as an Alternate representing BART. I attended most of the numerous meetings held .The Final Summary Report was presented ion November 2000. The Final Summary Report I was never accepted by the Policy Advisory Committee and MTC basically threw up its hands and did not pursue the report's conclusions. 1
All the cities to the west of the hill who represented PAC, all objected to the construction of the 4th Bore and, if I recall correctly, one of the cities to the east did as well with another expressing some reservations.

I was critical of several points in the report. First, the study was based on a projection of only 20 years into the future, whereas, the Tunnel , being major infrastructure similar to the Bay Bridge, will function for a far longer period, so the study should have over a longer period. If it had been done for a 50 year period it is very likely that the Tunnel would by that time become congested again, so are we to build a 5th or beyond that a 6th tunnel? 2

Another point the I found troubling was that most of the study was focused on capacity and congestion and little on land use and development, which determines the number of cars used for mobility. The current development pattern currently generates the peak use of BART that is obtuse in that the AM Peak westbound is 5 times greater than eastbound. The reason for this is simply the density of development around stations to the east versus the west is not conducive to transit use and relies on auto access. The report to some degree then acknowledges this by considering in an alternative of building more parking for BART. This encourages greater auto use, which leads to a need for more and more highways and tunnels. This points out the lack of real land use and development issue considerations. 3

Overall, the Environmental impact of the new Bore will be detrimental to livability, air quality and health, our climate and OUR resources.

The Social Equity implications of major mega projects such as the new Bore are generally that those who benefit are the more affluent living in low density who drive more are the ones with greater auto trips who create the problems of congestion.

The Cost Effectiveness of a $400,000,000 Tunnel being built to increase capacity primarily for peak hour is negative. The new Tunnel will add capacity for only 3800 cars, so the cost per car will be over $15 per trip for 20 years. 4

Transit Alternative; Before BART started operation across the Bay AC Transit during peak period was carrying the same number of people as all the vehicles or 8-9,000 per hour. Admittedly it took time to build up to this volume and there needs to be dense development as destinations as San Francisco. There is a total lack of this kind of concentration especially to the east of the Tunnel.

I recall I-710 down in Southern California was held back by Caltrans for 25+ years because of the objection of the communities through which it would pass. Now Caltrans is proposing a long tunnel through this section through Alhambra and South Pasadena. Will Caltrans recognize the significant objections by cities such as Berkeley that will get added traffic when the congestion on Route 24 is relieved? Berkeley is already troubled by congestion on its local streets, so will Caltrans build a tunnel through Oakland/Berkeley to I-80? . 5 6

All that this project is doing is encouraging more auto use.

P.S. I retired as an Acting City Traffic Engineer, Was elected to AC Transit and served 20 years, and was elected to BART and served 12 years, currently serving on TRB's committee on Public Transportation Planning and Development, and a old time employee of Calif, Div of Hwys --

Roy Nakadegawa P.E.
rnakadegawa@myfastmail.com
phone: 510-526-5094; fax: 510-526-5094
751 The Alameda Berkeley, CA 94707

rnakadegawa.vcf

1-It is true that the Policy Advisory Committee never formally accepted *The Final Staff Report: Route 24 Corridor Study*. The study did recommend that the fourth bore be studied further as a long-term strategy to relieve congestion along the corridor. In addition, in a letter of December 18, 2002 from Chris Brittle, Manager of Planning at MTC to Mr. Leo Scott, Project Manager at Caltrans District 4 (copy attached), included in the *Caldecott Improvement Project Final Scoping Summary Report, February 2003*, MTC stated that "The Caldecott study serves as the Major Investment Study (MIS) for the State Route 24 corridor."

2- It is standard Caltrans practice to design capacity increasing projects for the traffic foreseen twenty years after the construction of the project is completed. The Highway Design Manual states, "Geometric design of new facilities and reconstruction projects should normally be based on estimated traffic 20 years after completion of construction."

This period is a compromise between competing factors. It is obviously advantageous to build projects that will provide quality service for as long as possible after the completion of a project. However, other factors make a case against too long of a design period. First, it might result in building far too large a facility whose capacity would not be needed for many years. This would result in spending limited transportation funding imprudently and perhaps incurring unneeded environmental impacts. Second, it would be extremely difficult to forecast the transportation needs fifty years in the future. Consider the difficulties facing an agency trying to design a facility to function adequately in 1950 in 1890 or a facility for the year 2000 in 1940 The next fifty or sixty years will doubtless bring many unforeseen economic and technological changes that make it impossible determine what will be necessary in 2060 and beyond.

3- The environmental document considers land use and growth in the framework required by NEPA and CEQA by using the required regional ABAG projections for future land use. The state of the art of regional land use projections as practiced by metropolitan planning organizations does not yet include an interactive transportation-land use component. Organizations such as ABAG anticipate as best they can what the major transportation improvements may be that will affect land use and include the effects along with other factors used in the projections. The growth study (Section 2.1.2 of the DEA/EIR) addressed the growth inducement issues by looking at how the proposed project would affect development compared with existing growth plans and projections, while other technical studies describe the project impacts on other aspects of the environment. The growth study found that the project would support planned growth and not induce unplanned growth. For further summary of the conclusions of the growth study, please see the response #61 to Grasetti Environmental Consulting's letter of July 10, 2006.

4- The proposed project would improve reverse commute access in the corridor for all income classes that drive. As noted, it does not help those who are transit dependent, who tend to have lower incomes. The cost effectiveness calculation does not account for an expected project life of 50 to 75 years or for the value of time savings to the users. The decision as to whether the project is cost effective and whether it will go forward will be made by FHWA, Caltrans, CCTA, ACCMA, and MTC. In passing Regional Measure 2 and Contra Costa Measure J voters approved funding for the Caldecott Improvement Project and a variety of other transportation projects.

The relatively dispersed nature of destinations at both ends of the tunnel may tend not to stimulate substantial increases in corridor BART ridership. The travel demand analysis for the Caldecott project examined future mode split with and without the fourth bore and found no decrease in BART ridership with the tunnel in place.

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

5-Caltrans recognized the importance of partnership and will work with local agencies as feasible. The specific comments on the Caldecott Improvement Project from the City of Berkeley are addressed in Chapter 6, Contains Comments And Responses To Comments On The DEA/EIR From Local Agencies, in this Volume.

6- Please see response #2 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1. Caltrans has no plans to build a tunnel through Oakland/Berkeley to I-80. However, should the City of Berkeley and or Oakland desire such a tunnel, the Department is willing to work with them.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Planning

METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel.: 510.464.7700
TTY/TDD: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848
e-mail: info@mtc.ca.gov
Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov

Sharon J. Brown, Chair
Cities of Contra Costa County

Steve Kinsey, Vice Chair
Marin County and Cities

Tom Ammiano
City and County of San Francisco

Keith Axtell
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

James T. Beall Jr.
Santa Clara County

Mark DeSaulnier
Contra Costa County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Randell H. Iwasaki
State Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

Barbara Kaufman
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Sue Lempert
Cities of San Mateo County

John McLemore
Cities of Santa Clara County

Michael D. Nevin
San Mateo County

Jon Rubin
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Pamela Torliatt
Association of Bay Area Governments

Sharon Wright
Sonoma County and Cities

Shelia Young
Cities of Alameda County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Director/Operations

Therese W. McMillan
Deputy Director/Policy

December 18, 2002

Mr. Leo Scott, Acting Division Chief
Project Management – East Region
Caltrans, District 4
PO Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

RE: Comments on the Caldecott Improvements Project Notice of Preparation of EIR/EIS and the Agency Scoping Meeting

Dear Mr. Scott:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS and to participate in the agency scoping meeting held on December 3, 2002 for the Caldecott Improvements Project. The Caldecott 4th Bore project is included in the recently adopted 2001 RTP.

We are concerned that the current environmental approach is taking an extraordinary amount of time and is about to duplicate significant work that has already been completed in an MTC-led MIS process. The end result will be even more time spent on analysis that is not required. As you know, MTC, in partnership with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, and Caltrans, undertook and completed the *Route 24/Caldecott Tunnel Corridor Study* in early January 2001. The study provides detailed evaluation of a full range of transportation options including improvements to transit, carpooling, freight movement, non-motorized options and a new Caldecott Tunnel fourth bore.

Current Caltrans environmental review work should take full advantage of the previous study and its findings and recommendations. Specifically:

- The Caldecott study serves as the Major Investment Study (MIS) for the Route 24 corridor.
- As such, it is not necessary to re-examine transit and other modal options to the fourth bore project covered by the Caldecott MIS. Limiting the scope of the EIR/EIS to an evaluation of tunnel options not only is appropriate, but will also save time and limited resources.

The Caldecott MIS provided for extensive agency and public input on alternative definition and final recommendations, as would be expected for a comprehensive corridor study. Study policy oversight was provided by a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), which consisted of elected officials representing local corridor jurisdictions and transit agencies that operate in the corridor, including BART, AC Transit and Contra Costa Transit Agency (CCCTA); a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) consisting of staff from these same agencies provided study technical oversight. The PAC and TAC met regularly throughout the 18-month study and

directed all aspects of its development. In addition, project team members held several formal and informal workshops and meetings to solicit ideas and comments from the public.

In the initial phase of the Caldecott MIS, the project team developed a list of about 50 potential projects and improvements that had been identified by partner agencies, at public outreach meetings and by members of the study's Technical Advisory and Policy Advisory Committees. A screening process eliminated those projects that had significant fatal flaws and the remaining projects were evaluated in three categories: 1) street and highway operations improvements; 2) transit (bus and BART expansion) improvements; and 3) new 4th Bore improvements. This evaluation provided the basis for the study's short- and long-term investment strategies. Although the PAC failed to reach a bi-county consensus on these strategies, the technical conclusions of our corridor study remain a sound basis for subsequent environmental analyses.

For these reasons we question the rationale to again examine the transportation systems management (EIR Project Alternative 2) and mass transit (EIR Project Alternative 7) options as part of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the fourth bore. The Caldecott MIS found that improvements such as the HOV lanes, feeder bus service to BART, and other related operational and transit improvements could be only modestly effective when implemented in combination with a fourth bore, but certainly not in-lieu of a fourth bore. In addition, several of the transit strategies that were studied have already been implemented, such as BART station bus shuttle service, various BART station parking and access improvements. Several operational projects in the corridor have been carried out, and MTC-funded traffic studies to assess potential local arterial impacts from a new bore were completed in Oakland and Orinda. Thus, we recommend that Project Alternatives 2 and 7 be eliminated as stand-alone project alternatives and be identified as other possible strategies that would be implemented as part of potential fourth bore alternatives or by other project sponsors as appropriate.

We also question the need to re-evaluate south side fourth bore options. The study's PAC had screened out the south side option early on in the study recognizing that the north bore option's environmental superiority far outweigh any potential eastbound operational benefit of a south side option.

Lastly, several primary environmental issues related to the feasibility and costs of the fourth bore construction were identified in the *Environmental Reconnaissance Evaluation* (April 2000) that was prepared as part of the Caldecott MIS (see attached). We request your review and consideration of these environmental issues as part of the EIR/EIS analysis. Further, because the RTP has been found to conform to the federal air quality plan, the projects in the plan, including the new bore, comply with the air quality objectives for the region.

We appreciate your careful consideration of our comments. Please contact Doug Kimsey of my staff at 510.464.7794 if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

Chris Brittle

Chris Brittle
Manager, Planning

Cc: Sharon Brown, MTC
Mark DeSaulnier, MTC
Shelia Young, MTC
Scott Haggerty, MTC
Jeremiah Hallisey, CTC
James Kellogg
Bob McCleary, CCTA
Dennis Fay, ACCMA

J:\COMMITTE\Caldecott\MTCComments_NOP-ScopingMtg1.doc

Nesbitt, Bryce

bryce1@obviously.com ()
07/21/2006 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 (bryce1@obviously.com) on Friday, July 21, 2006 at 14:41:22

Firstname: Bryce

Lastname: Nesbitt

Zip: 94707

Comments: I feel reasonable co-projects to this one are:

* A north-south bike/ped connection at the route 24/route 13 intersection (near Lake Temescal). There's also a wonderful little spot of land for a park with great Bay Views here. 1

* Bike/Ped access over the maintenace roadway above the west bore entrances.

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

Newton, Karen

"Karen Newton"
<karenn@wcwr.com>
07/17/2006 09:38 AM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov.>
cc
bcc
Subject FW: Caldecott tunnel 4th bore hole

From: Karen Newton
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2006 9:02 AM
To: PCEurope
Subject: FW: Caldecott tunnel 4th bore hole

From: Karen Newton
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2006 1:12 PM
To: PCEurope
Subject: FW: Caldecott tunnel 4th bore hole

From: Karen Newton
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2006 1:11 PM
To: 'comments@dot.ca'
Subject: Caldecott tunnel 4th bore hole

I am an Oakland resident living near the tunnel. The current noise generated by traffic on Hwy 24 is already at uncomfortably high levels during much of the day. I have recommended superior paving such as they have in Europe to cut down on noise levels but to no avail. Instead of promoting car transportation with its attendant pollutions for commuting to work and accessing entertainment, I would propose seismically improving and expanding Bart. I find this fourth bore hole and the increased noise level it will create as an unfair burden on the residents of Alameda County who have opted to live, work and entertain themselves in the same area. Our efforts already benefit Contra Costa Residents by reducing traffic congestion. As a result of our choice we bear higher housing costs and private school costs for our children. Enough is enough!! Cal trans should be working on reducing the ever increasing noise levels in the vicinity of the tunnel instead of trying to create more for us to endure. 1

Karen Newton home owner and business owner in Oakland CA.

1- The project is predicted to increase noise levels by 2 dB within the project study area boundaries. This difference in traffic noise is barely perceptible to the average person.

Nicole, Anastasia

Anastasia Nicole
<anastasia.nicole@sbcglobal.net>
07/11/2006 12:11 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Pedestrian/Bike tunnel inclusion in any 4th bore.

Dear Caltrans,

There is urgent need for a bike/pedestrian path between Berkeley/Oakland and Orinda/Lafayette/Walnut Creek, as evidenced by the auto traffic constantly congesting the 3 current tunnels. On many occasions, I have had to join this traffic in my car because there was no alternate route by foot or bike. Expecting bicyclists and pedestrians to walk over the hill is simply ludicrous, as the distance is too far, and the conditions too steep.

Worldwide oil production is at or past it's peak. Gasoline prices will continue to rise, making auto transport less attractive. Yet population growth in California continues to climb. To make roads usable, there must be provision for alternative transportation. If Caltrans does not build a bicycle connector to Contra Costa County, you create a self-fulfilling propecy of more congestion, more pollution, and more global-warming CO2 emmissions.

If a bicycle tunnel were created, insulated and properly protected from the auto tunneles, the possibility exists to create separate transit bike paths, linking up with existing sections in Contra Costa and Alameda Counties, as well as bike lanes on the new Bay Bridge span. If continuous routes are connected, more commuters, residents, and visitors will be able to explore the area car-free.

It seems, in this planning stage, that because no current bike path exists, Caltrans officials do not see any current use, so they see no current need for pedestrian and bicycle access from Alameda to Contra Costa Counties. The same could have been said for bike and pedestrian traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge - before it was built, there was no demand. But now that the bridge is there, thousands of residents and visitors use the Golden Gate Bridge bicycle and pedestrian paths on a daily basis. A former co-worker of mine commutes by bike daily from Marin to South of Market in San Francisco. A bike path connecting Oakland to Walnut Creek would be a similar commute. If you build it, it will be used.

Finally, a 2-way (4 lane) bicycle/pedestrian tunnel would provide emergency access through the 24 tunnels in case of Earthquake or other emergencies.

Please include a bicycle/pedestrian tunnel in any plan for a 4th bore tunnel. 1

Anastasia Nicole
1350 Yulupa Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

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

Olf, Ryan

Ryan Olf
<ryanolf@berkeley.edu>
07/11/2006 03:23 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject bicycle access in 4th bore

Dear Sir or Madame,

Many tax paying residents of Alameda and Contra Costa county currently use a bicycle as a primary means of conveyance, and over the lifetime of the proposed 4th Caldecott bore, concerns about CO2 emissions, renewable energy, and personal fitness are almost certain to result in increased public interest in cycling. A bike lane through the Caldecott tunnel will give current cyclists easy passage between Walnut Creek/Orinda and Oakland/Berkeley and encourage others to commute via bicycle long into the future. Bicycling has many advantages over driving a car, for society, the environment, and oneself, and yet without proper support for bicycles on public roadways, these advantages are for naught. Please make any final plans for a new Caldecott bore bicycle friendly. 1

I personally ride my bike both for my commute and pleasure, as do many of my friends. Indeed, I have many times wished to ride to Orinda and/or the Walnut Creek area from my house in Berkeley, but have been put off by the prospect of climbing over Grizzly Peak on both legs of the trip, and have instead opted to drive, contributing to both traffic congestion and pollution, as well as the slow atrophy of my muscles.

Ryan Olf
1627 Carleton St.
Berkeley, CA 94703

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

Olmos, Axel K.

"Axel K. Olmos"
<ax@CSUA.Berkeley.EDU>
05/30/2006 07:04 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Comments for Caldecott Improvement Project- AGAIN.

Hi,

I am appending a letter I wrote commenting in 2003.

What are you waiting for?
Why ask for comments AGAIN three and one half years later? 1

It took three years to build the original tunnel in 1934.

The tunnel could have been built by now!!

The endless delays, meetings, impact reports, are a perfect example of what is wrong with government today. This isn't even a new project. You are just augmenting the number of tunnels by one. You could have photocopied all the paperwork, impact reports, etc. from the last time this was done in 1964, and saved the tax payers some money.

Give the tax payers a break, stop wasting time, show some leadership ability, and announce a day for groundbreaking.

Governor Schwarzenegger himself made an appearance at the Caldecott tunnel several weeks ago and was delayed by traffic.

How much more proof of a problem and awareness at the highest levels of government do you need?

As for the no build option, if that option is approved, everyone involved on this project should refund their salaries, expenses, consultant fees, etc. related to the Caldecott Improvement Project to the taxpayers.

Why should we pay for nothing?

Axel Olmos 5/30/06

Axel Olmos
5405 Thomas Ave.
Oakland, CA 94618-1749
(510) 653-5457 ax@csua.berkeley.edu

Christina Ferraz, Project Manager
Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

I attended the meeting January 9th, 2003 at the Peralta Elementary School. I was late for that meeting because I was stuck in traffic at the Caldecott tunnel. A commute that should have taken 22 minutes took 50. That's 28 lost minutes. 28 lost minutes each day of my life for the past five and a half years. That's 300 to 400 hours of my life lost to a frustrating white knuckle commute already, and depending how long my job lasts, I can look forward to years more.

The meeting at the Peralta School was exactly what I expected. There were people there who claimed to be representing the Rockridge community. I don.t recall voting for any of them, and they certainly do not represent me, or any

of the tens of thousands of people who are needlessly stuck in Caldecott traffic each day. That small minority of people at the meeting represents those who hate cars, the idea of commuting, freeways, and anything other than walking or riding a bike as a means of transportation. Their idea of a compromise is everyone ride sharing electric vehicles in HOV lanes while everyone else sits in traffic. How many of them rode their bikes at night in the rain to get to the meeting? I didn't see one bike parked out side, or one electric vehicle. It's a safe bet they didn't ride share their way to the meeting either.

This isn.t a Rockridge issue; this is a Bay Area issue. The vast majority of people in the Bay Area want better commuting on our existing freeways by at least having four lanes in all directions. The Caldecott needs to be upgraded to support that idea. It's that simple. Not improving the Caldecott hurts people more than improving it. The way people act as the lanes get cut down from four to two is criminal. The horn honking and near accidents happen time and time again as people try to force their way into a lane at the last minute.

Do not let the small vocal group of protestors decide how my commute will be in the future. Forget about what Rockridge thinks; ask what the Bay Area thinks. If you really want an opinion on the matter, put it up for vote. Put a measure on the ballots in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties if they want the Caldecott tunnel widened or not. You will then get the opinion of the Bay Area, not just one small community. If the Caldecott tunnel construction inconveniences Rockridge, so be it. It is a sacrifice that must be made for the well being of the Bay Area.

Caltran.s mission statement is: Caltrans improves mobility across California. The only way you are going to do that is expand the Caldecott as quickly as possible. Each day you delay starting construction is another day thousands of people suffer needlessly.

Axel Olmos
Commuter, and Rockridge property owner

1- Environmental processes are legally required and do take time. 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.

Orenstein, Ginnny

Ginny Orenstein <ginnyorenstein@yahoo.com>
07/19/2006 04:51 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc roalor2004@yahoo.com
bcc
Subject Caldecott Tunnel 4th Bore

Please tell me what impact the construction of the 4th bore of the Caldecott Tunnel will have on the neighborhood near Chabot Elementary School. I own a home on Chabot Rd., near the school. 1

Will the construction cause traffic to be diverted to this location? Will there be additional traffic and noise on route 24 near the Chabot school? Are there any other impacts on this area? 2

I have read the environmental impact report and have been unable to find any comments related to the Chabot area. 3

Thank you.

Ginny Orenstein

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

1- We recognize that existing traffic utilizes city streets due to freeway congestion in the Oakland area. In this vicinity, given that westbound State Route 24 is relatively free flowing both in the morning and afternoon peak, the traffic you referenced is presumably eastbound traffic. Although building a fourth bore would not provide any eastbound congestion relief during the afternoon peak, it would provide relief during the morning peak and should reduce traffic diversion to local arterial streets.

See Response to Rockridge Community Planning Council, July, 10, 2006, #36.

2- The construction of the project will not cause traffic to be diverted to your specific location. Also, Chabot School will not experience a perceptible noise increase. Please see response #2 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

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

Ott, Kenneth

Ken <k150@yahoo.com>
07/12/2006 09:17 AM
Please respond to k150@yahoo.com

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject New tunnel needs pedestrian/bicycle access too

Dear DOT Staff,

I recently sold my car and only use a bicycle and public transportation to get around. I need to have the option of bicycling through the hill to get to Lafayette from Oakland. 1

Please refer to the East Bay Bicycle Coalition's proposal for having pedestrian/bicycle access in the tunnel.

Thank you in advance for your hard work.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Ott
350 49th St.
Oakland, CA 94609

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.

Paolini, John

John Paolini
<john@vmwp.com>
07/19/2006 05:33 PM

To caldecott_public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Include Bike/Ped access to 4th Bore

I strongly urge the department of transportation to include a well ventilated, protected & pleasant pedestrian & bicycle section in the Caldecott tunnel's 4th Bore. Omitting this section from the bore would inhibit safe, healthy, and sustainable transit between the Oakland Hills. 1

thank you,
John Paolini
510-289-9269

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

Pavlov, George

"George Pavlov"
<gpavlov@speakeasy.net>
07/31/2006 09:35 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc jbrunner@oaklandnet.com
bcc
Subject Caldecott needs bike access

To: Caldecott Tunnel Planners
CC: Jane Brunner

I am writing to express my strong support for adding bycicle and pedestrian access as part of any renovation or expansion of the Caldecott Tunnel on Rte 24 between Oakland and Orinda. This is one of the places where access REALLY MATTERS because it will drastically improve the situation for bicycle commuters and pedestrians, opening up a previously inaccessible route. 1

I live in North Oakland. Several years ago I worked in Pleasant Hill and sometimes commuted by bicycle. My commute was approximately 18 miles, but it was 1.5 hours long, over half of the time was spent going over the hill, even though that was less than 1/3 of the distance. Had I not been put at a disadvantage compared to cars (which take a shortcut through the tunnel) my commute by bike would have been under and hour and it would have been feasible to do it daily.

For me not having tunnel access made the difference between "sometimes" and "daily". For others (older residents, children, people not in physical shape to go over the hill) lack of tunnel access means that they would NEVER go accross in anything but a car. Tunnel access would make an Oaklander's trip to the Shakespeare Theater, or an Orinda resident's visit to Rockridge, or a commute to work in Walnut Creek from Oakland or vice versa an ordinary option rather than a curiosity or a feat of physical endurance.

In this time of raising gas prices, increasing pollution, growing obesity it really does not make any sense to continue favoring and subsidizing automobile transportation at the expense of more sustainable modes. Bicycles and pedestrians need access at least equal to that given automobiles. Planning and spending money on new construction without equal access is nothing but myopic. Please do not proceed with the planning of this major project without making room for bicycles and pedestrians on an equal footing with cars.

George Pavlov
384 44th Street
Oakland, CA
510-597-0587

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

Penry, David K.

"David K Penry"
<Dpenry1950@aol.com>
07/05/2006 02:12 PM

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

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

Dear Gregory McConnell,

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I am landscape contractor with plans to expand into the East Bay/Concord area. one of my primary concerns in making the move is traffic conjestion and travel time costs I have to pass along to my clients and remain competitive. I understand
the 4th bore on the Caldecott tunnel is under consideration and that it has minimal
environmental impact. Please consider approving the new bore and make our lives
easier and businesses more comptetive. Thanks for your considreation.

Sincerely,

David K Penry
P O Box 481
Sebastopol, CA 95473-0481

Thank you for your comments.

Perry, Richard

Richard Perry
<Richard.Perry@sbcglobal.net
>
07/24/2006 10:04 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Support for 4th bore

I am writing to support the 4 bore Caldecott tunnel project.
My family has lived in Oakland since 1906. Now my mother lives in Danville.
The 4 th bore will help my children visit their grandmother.
I live in Rockridge and do not see any problems with the construction.

Richard Perry
7117 Chabot Rd
Oakland, CA 94618

Thank you for your comments.

Pootheri, Sridar

SridarKP@Gmail.com ()
06/06/2006 05:11 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 (SridarKP@Gmail.com) on Tuesday, June 6, 2006 at 17:11:43

Firstname: Sridar

Lastname: Pootheri

Business: Component Manager for AT &T Services

Comments: I strongly support building 4th tunnel. This is a long time over due. If the Govt values human lives, it should construct the tunnel and prevent the waste of hours of productive life time of people spent just by waiting for their cars to move inch-by-inch to & from their daily work. No wonder, jobs move out of California and out of this Country. Govt should take responsibility and act wisely in the best interest of hard working tax payers.

Start the work right away !

Regards,
Sridar K Pootheri, PhD, PMP

Thank you for your comments.

Prah, Borut

borut@prah.net ()
07/20/2006 03:00 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 (borut@prah.net) on Thursday, July 20, 2006 at 15:00:35

Firstname: Borut

Lastname: Prah

Business: IBM retired

Phone: 510-486-0375

Address: 75 Hiller Drive

City: Oakland Hills

State: CA

Zip: 94618

Comments: I would like to send you two letters I sent as the president of Hiller Highlands Homes Association in 2005 to the Director of Caltrans to solve the traffic congestion at Caldecott Lane overcrossing. Please send me your e-mail address so I can forward them for consideration in your plans. Thank you

---

HILLER HIGHLANDS HOMES ASSOCIATION
75 Hiller Drive, Oakland, CA 94618-2350
tel: 510-486-0375, fax: 510-486-1511; e-mail: borut@prah.net

May 13, 2005

Mr. Bijan Sartipi
District Director
Department of Transportation – District 4
PO Box 23660 Oakland, CA
94623-0660

Re: Caldecott Lane and Kay Overcrossing Highway 24

Dear Mr. Sartipi:

Thank you very much for your thorough response to my letter of April 2 concerning Caldecott and Highway 24 traffic.

I can agree with your rationale for all the requested items but one: the right-turn-lane parallel to the current eastbound lane on Caldecott Lane.

The eastbound right-turn-only lane without a stop sign (as it is now) would allow the westbound traffic saver movement. Many collisions have occurred on this spot over the years. The two I witnessed were both a misunderstanding by the vehicle coming from the Kay Overcrossing that the eastbound vehicle will turn right. 1

Any length of the right-turn-lane would make that intersection safer.

Please consider this safety element in your future plans. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Borut Prah, President HHHA

HILLER HIGHLANDS HOMES ASSOCIATION
75 Hiller Drive, Oakland, CA 94618-2350
tel: 510-486-0375, fax: 510-486-1511; e-mail: borut@prah.net

April 2, 2005

Mr. Bijan Sartipi
District Director
Department of Transportation – District 4
PO Box 23660 Oakland, CA
94623-0660

Re: The Pedestrian/Bicycle Crossing and Vehicle Access at Caldecott and Highway 24

Dear Mr. Sartipi:

The Problem. On most workdays, serious congestion is caused on Caldecott Lane by the tunnel-bound traffic, especially when there is trouble in the tunnels. The congestion is most aggravating for the Oakland and San Francisco bound traffic because it must wait for the East-bound traffic to turn right on the Caldecott overpass before it can reach the clear West-bound ramp of 24. Please see the attached map. The green line shows the problem area. During the peak hours this single lane of Caldecott Lane is used not only by the traffic coming from Berkeley and destined for West 24 and East 24, but also by the overflow traffic coming from North-bound Highway 13, circumventing the congested direct approach from Highway 13 to the tunnel.

The Solution. Please construct a right-turn-only lane, parallel to the current East-bound lane on Caldecott Lane, and a three way stop at both ends of the K Overpass (Caldecott Lane). And while you are at it, you may add a bicycle path for those few citizens who are suggesting that you spend several millions of dollars to construct a pedestrian and bicycle crossing over Highway 24. I understand you are told *"crossover and reconfiguration of the adjacent intersection will reunite the Oakland community that was split apart thirty-five years ago by construction [of] the Grove-Shafter freeway"*. As a resident of the area since 1963 I know of no splitting apart of the community. I believe that none such ever existed. In fact, the aerial photos from before 1950 on www.prah.net/hiller will show you clear separation of the Montclair and South Berkeley communities. The pedestrian and bicycle crossing over Highway 24 would be an enormous waste of money. 1

Thank you for considering my proposal. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Borut Prah, President HHHA

1 (HHHA 05/13/05)- The Kay Street right turn lane improvement is being included in the design of the Caldecott Improvement Project. The right turn lane onto the Kay Street Overcrossing will make motorists' intentions clear to westbound oncoming traffic at the stop sign.

1 (HHHA 04/02/05)- A right turn lane from eastbound Caldecott Lane to Kay Street will be provided as part of this project. Please also see the essay on "Bicycle and Pedestrian Access/Improvements" in Chapter 1.

Prah, Nadine

"Nadine Prah"
<nadine@prah.net>
06/06/2006 12:18 PM
Please respond to
nadine@prah.net

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Yes on Caldecott improvement

I support the Alternative 3N to add a fourth bore with three lanes. Every day when I commute to work, I am stuck in traffic. The addition of the fourth bore would cut my commute time in half. In addition to saving time I would also save gas and cut down on pollution. 1

Nadine Prah
nadine@prah.net

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

Quinn, Brian

Bquinn@carlsonquinn .com ()
07/24/2006 08:01 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
(Bquinn@carlsonquinn.com) on Monday, July 24, 2006 at 20:01:31

Firstname: Brian

Lastname: Quinn

Address: PO Box 594

City: Orinda

State: CA

Zip: 94563

Comments: The construciton of a fourth bore is long overdue and has been promised over and over again to the citizens of Contra Costa County. I personally have voted for polititions, Bonds, Special Taxes just to pay for this. It seems like it has all been a hoak. The fact that No Build is even an option is extremely dissapointed. In the future, I will be voting no or against anything or anyone that allegedly is for the fourth bore (until the fourth bore is under construction). All agencies involved should be ashamed of themselves. This should have been built 25 years ago. 1

1- Analysis of the No-Build Alternative in the DEA/EIR is required under both the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act the Department as part of the environmental review process. Please see the essay "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.