Radine, Gary

"Gary Radine"
<gradine@delta.org>
07/06/2006 10:32 AM

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

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

Dear Gregory McConnell,

Dear Mr. McConnell:

Traffic congestion is a leading concern when it comes to quality-of-life challenges
affecting Delta Dental's current 600-member, Bay Area-based workforce. Adding
a fourth bore at the Caldecott Tunnel will clearly benefit our regional transportation
system, which is why I want to urge that Caltrans certify the project environmental
document (EA/EIR) and construct the project as quickly as possible.

Our staff commuting from Alameda and Contra Costa counties report severe daily
congestion along the Highway 24 corridor and throughout most of the interconnecting
freeways. Addition of a fourth bore for the Caldecott Tunnel offers to balance
capacity in both directions, eliminate counter-commute congestion and avoid dangerous
merging. We believe it will improve regional mobility, employment access and
economic vitality.

It appears to us that the Draft EA/EIR offers a complete and comprehensive analysis
of the project and its potential impacts. Appropriate and adequate mitigations
are offered where impacts are identified. Let's not delay, nor allow the delaying
tactics of 4th bore opponents to worsen the congestion. The information we need
to move ahead sensibly and responsibly is in. It is now time to act on that
information.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Gary D. Radine
100 First Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2634

Thank you for your comments.

Rascher, Heather

Heather Rascher
<heather_rascher@sportsec onomics.com>
07/07/2006 01:46 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject protest of Caldecott expansion

Hello,

I am a Berkeley resident living near the Claremont Resort, and I
would like to protest the expansion of the Caldecott tunnel 1
expansion. I am a tax payer and a business owner in Berkeley as
well, and would hope that my discontent will be considered. If there
is a way to formally send a protest, please let me know and I will
file a claim. Also, if there is a way to formally vote on this
issue, please let me know.

Best,
Heather

1- Thank you for your comments. Your response to the DED assures that your comment has been considered. Assuming you were a registered voter in the nine County San Francisco Bay Area in March, 2004, you were provided an opportunity to vote on Regional Measure 2, which included funds for the project. If you happened

to be a registered voter in Contra Costa County in November 2004, you had an opportunity to vote on Contra Costa County Measure J. Please refer to the "Regional Measure 2 and Contra Costa Measure J" discussion in Chapter 1 of the document.

Reich, Rudy (7/08/06)

Rudy Reich
<rmreich@pacbell.net>
07/08/2006 10:53 AM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Comments

Hello,

My name is Rudolph M. Reich and I am a resident of Orinda. I am in favor of a third tunnel containing three lanes going west. My only concern is as follows: 1

A third tunnel for west bound traffic does not address the east bound traffic problem in the evenings. Traffic is backed up during the evening commute on Highways #24 and #13 and I don't see that is going to improve by adding the third tunnel. I suggest that you provide for lane switching (as you are currently doing) in your design so that you can use the three tunnels going east bound. This would still provide for three lanes of traffic going west bound during the evening commute. Moring commute traffic with four lanes east bound and 5 lanes west bound should not be a problem. The traffic is only going to increase and in 5 or 10 years we will have the same problem we have now unless you plan for the inevitable increase in car traffic. 2

Rudy Reich

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

2- Eastbound evening traffic conditions will remain the same. There are no plans to continue bore reversals after the completion of the construction of the fourth bore.

Reich, Rudy (7/31/06)

Rudy Reich
<rmreich@pacbell.net>
07/31/2006 12:52 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Comments

Hello,

My name is Rudolph M. Reich and I am a resident of Orinda. I am in favor of a third tunnel containing three lanes going west. My only concern is as follows:

A third tunnel for west bound traffic does not address the east bound traffic problem in the evenings. Traffic is backed up during the evening commute on Highways #24 and #13 and I don't see that is going to improve by adding the third tunnel. I suggest that you provide for lane switching (as you are currently doing) in your design so that you have the option of using three tunnels (six lanes) going *east* bound if there is sufficient demand. This would still provide for three lanes of traffic going *west* bound during the evening commute. Moring commute traffic with four lanes east bound and 5 lanes west bound should not be a problem. The traffic is only going to increase and in 5 or 10 years we will have the same problem we have now unless you plan for the inevitable increase in car traffic. 1

Rudy Reich

1- Please see comment #2 above.

Reid, Ed

Ed Reid
<reidworld@yahoo.com>
07/09/2006 11:47 AM

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

In the new tube for Caldecott Tunnel at Caldecott Hill, CalTrans should include a bicycle and pedestrian tunnel with proper ventilation, lighting, and security. 1

Sincerely,
Edward Reid
Oakland, CA

Want to be your own boss? Learn how on Yahoo! Small Business.

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

Resnikoff, Rachel

Rachel Resnikoff
<rachel@resnikoff.net>
07/21/2006 08:37 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject IF YOU BUILD IT, THEY WILL COME

Whatever you do to "improve" traffic through the Caldecott Tunnel, it will only appear better for a very short time.. The more capacity there is on highway 24, the more people will decide living "out there" and working "down here" is a good idea. Before you know it, you'll want eight bores through the hills. Then an earthquake will come and there won't be any more hills OR tunnels.

The long range plan for livability in this area is through mass transit projects. Roads are to be for trucks delivering goods, and emergency vehicles. People movers need to be trains, busses, ferries and a comprehensive, sensible, scheduled connection between them. The livability of the Bay Area and the planet require that we stop burning fossil fuel for personal space.

Rachel Resnikoff
26 Tunnel Road
Berkeley CA

Thank you for your comments.

Rhodes, Janet

Janet Rhodes
<janet@bratcat.com>
06/21/2006 08:02 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject fourth bore--yes!

Hello,

I am wholeheartdly in favor of a fourth bore for the Caldecott, and the sooner the better. I commute through the tunnel and the fourth bore is long overdue.

I read an article in the June 10 Contra Costa Times that a few residents who live near the tunnel have been opposing the new bore, because of cosndierations about noise, traffic, and so forth.

I was very surprised and disappointed to hear that. I am one of the 200,000 commuters who has to travel through the tunnel on weekdays. I don't think that the concerns of a few score people should come before the needs of 200,000--especailly not when you consider that the tunnel has been there for several decades--long before any of these folks purchased their homes. And discussion of a fourth bore had been under way the entire time I've lived in Walnut Creek--since 1991.

Considering the above, attempts to delay or prevent consrtuction of a fourth bore carry NIMBYism to a new level. To make an anology, I live near the BART station. I have not started a neighborhood group to reroute BART tracks in spite of traffic, parking and background noise caused by the BART trains. The BART station was here before I moved here. Likewise the people who've purchased homes near the tunnel. If construction of a fourth bore distresses them, they can sell their homes and move somewhere else.

Best regards,
Janet Rhodes
430 N. Civic Drive, #106
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Thank you for your comments.

Richerson, Debra

chartreuse33@fastmail.fm ()
07/27/2006 04:56 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 (chartreuse33@fastmail.fm) on Thursday, July 27, 2006 at 16:56:28

Firstname: Debra

Lastname: Richerson

Zip: 94706

Comments: Please consider bicycle transportation needs when building the new tunnel. It would help with traffic congestion and improve bicycle access if bicycle lanes were added to the project. At a minimum, please consider reducing disruptions or providing alternative to the Old Tunnel Road which is an important route from Berkeley/Oakland to cycling areas on the other side of the hill. I regularly cycle on this route and would really like to see this access maintained and improved. 1

Thanks for providing bicycle access in all phases of construction and in the finished tunnel.

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

Richter, Leonard and Sharon

7-27-06

Caldecott Improvement Project

Regarding your tunnel project. I have lived on the ridge of Rock Ridge just below Lake Temescal on Buena Vista Ave since 1965. The blasting for the last bore project put cracks in my plaster, & would shake the house! This caused my neighbor to fall from her bath tub & would wake up my children in fear. It was like being in a war zone. Blasting went on night after night. Of course, your experts determined the new cracks in our home & neighbors homes were not caused by your blasting & house shaking night after night! Make no mistake, your experts were wrong, our homes were damaged!

What will happen when your new bore project is started? 1

Because you placed a sound wall in the North side of the freeway, now the noise from traffic bounces off & up to our houses & the noise keeps us from opening our windows for ventilation. Sleeping with the noise from the freeway is now magnafied by the sound wall. Make no mistake, were for the new bore, but know as the traffic speeds up,

2 so will the noise of vehicles driving to & from the Caldecott Tunnel.

After the Oakland Hills fire, our old home was destroyed & is now rebuilt. Even with special double pane windows, the noise from the freeway bouncing off the soundwall is still unbearable!

So my way of thinking, if a soundwall were to be placed on our side of the freeway, this would alleviate a large measure of the traffic noise. 2

Now that we have tunnel machines that chew into solid rock & eliminates blasting & resulting damage to all of our new homes, will you still be blasting? 3

What are you going to do to keep the sound from the increased traffic flow from causing us more problems? 4

Please let me know in writing.

Leonard & Sharon Richter
5766 Buena Vista ave.
Oakland, Calif. 94618
510-547-2863

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

2- Noise abatements are considered only at locations where noise impacts are identified within the project study area boundaries. Caltrans has no program to provide noise abatements for areas currently subject to freeway traffic noise, and where there is no new freeway, or reconstruction of an existing freeway. This location is outside the limits of the project. The sound walls that are being proposed will not cause a reflected noise problem either within or outside of the project study area boundaries.

The noise from State Route 24 will not perceptibly increase at this location. No abatement measures would be necessary.

3- The majority of the tunnel excavation will be performed using a roadheader but the contract will allow blasting during daytime hours only in the event that areas of hard rock are encountered that cannot be efficiently excavated by a roadheader. Blasting will be kept to a minimum and charges will be limited to avoid any damage to local residences. Prior to any blasting a survey will be done to identify properties that would potentially be affected by the blasting and monitoring of those properties will be done.

4- See response to comment #2 above.

Rickard, Rick

rrick1@mindspring.com ()
07/10/2006 12:40 PM

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

```
Below is the result of your feedback form.  It was submitted by
 (rrick1@mindspring.com) on Monday, July 10, 2006 at 12:40:44
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Firstname: Rick

Lastname: Rickard

Address: 3241 Crane Way

City: Oakland

State: CA

Zip: 94602

Comments: As a driver & bicyclist from the Oakland Hills, it is unacceptable
to me that the DEIR fails to adequately address issues of increased traffic,
noise, and pollution in Oakland/Berkeley, and that the needs of bicyclists
have been totally ignored despite years of input!

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

Thank you for your comments.

Rifas, Bert

" bertramrifas" <bertramrifas@rcn.com>
07/18/2006 10:54 AM

To <caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject comments on proposed tunnel

Take into consideration the potential need for expanded bart capacity parallel to the tunnel. Possibly make it a dual use tunnel or a convertible tunnel. this ay mean making the bore larger than needed right now. 1

Bert Rifas.

1- The existing BART tunnel is located north of our project limit. BART is a separate entity from Caltrans and expansion of their facilities is under BART's jurisdiction. Please see essay on "Scope of the Project" in Chapter 1.

Robbins, John

"John Robbins"
<johnr@pacbell.net>
07/23/2006 11:51 PM

To <caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject public comments

I wish to voice my strong support for the new tunnel. Traffic is heavy every day in both directions and another tunnel would make traffic flow better, reducing emissions. Given the minimal housing near the tunnel, there should be no effect or a positive effect on noise.

John Robbins
88 Oak Road
Orinda, CA
925-254-5548

Thank you for your comments.

Romero, Kathleen

Kathleen Romero
<kromero8970@sbcglobal.net
>
07/31/2006 10:20 PM
Please respond to
Kathleen Romero
<kromero8970@sbcglobal.net
>

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject

Creation of a 4th bore – may help to eleviate traffic back-up – but it does nothing towards encouraging conservation or carpooling. As more and more housing is built "over the hill", more and more people will be commuting. Every effort should be made to encourage people to use public transporation or carpooling. If you build a 3rd & 4th Bore at least one bore or lane within the bore should be a "carpool" lane. 1

I have lived in the Bay area since 1976. Pollution has grown and holds in the Bay Area with the increase of commuters driving their personal cars from distant new communities from Pleasonton to Merced.

Kathleen Romero
510-261-8843
2631 Pleasant Street
Oakland, CA 94602

1- Providing HOV lane within the tunnel bore limit will not provide any benefit because the traffic is free flowing by the time the motorists enter the tunnel. Please see response #5 in the essay on "Traffic Operations" in Chapter 1.

Sack, Kirby

<ksack@sackproperties.com
>

07/05/2006 12:22 PM

<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:

Air quality is critical to the survival of our species and the situation in the Bay Area is becoming deadly. Additing the fourth bore at the Caldecott Tunnel will help keep traffic flowing so cars aren't sitting bumper to bumper spewing out polutants at this bottleneck.

Adding a fourth bore at the Caldecott Tunnel is one of the most important projects, and I urge Caltrans to certify the project environmental document (EA/EIR) and construct the project as quickly as possible.

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

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

Sincerely,

Kirby Sack
49 Geary St
San Francisco, CA 94108-5705

Thank you for your comments.

Sadigh, Emily

"esadigh@camail.harvard.edu"
<esadigh@camail.harvard.edu>

07/09/2006 01:11 PM

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

Dear Sir or Madam:

A bike/pedestrian multi-use path is part of the new Bay Bridge and should also be integrated in the new Caldecott Tunnel. As someone who has lived in Berkeley without a car for several years, efficient bike/pedestrian access through the hills is a missing link in a system that should serve *all* taxpayers.

We should connect San Francisco to Contra Costa. Imagine how valuable this would be in an emergency for stranded commuters to return home as well as complementing local plans to reduce car dependence. As you may know, 9 cities in Alameda County as well as the County itself have joined in an effort to measure and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate global warming. Berkeley residents, for example, will be voting on a ballot measure to reduce emissions 80%. These goals cannot be achieved in isolation from regional transportation planning.

In sum, it is clear that 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. 1

Please let me know whether a bike/pedestrian path will be included and if you need additional information about the Alameda County climate change leadership program.

Sincerely,
Emily Sadigh
2610 Hillegass Ave., Apt 303
Berkeley, CA 94704

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

Sarabia, Michael F.

MchlSrrb@aol.com

06/10/2006 01:45 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Cancel the Coldecott Tunnel

Is it needed? Yes. We also need drugs and gasoline but we should not cater to that which is inimical and unsustainable.

Oil prices will never go down, we need a culture shift away from cars and the tunnel promotes the wrong attitude and values.

Put the money on eBART to Byron and BART to Livermore and, if there is money available, a freight rail line from Oakland to Stockton and another freight rail line from Pittsburg to Stockton, for trains to move shipping containers without stopping over all current street level crossings. You might build both eBART and the freight line out of Pittsburg together, to cut the cost of all street level crossing underpasses. 1

Michael F. Sarabia

P. O. Box 5156
Bay Point, CA 94565
Ph 925.709-0751

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

Schafer, Ann

fairview41@webtv.net (Ann Schafer and Lm Rockwell)
06/12/2006 12:21 PM

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

How about some creative alternatives? If bus service through the tunnel were free or low-cost, more people would use it--- (providing there were shuttle buses at the current but stops to take them where they need to go.) I was recently in Lafayette and to my amazement there was what appeared to be a City bus. On Oak Hill Road there were stops for the local bus. 1
Surely a feasibility study about alternative ways to get around once into Contra Costa County would be a wise and quicker alternative to the cost and disruption of building a 4th bore.
It also would "spare the air" which benefits the planet and all those on it who need to breathe. Ann Schafer

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

Schiller, Judy

"Judith D. Schiller" <jdschil@earthlink.net>
07/10/2006 09:17 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Bicycle lanes in tunnel

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. <?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

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

It is very important to make bicycle transportation more possible for those of us who use our bicycles on a regular basis and would like access to the East Bay on the other side of the tunnel.

Thank you.
Judy Schiller
1261 Waller St.
San Francisco, CA 94117, jdschil@earthlink.net

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

Severson, Ralph F.

June 2, 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.

RE: Approve Caldecott Tunnel Project

Dear Mr. McConnell,

Thanks to the California Department of Transportation for doing a good job on the comprehensive and fair DED report. It adequately identifies the impacts of the project and includes an appropriate list of mitigations.

Every day of ongoing major traffic and congestion, speaks to the urgent need for timely completion of the 4th Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel project. The 4th Bore will reduce traffic congestion, facilitate the flow of people and commerce, and improve the quality of life for all Bay Area Residents.

Please approve the DED report, finish the design and begin construction on the Caldecott Tunnel project as quickly as possible!

Sincerely,

Ralph F. Severson
67 Martha Road
Orinda, CA 94563
925-254-1679

Thank you for your comments.

Severson, Sue

June 2, 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.

RE: Approve Caldecott Tunnel Project

Dear Mr. McConnell,

Thanks to the California Department of Transportation for doing a good job on the comprehensive and fair DED report. It adequately identifies the impacts of the project and includes an appropriate list of mitigations.

Every day of ongoing major traffic and congestion, speaks to the urgent need for timely completion of the 4th Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel project. The 4th Bore will reduce traffic congestion, facilitate the flow of people and commerce, and improve the quality of life for all Bay Area Residents.

Please approve the DED report, finish the design and begin construction on the Caldecott Tunnel project as quickly as possible!

Sincerely,

Sue Severson

Sue Severson
67 Martha Road
Orinda, CA 94563
925-254-1679

Thank you for your comments.

Shemuel, Ben

benshemuel@lmi.net
07/09/2006 05:48 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject New Tunnel Bike Lane

Hello,

I'm a cyclist and I commute through the Caldecott Tunnel. I would use my bike most of the year instead of my car if there were a safe, well-lit bike lane through the tunnel. 1

Thank you,
Ben Shemuel

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

Shibata, Shawna

"Shawna Shibata" <sshibata1@gmail.com>
07/10/2006 09:51 AM

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

Dear Caltrans,

CalTrans intends to build a 2 or 3 lane tube, with shoulders, for car-only access through the Caldecott Hill. However, there is in fact a 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. 1

The public and the public interest is not solely defined by automobiles.

Sincerely,
Shawna Shibata

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

Shilliday, Melissa

MelShilliday@aol.com
06/23/2006 09:33 PM

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

Thsi email is to ask you to stop the process of building a third tunnel until a thorough enviromental analysis has been done and the community living around the tunnel area can be heard in a public forum. 1

Thank you.
Melissa Shilliday
6115 Margarido Dr.
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.

Shorstein, Neal

<creatusmail-orders@yahoo.com>

07/13/2006 10:59 PM

Please respond to creatusmail-orders@yahoo.com

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Supportive of 4th bore

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I am a Rockridge resident who commutes in the "reverse" direction daily to Walnut Creek from Oakland (and should continue to do so for the next 15 years).

I'm excited about the prospect of a 4th bore for reverse commuters. I witness firsthand the back-up in traffic westbound each evening. What a relief it would be to not have to worry about increasing congestion. I would most likely be more productive at work during the last part of my work day, not feeling that I have to speed through my work in order to make it to the tunnel before 5:30pm to avoid the wait before the tunnel.

The reduction in exhaust should also be quite beneficial to the Orinda residents.

It strikes me as a "win-win" for all involved.

If you have any questions, please feel free to respond to the email address above.

Thank you.
Neal Shorstein
63rd Street
Oakland, CA 94618

Thank you for your comments.

Singer, Andrew

Andy Singer
<andy@andysinger.com>

07/10/2006 11:42 PM

Please respond to andy@andysinger.com

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Opposed to Caldecott 4th bore

July 10, 2006

To whom it may concern at CALTRANS (and the MTC),

I am totally opposed to the proposed 4th Bore in the Caldecott Tunnel, detailed in the Draft EIR of the so-called "Caldecott Improvement Project".

The report is full of inconsistencies and omissions. In one place the current task of changing traffic direction in the center bore is next to impossible. In another (and in reality), CALTRANS is able to do it quite efficiently every day. In the long term the report fails to fully evaluate the effects of "Traffic Generation" on suburban sprawl east of the tunnel, on South Berkeley and North Oakland neighborhoods, and on the Bay Bridge and highway interchanges west of the tunnel.

In addition to inducing increasing numbers of EXISTING suburbanites to drive towards San Francisco, a 4th bore in the Caldecott tunnel will increase sprawling, car-oriented suburban development east of the tunnel. This, in turn, will quickly generate more car traffic (in both directions) until any new tunnel capacity is completely filled with bumper to bumper cars. Thus we will be back to jammed traffic at rush hour. Furthermore, it will add two additional lanes worth of cars into the already congested Macarthur Maze and 580-24-80-Bay-Bridge interchanges, making traffic tie ups at these points even worse. Thus, pollution from idling cars will be moved from an uninhabited valley (on the east side of the tunnel) to a densely populated city (on the west side of the tunnel). This increased pollution will have negative health impacts on the citizens of Oakland and Berkeley.

More broadly, the report fails to look at the larger regional, state and national contexts in which this project is being proposed. Global oil is reaching it's "Peak" production levels. As a result, gas prices are rising and will continue to rise until world oil supplies are depleted. At the same time the nation and the planet is facing catastrophic global warming. In the Bay Area, regional air quality is declining, with increased numbers of "Save the air" days. Since the primary cause of national oil dependence is cars and bad, car-oriented land-use patterns, and since the main cause of regional air pollution and greenhouse gas is cars ...THEN IT IS FOOLISH TO SPEND HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS TO INCREASE HIGHWAY CAPACITY! We should be putting every available transportation dollar into better public transit, reduced BART fares and other measures to force people OUT of their cars. We should NOT be making it easier for them to drive!

I urge you NOT to build a 4th bore on the Caldecott but to come up with better public transportation systems and land use regulations to ensure transit-friendly development in the Bay Area. 1

Andrew Singer
PO Box 14392
Berkeley, CA 94712
andy@andysinger.com

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

Smith, Craig J.

Craig J Smith
<Craig.J.Smith@us.mwhgloba
l.com>
07/31/2006 11:44 AM

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

Hello,

My name is Craig Smith and I live at 260 Caldecott Lane, adjacent to the proposed project. I do not support this project because none of the alternatives improve the level of service for peak hour traffic.

As a reverse commuter, I would appreciate an extra tunnel for my eastbound morning and westbound evening drives. I know first hand however, that the need is on the other side of the highway. Every morning I see thousands of cars lined up from the tunnel to Walnut Creek and beyond. I thank God I don't have to drive that route. This project will not help the people who need it most.

As an Engineer, I was dismayed not to find a thoroughly prepared traffic analysis as part of the EA/EIR. It would be very useful to have further insight of the driving habits of the peak hour commuters. The report acknowledges where bottlenecks begin, but it doesn't discuss why. Although it may be obvious that the tunnel is responsible, there is more going on here. The missing piece is driver reaction. As drivers approach the tunnel, the lanes are tightened together. This makes drivers more cautious and they slow down. Inside the tunnel it is very dark. Shouldn't the project consider improvements to the existing tunnels as well? 1

I have read the online documents and believe they are rather biased in favor of the project. Clearly, voter approval of RM2 and Measure J do not endorse any of the alternatives. My interpretation is that voters approved solving the congestion problem at the tunnel. I don't believe they understand technical topics (i.e. peak hour demand, LOS, etc.) but they do know that the main problem in the morning is eastbound and the main problem in the evening is westbound. If you fail to solve those 2 main problems, the voters will be very disappointed. Please make sure you are focusing your energy in the right direction. 2

Again, I do not support this project because it does not improve the level of service for peak hour traffic.

Sincerely,

Craig J. Smith
Senior Engineer
MWH
925-274-2202

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

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

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

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

Smith, Hugh

"Hugh Smith"
<Hugh@AVBTravel.com>
07/27/2006 09:48 AM

To <caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Build the 4th bore now

Dear Caltrans: In regards to the 4th bore of the Caldecott Tunnel. Build it, Build it as quickly as you can. Work 24/7 if need be.

Thank You, Hugh Smith, 974 Rose Avenue, Piedmont, CA 94611

Thank you for your comments.

Smith, Pat

"Pat Smith"
<psmith43@sbcglobal.net>
06/04/2006 05:06 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@DOT.CA.GOV>
cc
bcc
Subject Forth Bore

I want to add my voice to those that are raised against a forth bore in the Caldecott Tunnel.

Traffic planners are needed who can think for the future of the region not just for the here and now. Ten years from now when traffic is still a nighmare even with a forth bore, what will the plan be then?

Instead of putting money into larger highways and soundwalls, we need to recognize that this is a metropolitan area and treat it as such. Mass transit of all kinds needs the funding, not the highways. People will use mass transit if it is convenient and wide spread. Right now, the transit systems we have in the greater Bay Area are not all that sophisticated. If we use our transportation funds to increase BART lines and routes and have bus and muni systems that connect well and are reliable, we will be able to move into the future better prepared than we will be by adding access to more cars.

My vote on the best plan to use transportation funds at this point would be to make a BART tunnel in the area of the San Mateo bridge. The BART trains from the Pleasanton/Livermore, Hayward/Fremont area would use this tunnel and eventual San Jose trains as well. This would free up time in the present tunnel to add trains from the more northern areas. Building double deck parking at the Orinda and Lafayette Stations and running a new BART line down Ygnacio Valley Blvd. would definately bring more traffic from those areas. Right now, since BART parking is so scarce out there, many commuters drive into Oakland and park around the Rock Ridge station and take the train from there. 1

I am going to try to get to the presentation on June 15th.

Pat Smith
Oakland

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

Smith, Pat (07/28/2006)

"Pat Smith"
<psmith43@sbcglobal.net>
07/28/2006 10:52 AM

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

I cannot understand how the EIR on the 4th bore was passed without any data about Chabot Elementary School. All this says to me is that a deal was made and damn the kids. 1

Builders of housing units are allowed to set aside only one parking place per unit, even if that unit has multiple bedrooms. This would tell me that cities are expecting that residents of those units are either going to take mass transit, walk or bicycle. Apparently the State of California thinks otherwise and therefore, is making it easier? by adding more tunnels, highway lanes, etc. 2

The 4th bore addition plan should come to an end, the money should be used for planning a Bay area wide mass transit system. Cal Trans should realize that the East Bay, the South Bay, The Peninsula and the North Bay are becoming a large metropolitan area very like the New York/New Jersey area and plan NOW for this before all the infill is gone and there will be NO place to put anything. 3

Pat Smith
6019 Rock Ridge Bl
Oakland, CA 94618

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

2 – Please see the essay on "Purpose and Need" in Chapter 1.

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

Smits, Bernard (e-mail)

Theresa Nelson
<nelsontm@pacbell.net>
07/12/2006 07:32 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject public comment

Comment letter attached and pasted below.

Bernard R. Smits
446 Hudson Street o Oakland, CA 94618 o
Phone 510-652-6672 o Fax 510.420.1817 o barneysmits@pacebll.net

July 10, 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

RE: Comments on 4th Bore DEIR

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I am writing on behalf of my family, 22-year resident of lower Rockridge. We oppose the project and this DEIR, because of the major long-term impacts on our neighborhood which were not at all taken into account in the analysis.

We are deeply concerned about how the 4th bore would negatively affect our home, our neighbors and our local streets. Most importantly, the DEIR/EA study area does not extend far enough to properly evaluate the project impacts. Extension to the I-580/Maze interchange is warranted and necessary to assess impacts on local streets and a sensitive receptor such as the Park in this DEIR/EA. . While the DEIR claims that "Alternatives 2N and 3N are very similar (pg. 25), it also goes on to state that Alternative 3N would provide the greatest congestion relief" on pg. 26. That is true-within the scope area-but not farther westward. MTC' s "Route 24/Caldecott Tunnel Corridor Study (2001), prepared in partnership with CalTrans, shows that the a 3-lane 4th bore would move the westbound peak AM freeway backup further westward along 24 toward the Maze. In our area, more eastbound Hwy. 24 vehicles will approach the two southernmost bores in the predominant PM commute. As that capacity is unchanged in this project, thousands of cars would be idling right near our homes, (and directly above Frog Park, where my family and I have volunteered for more than 7 years), with heavier-than-air pollutants and debris falling on pedestrians and young park users. The EIR fails to study this impact. 1 2

Due to the narrow DEIR/EA study limits, current and induced congestion on local streets is not included. Drivers already shortcut through residential streets to avoid Hwy. 24 congestion, and 3

the "unbalanced" Tunnel would produce more speeding, more accidents and near-misses, in an area heavily used by pedestrians, cyclists, children learning to ride bikes, and people with strollers. Yet the streets nearby are not even listed on your checklist for traffic impacts. The DEIR/EA needs to include a Rockridge street study that addresses traffic calming and pedestrian safety along its extended scope.

Induced traffic demand and its effects are likewise inadequately treated in this DEIR/EA. A fuller discussion of this point is contained in the Rossman and Flashman letter. Traffic which "will come if you build it" must lead to increased noise on the freeway with the now freely flowing counter-commute traffic. Furthermore, the project could increase the noisy truck traffic now that trucks can avoid breaking on the long hill, putting further strain on local arterials. The noise at this sensitive receptor is already deafening so that sometimes you literally cannot hear someone talking next to you. Again, the EIR did not study this impact. 4

If this project goes through, there must be some mitigation for the very significant impact on lower Rockridge and FROG Park. Sounds walls or other protective devices to reduce noise, pollution and debris, and measures to protect the public health of our youngest residents are mandatory. Enhancements to the neighborhood such as expansion of open space away from the freeway adjacent to the park, traffic calming devices on nearby streets, and improvements to the Temescal Creek should all be considered. 5

We believe that the EIR must be withdrawn due to this serious deficiency in its scope, and that CalTrans should commission a full EIS, respond to these comments and our letter, and most of all, extend the study area to include our immediate lower Rockridge streets and FROG Park. 6

Sincerely,

Bernard R. Smits
--

Regards,

Theresa Nelson 4thboreBRSLetter10july2006.dc

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

2- Please see the essay on "Project Study Area Boundaries" in the Chapter 1 on how the traffic study area was determined and explaining why there is no need for additional traffic-related studies. Also see response #7 in the "Traffic Operations" essay and response to Friends of the Rockridge—Temescal Greenbelt, July 29, 2006, #1-3.

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

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

5-The Department has no plans to provide the enhancements listed on this comment. All mitigation listed on the Final Environmental Document will be provided, in accordance with CEQA and NEPA requirements.

Please see the essay on "Cumulative Impacts/Enhancements " in Chapter 1.

6- 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.

Smits, Bernard (USPS)

Bernard R. Smits
446 Hudson Street • Oakland, CA 94618 •
Phone 510-652-6672 • Fax 510.420.1817 • barneysmits@pacebll.net

July 10, 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

RE: Comments on 4th Bore DEIR

Dear Mr. McConnell:

I am writing on behalf of my family, 22-year resident of lower Rockridge. We oppose the project and this DEIR, because of the major long-term impacts on our neighborhood which were not at all taken into account in the analysis.

We are deeply concerned about how the 4th bore would negatively affect our home, our neighbors and our local streets. Most importantly, the DEIR/EA study area does not extend far enough to properly evaluate the project impacts. Extension to the I-580/Maze interchange is warranted and necessary to assess impacts on local streets and a sensitive receptor such as the Park in this DEIR/EA. . While the DEIR claims that "Alternatives 2N and 3N are very similar (pg. 25), it also goes on to state that Alternative 3N would provide the greatest congestion relief" on pg. 26. That is true-within the scope area-but not farther westward. MTC' s "Route 24/Caldecott Tunnel Corridor Study (2001), prepared in partnership with CalTrans, shows that the a 3-lane 4th bore would move the westbound peak AM freeway backup further westward along 24 toward the Maze. In our area, more eastbound Hwy. 24 vehicles will approach the two southernmost bores in the predominant PM commute. As that capacity is unchanged in this project, thousands of cars would be idling right near our homes, (and directly above Frog Park, where my family and I have volunteered for more than 7 years), with heavier-than-air pollutants and debris falling on pedestrians and young park users. The EIR fails to study this impact.

Due to the narrow DEIR/EA study limits, current and induced congestion on local streets is not included. Drivers already shortcut through residential streets to avoid Hwy. 24 congestion, and the "unbalanced" Tunnel would produce more speeding, more accidents and near-misses, in an area heavily used by pedestrians, cyclists, children learning to ride bikes, and people with strollers. Yet the streets nearby are not even listed on your checklist for traffic impacts. The DEIR/EA needs to include a Rockridge street study that addresses traffic calming and pedestrian safety along its extended scope.

Induced traffic demand and its effects are likewise inadequately treated in this DEIR/EA. A fuller discussion of this point is contained in the Rossman and Flashman letter. Traffic which "will come if you build it" must lead to increased noise on the freeway with the now freely flowing counter-commute traffic. Furthermore, the project could increase the noisy truck traffic now that trucks can avoid breaking on the long hill, putting further strain on local arterials. The noise at this sensitive receptor is already deafening so that sometimes you literally cannot hear someone talking next to you. Again, the EIR did not study this impact.

If this project goes through, there must be some mitigation for the very significant impact on lower Rockridge and FROG Park. Sounds walls or other protective devices to reduce noise, pollution and debris, and measures to protect the public health of our youngest residents are mandatory. Enhancements to the neighborhood such as expansion of open space away from the freeway adjacent to the park, traffic calming devices on nearby streets, and improvements to the Temescal Creek should all be considered.

We believe that the EIR must be withdrawn due to this serious deficiency in its scope, and that CalTrans should commission a full EIS, respond to these comments and our letter, and most of all, extend the study area to include our immediate lower Rockridge streets and FROG Park.

Sincerely,

Bernard R. Smits

See prior letter.

Smyer, Mary

Mary Smyer
<mary@smyer.com>
06/28/2006 01:40 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject protesting caldecott tunnel bore

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
Please register my opinion. Thank you.
Mary Smyer

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

Sperry, Josh

Josh Sperry
<jsperry@riseup.net>
06/04/2006 05:34 PM

To caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject opposed to fourth bore of Caldecott Tunnel

Dear Mr. McConnell and Ms. Dorado,

I live in Oakland and work all over Contra Costa County. I use the Caldecott tunnel 3 to 4 days per week in the reverse commute direction. As a result, I might stand to benefit most from adding a fourth bore to the Caldecott Tunnel. I have certainly spent many painful hours creeping through Orinda in the late afternoon when there is only 1 bore open heading into Oakland.

However, I am strongly OPPOSED to expanding the Caldecott Tunnel by adding another bore. The last thing the Bay Area needs is more highways and more lanes on our existing highways. We have seen again and again how adding more highways only makes for more traffic. This tunnel project would consume billions of dollars, which could be spent on much measures to reduce traffic congestion -- for example, BART and bus service. 1 2

In addition to the well-known fact that extra lanes are only a temporary solution to traffic congestion, there is also the environmental impact of the expansion to consider. I refer to the impact on our local and global environment of encouraging more people to drive their cars and drive them further. Locally, more cars on the roads leads to air pollution, "spare the air days" and asthma, among other impacts. Globally of course, carbon dioxide emissions from cars are a major source of climate change. Public transit reduces all these impacts, while increased driving by people in their individual cars makes them worse. I don't see anything in your stated goals of this project about improving the environment, but I urge you strongly to consider the environment as a factor in the decision. 3 4

On environmental grounds, the No Build option is clearly superior to building another bore. And on practical grounds, I don't see how an extra couple lanes in the reverse direction is going to help congestion very much. On budget grounds, I think it is indefensible to spend billions and billions of dollars on an extra tunnel of dubious value while the schools in Oakland are crumbling, the city streets are unpaved, the water and sewer systems need an upgrade, not to mention the great need for funds to repair our levees and flood defense in the Delta.

Please do NOT expand the Caldecott Tunnel, and instead direct the construction funds to any of the much more urgent infrastructure needs of our area. Thank you.

Joshua Sperry
5343 Broadway Terrace #206
Oakland, CA 94618

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

2- The Preferred Alternative will cost approximately $420 million; it will not consume billions of dollars. As shown in the forecast work done for this project and other studies in general, the demand on the freeway system will continue to grow. This growth is expected to occur as results of changes such as land use and population growth regardless of traffic infrastructure improvements. We recognize improvements on other transportation modes are also needed in the future, but not constructing a fourth bore would not stop the demand growth nor address the region's transportation needs. The demand on BART ridership was examined and determined that not constructing a fourth bore would not lead to a significant increase on BART demand

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

3- The Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2N) of this project is included in the 2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (which conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP)) and the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and thus is in conformance with all related federal air quality requirements. The SIP is designed to be protective of human health.

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

Caltrans takes its role as stewardship of the State's transportation system seriously and considers the environment in all of its transportation decisions. Also, please see "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.

Spitzer, Ronnie

Ronnie Spitzer
<rspitzer@sbcglobal.net>
07/30/2006 08:18 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Public response letter for Caldecott Improvement Project

Mr. McConnell,
Attached is my public response letter for the Project. Please keep me on the mailing list.

Thanks,

Ronnie Spitzer Caldecott DEIR.doc

30 July 2006

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

Dear Mr. McConnell and Ms. Dorado:

I am writing on my own behalf, as a Rockridge resident, to point out the inadequacy of the DEIR/EA.. This letter enumerates the document's many shortcomings and failings, and requests that a new full DEIR/ EIS be prepared. While in the past, I served on the TAC committee for the MTC' s "Route 24/Caldecott Tunnel Corridor Study (2001), this letter reflects only my own viewpoint. 1

1. Inconsistent evaluation within the study area renders the DEIR/EA incorrect and incomplete.
Many examples can be cited throughout the DEIR/EA. The noise most clearly represents the problems within the documentation.

Supporting documents clearly show that the study limits in the DEIR/EA report changed relative to the supporting study limits. This is more obvious in the "Traffic Noise Impact Report" Appendix, prepared by Caltrans under the supervision of Glenn Kinoshita, which extends from "State Rd. 13 IC to Gateway". While the DEIR itself places the project beginning at the Broadway EB on-ramp, homes adjacent to Highway 24 both north and south between that onramp and the State Rd. 13 IC are not assessed AT ALL. As several homes are equally close to SR 24 as the North Lawn of Lake Temescal, this is a major flaw in the DEIR. 2

In addition, noise levels at the North Lawn were identified to be over federal thresholds in the Caltrans mitigated negative declaration for the SR13/24 interchange project. The proposed Caltrans mitigation, a bike route along the former Hwy. 13 connection in place of a soundwall, was never completed. Therefore, this soundwall requirement is preexisting and should not be included in mitigation money required by this project. 3

Most importantly, both Chabot Elementary and College Preparatory Schools are included in the DEIR study range BUT are not assessed for traffic along routes to school, noise, or other environmental impacts. CEQA law specifically requires sites for sensitive receptors be analyzed for impacts, both present and long-term. At no point in the documentation is there any indication that routes to either school has been identified, or any environmental effects evaluated. 4

Another unsubstantiated evaluation criterion is the extension of the rush hour evaluation period to 4 hours. Caltrans does not supply any reason, within the document, for this period. According to data included in the Technical Appendix of both this Caltrans DEIR

and the MTC report, as well as the main DEIR text Chapter 1 section, the length of the AM and PM peak depends on the direction. The MTC Corridor Study defined the peak AM and PM periods as 2 hours, while the City of San Francisco Traffic Engineering uses 3 hours. While it is known that spreading exists within the Bay Area transportation network for the commute peaks, it's characterization by a 4 hr. criterion appears arbitrary. Is the tunnel at capacity that entire time, so no vehicular increase is possible, or not? In a project as crucial as this one, it must be explicitly written so transit shift or other alternatives can be properly evaluated. 5

For the sake of brevity, other equally incorrect issues are not mentioned in this communication. Letters by the RCPC, the 4th Bore Coalition, and Antonio Rossman/Stuart Flashman specify further issues and problems.

2. Project goal is inconsistent within the document, and with regional and corridor congestion studies.

The Caldecott Improvement project claims to address congestion in the Hwy. 24 corridor. As shown in the documentation supplied with the DEIR, the primary congestion and BART ridership in the corridor is in the peak direction. "The "reverse" commute through the Caldecott corridor is about 20 percent of the prime direction (westbound AM) commute" [MTC Commuter Forecasts May 2004, Chuck Purvis]. The reasoning that reducing the delay in the "reverse" direction will materially lessen Corridor congestion is unclear. 6

What is clear is that while Alternative 3N definitely increases congestion on Highway 24 between Broadway and the I-580 interchange in the primary commute direction, the DEIR simply notes that a backup grows from the I-580 interchange with Alternative 3N. This result is clearly identified in the MTC Study Technical Appendix, and long queue lengths shown. Not studying or mitigating this consequence is illegal, as it has already been identified in a previous regional study. This is also one example why the DEIR project limits MUST be extended to the I-580 interchange. 7

The DEIR does indeed specify population and growth rates within Contra Costa and Alameda Counties based on recent ABAG projections. However, not only does it fail to reconcile these estimates with the 2001 MTC study predictions, which are substantially lower, but it completely omits this issue. That the DEIR forecast is inconsistent with the MTC Study should be included as part of the DEIR and analyzed. 8

What the DEIR fails to clarify is that " ABAG's Projections 2003 is based, in part, on the Bay Area's Smart Growth Vision process, completed in March 2002 .... <u>In a departure from previous regional forecasts produced by ABAG, Projections 2003 relies on proactive economic assumptions and land use policies. (underline added by R. Spitzer)</u>" [Purvis]

Another serious shortcoming is the lack of reconciliation of the document with the City of Oakland plans. While the DEIR notes that traffic counts will increase on Broadway Ave. if ANY bore is made, it fails to note that Broadway is currently scheduled for downsizing from 4 to 2 travel lanes as part of a Bike Plan/Traffic Calming plan and what 9

the consequences will ensue. Caltrans clearly did not correspond with the City of Oakland about its plans, nor communicate with it. A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LOCAL STREETS TO RESPOND TO THE PREDICTED INCREASE [ON LOCAL STREETS] is recommended on pg. 55 of the 2001 MTC Study for a formal environmental analysis and clearly indicated here.

Again, these discrepancies are serious enough that the current DEIR/EA should be withdrawn, the study limits expanded, additional studies made and a compliant DEIR/EIS written.

3. Induced demand must be examined as part of the project impact.

The draft EIR/EA's estimates of future traffic and resultant congestion if the project is constructed wrongfully fails to take into account the effects of induced demand on future traffic in the corridor. Because of induced demand, traffic in the reverse-commute direction (i.e., west to east during AM peak hours, east to west during PM peak hours) will be greater than indicated under the future conditions modeling in the DEIR/EA. Adverse impacts due to increased noise and air pollution will be greater than indicated in the DEIR/EA. For these reasons, the analysis in the DEIR wrongfully underestimates future project impacts. 10

ABAG predictions depend on future stated land use policy, which do not include having a 4 bore Caldecott Tunnel. Clearly rudimentary induced demand is included in the Technical Appendix dealing with this subject, as the numbers increase. However, no justification is given for the nunbers, which is expected in a DEIR designed to inform the citizenry. Furthermore, the predicted 65 mi/hr speed in the reverse-commute direction makes it the most attractive route for entering Contra Costa. Trucks traveling between the Port of Oakland and Stockton will not have to break on the eastbound Tunnel upgrade anymore, making that route more attractive. However, the DEIR states that truck traffic will not increase, without any justification. While such statements are adequate for mitigated negative declarations, they are NOT for DEIRs. 11

Furthemore, the DEIR states on page xx that "Alternative 2N shows an incremental demand increase, with 3N a marginal demand increase compared to 2N." What is the justification for this statement? With Alternative 3N, the capacity of Hwy. 24 and the Caldecott Tunnel is increased relative to 2N by one lane resulting in an UNBALANCED capacity tunnel. The 2005 DKS Associates transit alternatives study prepared for CCTA by principle Deborah Dagang shows that the number of current through year 2030 Hwy. 24 vehicles that will exit onto Hwy 13 is less than the Bore 3 lane capacity of 2600 vehicles/hour measured for the 2001 MTC Study. Therefore, the 3N Alternative will DEFINITELY add vehicles beyond the DEIR study limit in the AM westbound peak period. Furthermore, these vehicles must return to Contra Costa in the primary PM peak direction on a road that ONLY has 4 lanes. This must cause increased congestion, both on Hwy. 24 and on Oakland arterials. Yet the DEIR specifically excludes these areas from the study scope. This is yet one more reason why the limits must be extended for a legally correct DEIR/EIS and more accurate disclosure required. 12

4. Environmental justice is inadequately treated in the DEIR/EA.

The DEIR/EA only evaluates a tunnel bore option. Census data shows a high correlation between low socio-economic status and lack of car ownership [MTC Census 2000 evaluation, Chuck Purvis]. Therefore, Caltrans must fully evaluate alternatives such as transit enhancements and increased bus service to fulfill the environmental justice requirements of CEQA. As Caltrans claims this is a regionally justifiable project, then all of Oakland must be included in the socio-economic analysis, not just the areas in the limited study. 13

In conclusion, in accordance with the Fourth Bore Coalition I request that for these and other reasons the current DEIR/EA be withdrawn and a full, legally correct DEIR/EIS be resubmitted in its place.

Regards,
Dr. Ronnie Spitzer

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.

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

3- Sound walls are being considered on this project in conformance with Code of Federal Regulations 23CFR772. Caltrans has no such pre-existing commitment for sound walls from a previous project.

4- In regards to Chabot School and College Preparatory School, both are outside the limits of this environmental document. See response to Rockridge Community Planning Council, July, 10, 2006, #36.

5- The peak period is merely the period chosen as being appropriate to reflect and model the traffic congestion in a given area. No harm can come of using a longer peak period for an operational analysis. If the peak period used includes the period where the traffic is freely flowing, it will be reflected in the analysis. A longer peak period can only refine the results that would be arrived at with a shorter peak period. The peak period is merely the period chosen as being appropriate to reflect and model the traffic congestion in a given area. For this proposal to construct a fourth bore to relieve off-peak direction congestion, varying the duration of study period between 2 to 4 hours could only change the quantity of performance measures but would not affect the conclusions of the operational analysis.

6- It is true that the project reduces delay only in the off-peak direction and that, by definition, there are more travelers traveling in the peak direction. However, the off-peak direction delays are already serious and are projected to grow increasingly worse in the future. This project will allow full use of all of the existing lanes of State Route 24 and solve the congestion concerns for the foreseeable future. In contrast, addressing the peak direction congestion problems would require corridor length improvements on State Route 24 between State Routes 580 and 680 at a much larger cost and possible environmental impact.

7- The operational analysis included the I-580 interchange connectors to and from State Route 24. With reference to the three-lane alternative (Alternative 3N), as cited in the comment, the backup would spill back from the Interstate 580 connector on to westbound State Route 24. Mitigation measures such as additional widening along State Route 24, connectors; I-580, etc. would have additional issues to be addressed. At this time, Alternative 2N has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Please see the essay on "Preferred Alternative" in the Chapter 1.

8- In a region with changing economic conditions and evolving land use planning goals, it is common for the latest set of projections not to agree with earlier versions. That is one of the primary reasons for new editions of regional projections. The environmental document used the most recent ABAG projections available as required under NEPA. FHWA guidelines require that regional growth projections from the metropolitan planning organization (ABAG in this case) be used as inputs for the assumed future year conditions. The growth study used ABAG 2005 land use projections while the traffic modeling used a hybrid of ABAG 2002 and 2003 land use projections; the CCTA traffic demand model used in the study was the most up-to-date suitable travel demand model available when the forecasting effort began. Hence, the projections on which the 2001 MTC study was based are now a little dated and do not constitute the most relevant benchmark for a current environmental document. See also the response #35 to the City of Berkeley's letter dated June 30, 2006.

9- The travel demand model used for this project included all roadway changes that were foreseen at the time of its development. Relatively minor discrepancies should not affect the build versus No-Build assessment. The intent of these planning level studies is to evaluate conditions more than 25 years in the future (20 years design life plus the time it takes to plan, design, and construct the tunnel). It is not intended to evaluate the effect of the City's local calming plan. Generally, we recognize constructing a fourth bore would lead to minor increase in traffic demand. As for the City's plan to reduce Broadway from four lanes to two lanes as a part of the City's traffic calming strategy, it may have the effect of diverting trips from Broadway to other local arterial streets regardless of the construction of a fourth bore.

10-Please refer to responses #2 and #4 in the essay on "Traffic Modeling/Forecasting" in Chapter 1.

11- The Caldecott Improvement Project is consistent with local planning, as discussed in Section 2.1.1.2, Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans, of the DEA/EIR. The project is specifically mentioned in the Contra Costa County General Plan. By passing Regional Measure 2, Bay Area voters approved funding for the Caldecott project as well as other transportation projects.

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. Also see response #8 to Ronnie Spitzer's letter dated July 30, 2006, on the requirement for using the ABAG projections.

Please see response #2 and #4 in the essay on "Traffic Modeling/Forecasting" in Chapter 1.

12- The three-lane bore alternative does cause five lanes through the tunnel feeding into four through lanes on State Route 24 west of the tunnel. However, it is important to remember that there are only four through lanes east of the tunnel as well so there should not be a significant imbalance. The travel demand model does show additional travel demand through the tunnel with the three-lane bore alternative, but the amount of traffic passing through the tunnel is, of course, limited to the amount of traffic that can reach the tunnel on State Route 24.

13- Please see the essay on "Alternatives Considered in the Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report (DEA/EIR)" in Chapter 1 regarding alternatives considered. Please see response to Claremont Elmwood Neighborhood Association, July 17, 2006, #37 as well as the essay on "Project Study Area Boundaries" on the definition of the study areas. Traffic and other impacts are confined to the study areas, which were defined on the basis of the expected impacts, based on traffic volumes on arterial streets with and without the project.

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.

Stern, Bob

bob stern
<bobpts@asis.com>

07/11/2006 03:51 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc cityclerk@oaklandnet.com, lreid@oaklandnet.com, dbrooks@oaklandnet.com, idelafuente@oaklandnet.com, cityochang@oaklandnet.com, jbrunner@oaklandnet.com, nnadel@oaklandnet.com, jquan@oaklandnet.com, pkernighan@oaklandnet.com, officeofthemayor@oaklandnet.com, citymanager@oaklandnet.com, jrusso@oaklandcityattorney.org, gwozniak@ci.berkeley.ca.us, worthington@ci.berkeley.ca.us, olds@ci.berkeley.ca.us, lcapitelli@ci.berkeley.ca.us, spring@ci.berkeley.ca.us, lmaio@ci.berkeley.ca.us, dmoore@ci.berkeley.ca.us, manderson@ci.berkeley.ca.us, manager@ci.berkeley.ca.us, mayor@ci.berkeley.ca.us, cityclerk@ci.berkeley.ca.us, bfbc@lmi.net, info@ebbc.org, cole@bayareabikes.org, cbc@calbike.org
bcc
Subject new caldecott tunnel bore???

> Dear Caltrans:

> I understand you're planning a new bore for The Caldecott Tunnel.
> Your DEIR has apparently ignored all the input you've received from
> bikers and hikers(and their supporters) and failed to include any
> provision for pedestrians and bicycles. I personally favor a "No
> Action" alternative--don't build a new tunnel at all. But if you must
> build it, there is no justification whatsoever for building it without
> including a bicycle and pedestrian passage. Too many projects are
> planned for motor vehicles alone. If this project goes ahead, you must 1
> include biker and hiker access. There is no excuse for spending what
> will be tens of millions of dollars(at least) for cars and trucks
> alone. My concerns range from motor vehicle air, noise, and light
> pollution and increased congestion to 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 you to ensure that mitigations are properly
> negotiated if you bore a new hole in the Berkeley hills for highway
> 24. There is already a history of slicing, dicing and chopping up our
> cities to provide for automotive needs alone. We need to ensure
> ped/bike transportation and the safety of everyone on the ground.

> 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 but a vision years after they start.
> A pedestrian/bicycle path is under construction on the east side of
> the new Bay Bridge and engineering has been done for the western
> span. 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 highway 24 to the Iron Horse Trail and
> connecting the Bay Trail and future Delta Trail.

> I understand that CalTrans intends to build a 2 or 3 lane tube, with
> shoulders, for cars through the Caldecott Hill. You say there is no
> need to allow for bicycles and pedestrians to use the shortcut. I am
> writing to tell you that you are completely wrong. If you want to

> travel thru the Berkeley hills, the distance by car is 0.6 miles--if
> you're on foot or bicycle, you cannot go thru, but must go over--7.5
> miles up a 608-foot climb, on winding, narrow roads.

> An acoustically separated, properly ventilated and properly lighted 2
> pedestrian/bicycle tunnel should be included in the project. 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.

> Please plan a better project that serves more people and provides for
> transportation options. If you are going to spend public funds, you
> need to provide for all the public, not just cars.

Sincerely,

Bob Stern
1349 CarletonStreet
Berkeley, CA 94702

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

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

Stremmel, Bill

Bill Stremmel
<bstremmel@sbcglobal.net>
06/10/2006 10:23 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject 4th Bore "No Build" - NO alternative at all

William J. Stremmel
837 Boris Court
Walnut Creek, CA 94597-2560

Phone: (925) 932-2768
Cell: (925) 639-1446

Email: bstremmel@sbcglobal.net
alt.email: stremms@sbcglobal.net

June 8, 2006

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

RE: **Caldecott Improvement Project**

Following up my verbal comments at the June 7 hearing in Orinda, is my detailed analysis countering the utterly specious argument that a fourth vehicular bore is unnecessary because BART trains running in the direction of the "reverse commute" are not well patronized, repeated below by the editor of Bay Area Transportation News:

[BATN note: the BART tunnel through the Oakland Hills parallel to the proposed new Caldecott bore runs nearly empty trains in the "reverse commute" direction the new bore is supposed to serve.]

This argument needs to reversed to show how overly-simplistic logic can lead to false conclusions. BART has been running in the Highway 24 corridor for over 30 years. If BART really is an alternative for the thousands of truckers, service technicians, delivery workers, paratransit operators, bus drivers and auto commuters, then why are these people not riding BART instead of sitting in daily traffic jams waiting to get through the tunnel? Clearly BART is not the answer for everyone anymore than we can expect everyone to drive their own cars to major sporting events. BART can neither carry freight nor can it deliver tools needed to perform services onsite. BART cannot provide emergency access and door-to-door service for disabled passengers, for whom transfers at the stations can be very inconvenient. BART cannot even

police its system entirely via its own rails; BART police cars are frequently seen on either direction of Highway 24.

Neither BART nor any contemplated mode of light rail or bus rapid transit can be extended to the long-established developments sprawling over the Oakland-Berkeley Hills into Contra Costa County. The decision that a Fourth Bore would eventually be needed was made many generations ago when these low-density, auto-centric developments were approved. We can thank the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors for adhering to their Urban Limit Line adopted in 1990 that a fifth and a sixth bore will not be needed.

MTC's 24 Policy Advisory Committee examined a package of transit alternatives to the Fourth Bore in their deliberations during 2000. It is noteworthy that just the operating cost for the additional shuttles and trains over a span of just five years is equal to the capital cost of building a fourth bore. That doesn't even count the capital cost to purchase the buses and BART cars or the aesthetic damage from expanded parking at the BART stations. And what would there be to show for this huge investment of taxpayer dollars in system-oriented transit that cannot begin to serve the multiplicity of origins and destinations of those trips now accomplished by car? Can we honestly expect people living in the Oakland Hills to ride a shuttle down to Rockridge, then wait for a train to Orinda, and another shuttle to reach St. Mary's college in Moraga? Much more energy would be consumed and more carbon emitted into the atmosphere to operate the additional buses and trains than to simply let people drive their own cars without having to slam on the brakes as they approach the tunnel.

It is in recognition of these realities that BART's Board of Directors passed a resolution on December 5, 2000 supporting construction of a fourth vehicular bore. BART has been running in this corridor for 30 years. If it was the answer to everyone's travel needs, then everyone would be making use of the service already available. So this is not a question of road versus rail, but rather of safety, redundancy and flexibility to make modal choices based on the economic cost, environmental impact and time to accomplish the entire door-to-door trip from origin to destination.

Contrary to the contention that relieving this dangerous bottleneck will only encourage more driving and development, those whose trip origin or destination is near a BART station will continue riding BART. The loss of transit patronage feared by environmentalists and transit advocates simply is not going to happen. The private domain along the Highway 24 is already built out and virtually all of the remaining open space is either in the public domain or prohibited from being developed. So improving transportation infrastructure in this corridor cannot encourage an influx of new development, but rather will improve the quality of life for those people who are now living and working in the corridor.

These factors must be considered in the cost of keeping the existing three-bore configuration:

1. The current arrangement discriminates against reverse commuters to jobs in widely-scattered locations in Contra Costa County, for whom transit service is less convenient than those driving to work near major transit hubs in San Francisco, Oakland and Berkeley.

2. Delaying so many truckers and service people with tools who cannot possibly avail themselves of mass transit constitutes a significant economic loss.

3. Expansion of direct bus service between Alameda and Contra Costa Counties is needed to serve the many dispersed developments which are not in proximity to a BART station. It would also be a measure of redundancy during the occasional incidents disrupting BART service. However it is currently impossible to operate reliable bus service if buses get bottled up with other traffic queued up in the "reverse" direction. This delays passengers caught in the jam, and also prevents a timely backhaul for buses after they have operated westbound revenue service in the AM and eastbound revenue service in the PM.

4. The development that justifies the first expansion of the tunnel in nearly 40 years has already occurred. Failure to acknowledge this is denial of the antecedent. The people are here now and they must be accommodated.

5. There is no redundancy if an earthquake on the nearby Hayward or Wildcat Canyon faults collapses the 3 existing highway bores and the BART tunnel, all of which were constructed prior to seismic standards that have evolved over the past 30 years. BART's Berkeley Hills tunnel is a key segment specifically omitted from the seismic retrofit now underway for the rest of the BART system.

The February 16th and 23rd issues of the East Bay Express from 2005 describe the catastrophic damage certain to occur to unreinforced structures during an earthquake. They cite studies by BART's own engineers and consultants which have deemed seismic retrofitting of the Berkeley Hills Tunnel to be technically and operationally infeasible due in part to lack of any bypass redundancy for train traffic when the tunnel would have to shut down for the work. 50,000 daily passengers would have to find "another way" to accomplish their journey for up to 28 months after an earthquake. But that "other way" could not be the highway tunnels if they are also damaged by the same quake.

The existing infrastructure affords no redundancy if any of the three bores has to be shut down for maintenance or to clear accidents. Huge backups result late into the evening. Extended closure of the existing tunnels for deferred maintenance sometime in the future compels completion of this project as soon as possible.

The Caldecott Tunnel is not merely a link in the regional highway network; it is the only street between northern Alameda County and Central Contra Costa County. This essential link for all commerce and travel between central Contra Costa County and northern Alameda County would be completely severed if a 4th bore is not constructed before the inevitable 7.5 quake occurs. So the 4th Bore is necessary even if gas costs $10 a gallon.

The eight lanes of Highway 24 with generous shoulders and auxiliary lanes connecting the recently expanded interchange in Walnut Creek and the seismically retrofitted interchange in Oakland represent a tremendous investment in a facility for paratransit, ambulances, service and delivery vehicles, trucks, buses, and cars. Let's build that fourth bore and finally finish Highway

24!

Sincerely,

William J. Stremmel

wjs

Thank you for your comments.

Sugarman, Stephen

Stephen Sugarman
<sugarman@law.berkeley.edu
>
Sent by:
sugarman@law.berkeley.edu

07/29/2006 01:30 PM

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

1. I believe it is an unwise use of funds to add a bore that will do nothing to reduce the main direction commute. Instead, it may make the "reverse" commute a bit faster, but the time gain shown in the EIR is minimal in my view. 1

2. The morning reverse commute, if faster, will bring added noise to those of us who live on the Oakland side. I think that the EIR noise section is inadequate. AND the version of the EIR available on line does not provide key pages that discuss the noise issue. This is unacceptable. Those of us who live in a direct line to route 24 will be impacted by noise in ways not discussed in the EIR and not ameliorated by the measures envisioned. 2

3. I do not favor making it easier for people to drive their cars to Walnut Creek to shop. They should take BART or shop in Oakland. A faster reverse commute will be bad for Oakland business and bad for the air. 3

4. It would be much more socially beneficial to use the money to sharply decrease the BART fares -- "spare the air" days show that free public transit is better. 4

Thank you.

1- Comment noted.

2- The project would not cause perceptible increases to noise levels at receivers outside the project study area boundaries, where the roadway configuration would remain unchanged. Generally, freeway noise reaches its highest level when the traffic is heavy and yet moves at near free-flow speed. Any heavier traffic leads to congestion and, thus, lowers the noise levels.

The spiking and falloff of traffic noise already occurs daily along this corridor. Future traffic growth in the peak direction may heighten congestion, but not the traffic noise level, to above what is already in existence. In the off-peak direction, traffic would increase when the current bottleneck is removed by construction of the Preferred Alternative. However, noise generated in the peak direction would still dominate in the overall noise environment. Any incremental changes to traffic in the non-peak direction would not be noticeable to any receivers. The reason for this is that every doubling of traffic volume would raise the noise levels by no more than 3dBA. An average person can barely perceive a 3dBA change in traffic noise. The addition of 2 or 3 lanes in the non-peak direction could not possibly double the total amount of traffic already using a 6-lane freeway. Since the increased traffic could only be a fraction of the existing volume, the effect would be much less than a 3dBA increase and would not be noticeable.

3- The Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2N) of this project is included in the 2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (which conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP)) and the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and thus is in conformance with all related federal air quality requirements. The SIP is designed to be protective of human health.

4- Please see the essays on “Transit” and “Scope of the Project” in Chapter 1.

Sweiss, Fuad

fsweiss@comcast.net
()
07/08/2006 04:59 PM

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

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (fsweiss@comcast.net) on Saturday, July 8, 2006 at 16:59:09

Firstname: Fuad

Lastname: Sweiss

Phone: 510-433-1130

Fax: 510-433-0688

Address: 11 Embarcadero W, Suite 215

City: Oakland

State: ca

Zip: 94607

Comments: I strongly recommend Alternative 3N to handle future traffic loads and emergency closures. I believe that the additional cost is minimal on the long term if we consider all related factors. 1

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

Takeuchi, Toshihiko

"Toshi Takeuchi" <ttoshi@gmail.com>
07/10/2006 09:16 AM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject Pedestrian/bicycle lane for Caldecott tunnel

Dear Caltrans,

Please put a pedestrian/bicycle lane in the new bore of the Caldecott tunnel. Commute access to the East Bay is greatly hindered by lack of access via the Caldecott tunnel. 1

With rising gas prices and increased obesity in our society, we need to have access to alternate forms of transportation. The tunnel would be under a mile, while biking by alternate means requires a large climb up winding hills. It is not practical for a bicycle commuter to go that extra distance when a simple alternative exists.

The bicycle/foot access will also greatly enhance and join many systems of bicycle trails in the East Bay, allowing greater enjoyment of the outdoors for all people.

I believe that public money should be spent with the greater vision of serving the long-term interests of the greater community, which includes bicyclists, pedestrians, and commuters.

Thank you for your consideration,

Toshihiko Takeuchi
6529 Ascot Dr.
Oakland, CA 94611

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

Thompson, James W.

Gregory C. McConnell
Attention Sheryl Dorado
Department of Transportation
District 4
Environmental
Anayslis
Mail Station 8B
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623

Dear Mr. McConell:

In regard to a fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel in Oakland/Orinda, I wish to voice my complete support. This project is long overdue.

There are at least 4 issues that support the prompt completion of a fourth bore. They are:

1. Environmental
2. Traffic flow
3. Public safety
4. Future population and traffic growth

In regard to the environmental considerations, I believe it is obvious to anyone who frequents this route that they will be inhaling less carbon monoxide while waiting to pass through the tunnel on the off-hours (hours when there is only one tube access). This buildup of pollutants affects not just the drivers, but the residents, too - especially on the Oakland side of the mountain.

Traffic flow will be greatly enhanced, eliminating the huge backup experienced daily.

Public safety will be enhanced, too. This tunnel is notorious for accidents and has many deaths to its credit. Merging is a nightmare. Lives would definitely be saved by a fourth bore.

Pressure is already mounting for new homes in the area. A huge project has been offered on the Orinda side of the mountain and it should be only a matter of time before a project is passed. Even without this project, homes are being built on both sides of the mountain and population is growing, placing ever more pressure on the tunnel. The only responsible answer is a fourth bore.

Finally, I would like to put my vote in for a three lane fourth bore. It can only help matters, unless the cost is prohibitive. 1

Cordially,

James W. Thompson
1059 Longridge Rd.
Oakland, CA 94610

Sunday, June 04, 2006 America Online: Tptnnis

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

Thompson, Richard C.

"Thompson, Richard C. @ Oakland" <Richard.Thompson@cbre.com>
06/12/2006 09:22 AM

To <caldecott_public_comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Caldecott Tunnel - Additional Bores

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a resident of Moraga and I work in Oakland. I favor the addition of the maximum number of additional bores possible. 1

Respectfully,

Richard C. Thompson
344 Fernwood Drive'
Moraga, CA 94556

Richard C. Thompson | First Vice President
Investment Properties | Multi-Housing Group
CB Richard Ellis | Capital Markets
555 12th Street, Suite 900 | Oakland, CA 94607
T510 874 1973 | F 510 834 9158
richard.thompson@cbre.com | www.cbre.com

This email may contain information that is confidential or attorney-client privileged and may constitute inside information. The contents of this email are intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are directed not to read, disclose, distribute or otherwise use this transmission. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the transmission. Delivery of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privileges.

1- Thank you for your comments. The current project is considering only one additional bore. Alternative 2N has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Please see the essay on "Preferred Alternative" in Chapter 1.

Ting, Jan

"Jantrue Ting" <jantrueting@hotmail.com>
07/10/2006 11:11 AM

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

Dear Caltrans,

The Caldecott tunnel 4th bore project should include a bicycle/pedestrian pathway. 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. 1

With this project, Caltrans has an opportunity to improve the regional bicycle and pedestrian transportation system. Please ensure that it does not pass this opportunity by. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jan Ting
1442 11th Ave Apt C
San Francisco, CA 94122

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

Torney, Anne

Anne Torney <ATorney@SolomonETC-WRT.com>
07/10/2006 10:07 AM

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

I am outraged that public money is being used to add a bore to the Caldecott Tunnel without adding a safe viable route for bicycles and pedestrians. The route over the hills is far longer and way to hilly to seriously encourage use. Not adding a bike/ped lane in the tunnel is extremely short-sighted. It is crucial that pedestrian and bike traffic is regionalized and that Contra Costa and Alameda County are connected. The Bay Area is paralyzed by car traffic and this will continue unless options are provided and public money is used to encourage alternative modes. 1

Regards,

Anne Torney
2510 1/2 Etna Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

----wrtmail--%3423wrt%---- 1-

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

Torres, Mark

mtorres12@earthlink.net ()
07/12/2006 07:11 PM

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

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (mtorres12@earthlink.net) on Wednesday, July 12, 2006 at 19:11:55

Firstname: Mark

Lastname: Torres

Phone: 925 687-2817

Address: 2398 Walters Way, # 11

City: Concord

State: CA

Zip: 94520

Comments: Please consider upgrading AM radio reception in the tunnel. Right now it is terrible. Good reception can provide vital information if cars get stuck in the tunnel itself. 1

Thanks,

Mark Torres

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

Treacy, Chris

"Christopher Treacy"
<ctreacy@globix.com>
06/27/2006 01:56 PM

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

This project should move forward to ease congestion on 24.

Cheers,
Chris Treacy

Thank you for your comment.

Turnbull, Sandra

Turnbull
<gstk@sbcglobal.net>
07/18/2006 06:26 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern:

Given the inevitability of this project, here are my comments and concerns:

1. The present east direction morning backup on HW24 which spills over onto HW13 north presents an unnecessary bottleneck and burden for local drivers trying to exit off HW13 at both Thornhill and Broadway Terrace. Given that the exit lanes are too short, please consider permitting local traffic to use the right shoulder for exiting. This would be similar to what takes place at Park on HW580. 1

2. At least two lanes of traffic should be developed to provide greater queuing capacity for the HW13 north to HW24 east merge and the cross over problem should be remedied concerning drivers trying to get from HW13 north to HW24 west. 2

3. One of the tunnels should include provisions for the pedestrian and biking community so that other entities besides vehicles can use this route to connect to the Contra Costa bike trails already in existence. 3

4. Consider using some of the excavation materials to fill between the dual barriers installed on HW13 to minimize how far this material must be transported. Alternatively, some of it could be used to help develop contours that could be used for a BMX park or skatepark up at the Caldecott Park (or other nearby open space location). 4

5. Please provide a notification system for when any explosives are used for excavation so that when we hear and feel excessive earth vibration, a rumble or shake we know it isn't an earthquake. 5

Thank you for considering these.
Sandra Turnbull
143 Taurus Ave
Oakland CA 94611
510-655-3153

1 and 2- The construction of the Caldecott tunnel will result in four free flowing lanes in the eastbound and westbound direction. Merging will no longer take place, and eastbound and westbound traffic conditions should improve.

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

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

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

Whether the spoils are reused as imported fill or disposed of at a landfill, the material will be handled in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations promulgated by federal, state, and local agencies. For example, landfill waste characterization will be governed by Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and the federal parameters defined under the Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); additionally, reuse

as imported fill should satisfy guidelines established by, amongst others, the State Water Resources Control Board acting through its regional water quality control boards.

We anticipate that some will be used for a berm noise barrier adjacent to Caldecott Lane, State Route 24, westbound direction. If the City of Oakland requests fill to be used for a BMX park or skate park at Caldecott park, then Caltrans will work with the Contractor and the city.

5- Public outreach will be used to assure that nearby residents are informed of any planned blasting. Please see the essay on "Construction Impacts" in Chapter 1.

Udaltsova, Natalia

Natalia Udaltsova
<udanat@yahoo.com>
07/25/2006 04:30 PM

To Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov
cc
bcc
Subject The Caldecott Tunnel needs to have bike/pedestrian lanes

Caldecott Tunnel has to have access for pedestrians and bikes!
We need a bike/ped segment acoustically separated, properly ventilated and lighted! IT WILL BE USED!!! 1-Pnlu
Please complete a bike/pedestrian trail and connect San Francisco/Oakland and Walnut Creek!
Natalia Udaltsova, Ph.D.,
live in Walnut Creek, work in Oakland 1

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.

Ullmann, Joel

"Joel Ullmann"
<joelullmann@yahoo.com>
06/27/2006 09:29 PM

To <Caldecott_Public_Comments@dot.ca.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Fourth Bore - No!

I'm writing to express my concern with the proposed fourth bore in the Caldecott Tunnel. I feel that the burden of the additional bore will most be born by the Oakland/Berkeley residents while Contra Costa County will get most of the benefits. In addition I'm concerned with the proposed 5 years of construction and the noise, air and traffic pollution it will cause, most of it in and around my neighborhood and most troubling very close to our elementary school, Chabot Elementary. I am firmly opposed to the fourth bore project especially with the proposed construction plan.

Joel Ullmann, M.B.A.
6738 Manor Crest
Oakland, CA 94618

Please see the essays on "Construction Impacts" and "Project Study Area Boundaries" in Chapter 1.