

CALDECOTT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT



Final Scoping Summary Report

February 2003

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
 - A. Project Description
 - B. Purpose of Scoping Process
 - C. Noticing and Publicity
 - D. Scoping Meetings
 - E. Scoping Comment Overview

- II. Summary of Key Issues Raised
 - A. Scope of Study
 - B. Tunnel Alternatives
 - C. Process
 - D. Traffic and Safety
 - E. Transit
 - F. Bike and Pedestrian
 - G. Noise
 - H. Operational
 - I. Strongly Favor
 - J. Strongly Oppose

- III. Appendices (available on request)
 - A. Noticing Materials:
 - Notice of Preparation (NOP)
 - Notice of Intent (NOI)
 - Initial Study
 - Letter to Elected Officials
 - Letter to Agency Representatives
 - Newspaper Articles
 - Display Advertisements
 - Public Scoping Meeting Notice
 - Website Announcement
 - B. Meeting Presentation:
 - Information Boards
 - February 5, 2003 Agency Scoping Meeting Summary
 - C. Meeting Materials:
 - Scoping Meeting Programs
 - Comment Cards
 - D. Sign-in Sheets
 - E. Scoping Comments
 - F. Photographs

I. Introduction

- A. Project Description
- B. Purpose of Scoping Process
- C. Noticing and Publicity
- D. Scoping Meetings
- E. Scoping Comment Overview

I. Introduction

A. Project Description

The California Department of Transportation (the Department) proposes improvements needed to reduce congestion and improve mobility at and near the Caldecott Tunnel along State Route (SR) 24. Working with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Department will study and evaluate a range of proposed alternatives for the project area located on SR 24 on the border of Alameda and Contra Costa counties. Preliminary alternatives may include one or more of the following: roadway improvements; transit improvements; and a fourth tunnel. A “no project” alternative will also be considered.

The existing Caldecott Tunnel has three bores, with each bore having two mixed-flow lanes. Bore one (southern) serves the eastbound traffic and the third bore (northern) serves the westbound traffic. The second bore (center) is reversible and is used to serve westbound commuters during the morning rush hour and eastbound commuters during the evening commute periods on weekdays.

The Department and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) prepared studies addressing how to improve mobility along the SR 24 Corridor. These studies recommended strategies that included transit improvements and a fourth tunnel. Additionally, the Caldecott Improvement Project meets an identified need as outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan.

The study area encompasses the region spanning from Interstate (I) 580 to I-680 on SR 24 and the specific project area spans from Camino Pablo in Orinda to Broadway in Oakland. State Route 24 extends approximately 6.2 miles (10 kilometers) from the I-580 interchange to the Alameda/Contra Costa County lines and approximately 8.8 miles (14.2 kilometers) in Contra Costa County to the I-680 interchange. State Route 24 serves as a major transportation corridor between I-580 and I-80 in Alameda County and I-680 and SR 242/SR 4 in Contra Costa County. Additionally, SR 24 serves as a local highway in portions of the cities of Berkeley, Lafayette, Oakland, Orinda, and Walnut Creek.

B. Purpose of Scoping Process

Federal and state laws require a formal review of projects that may affect the environment. The federal law, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the state law, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A joint document that fulfills both requirements will be prepared to identify short-term impacts related to project construction and long-term issues of the completed project.

The EIS/EIR will describe the alternatives, existing environmental setting, potential impacts during construction and operation, and mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate potential environmental impacts.

The process of determining the scope and focus of the project is known as “scoping.” The scoping process allows agencies and other interested parties to provide input on the proposed

alternatives, topics being evaluated, and potential impacts and mitigation measures being considered. As part of the scoping process, the Department conducted agency and public scoping meetings to solicit input. Written comments were also accepted throughout the scoping period.

C. Noticing and Publicity

For the Caldecott Improvement Project, the scoping process began with formal agency notification. On November 6, 2002, the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed to advise interested agencies and the public that an Environmental Impact Report would be prepared. On November 21, 2002, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register to advise interested agencies and the public that an EIS would be prepared.

The scoping process was marked by two agency and three public scoping meetings that took place throughout the project area. All CEQA and NEPA requirements were met to inform the public of the scoping process. Additionally, a project mailing list was compiled, which included more than 1700 property owners, elected officials, city staff, special interest organizations, libraries, and neighborhood groups. A sample of the letter mailed to agency representatives and elected officials, as well as the public scoping meeting notice, are included in the appendices. Various invitations were followed up with emails or phone calls.

Information pertaining to the scoping meetings also appeared on the project website at www.caldecott-tunnel.com. An interim site announced scoping process information for several weeks prior to the permanent project website becoming available on January 15, 2003. Two articles appeared on December 14, 2002 in the *Oakland Tribune* entitled, "Caldecott Tunnel Comments Wanted" and on January 4, 2003 in the *Rockridge News* entitled "Caldecott Planning: Hurry for Input at Final Caltrans Scoping Meeting," which further promoted the scoping process and were a direct result of community outreach efforts.

Display advertisements announcing the public scoping meetings were submitted to the Contra Costa Times and the ANG Group for Sunday, December 1 and Sunday, December 8, 2002. The Contra Costa Times ran the advertisement, which is contained in the appendices.

During the scoping process a number of telephone conversations and meetings were held with interested parties including: AC Transit, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), City of Berkeley, City of Oakland, City of Orinda, City of Walnut Creek, Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, and the MTC.

D. Scoping Meetings

The first agency scoping meeting and the public scoping meetings were organized in an open-house format. Attendees were invited to examine 17 informational boards posted around the room and talk to the Caldecott Improvement Team regarding specific issues or to offer comments. At the second agency scoping meeting, brief presentations were given and the format of the meeting consisted of a round table discussion.

The meetings provided a forum for attendees to learn about the project, the environmental process, scoping, and initial project alternatives. Written and verbal comments were accepted at the meetings and also via mail and fax until February 14, 2003.

The agency scoping meetings were held at Caltrans District 4 on December 3, 2002 and February 5, 2003. A total of 27 agency representatives attended the meetings (18 on December 3rd and 9 on February 5th).

The public scoping meetings were held in three different locations throughout the project area, one in Contra Costa County and two in Alameda County. The first meeting was held on December 11, 2002 at the Orinda Masonic Center in Orinda and attracted an attendance of 35 people. The second meeting was on December 12, 2002 at the MetroCenter in Oakland and attracted 22 people, many of who were attending the bicycle workshop in the same location. The third meeting was held on January 9, 2003 at the Peralta Elementary School in Oakland and drew 28 people.

At the second agency scoping meeting on February 5, 2003, the Department provided agencies with background project information, a description of the environmental review process, and an update of the scoping process to date. Attendees were informed that additional agency scoping comments would be accepted through February 14, 2003. A summary of this meeting appears in the appendix.

E. Scoping Comment Overview

The Department received 85 written comment letters and cards during the scoping period. Letters and comment cards typically included comments on multiple issues. Divided by issue and added to the verbal comments communicated to the project team, the number of comments received totaled 338.

Letter	Comment Card	Scoping Meeting Verbal	Scoping Meeting Dictated	Total Comments
133	99	41	65	338

Many people provided feedback on a variety of topics. Therefore, there are more comments than comment cards and letters. Also, some comments appear in more than one category. The majority of comments can be categorized into ten topic areas that include: Scope of Study, Tunnel Alternatives, Process, Traffic and Safety, Transit, Bike and Pedestrian, Noise, Operational, Strongly Favor, and Strongly Oppose.

Scope of Study	Tunnel Alternatives	Process	Traffic and Safety	Transit	Bike and Pedestrian	Noise	Operational
44	39	33	24	53	25	37	44

Support	Oppose
26	13

Several interest groups submitted formal letters with recommendations and preferences. The following is a list of agencies and groups that submitted written comments:

- Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District
- Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
- Bay Area Rapid Transit District
- Bay Area Quality Management District
- Bike for a Better City
- California Transportation Commission
- City of Lafayette
- City of Oakland
- City of Orinda
- Contra Costa Board of Supervisors
- Department of the Navy
- East Bay Bike Coalition
- East Bay Regional Park District
- Hiller Highlands Four Association
- League of Women Voters of the Bay Area
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- North Hills Landscape Committee
- North Hills Phoenix Association
- Rockridge Community Planning Council
- US Department of the Interior – Fish and Wildlife Service
- United States Environmental Protection Agency

In addition, 58 individual citizens submitted written comments. See the appendix for copies of all written comments.

II. Summary of Key Issues Raised

- A. Scope of Study
- B. Tunnel Alternatives
- C. Process
- D. Traffic and Safety
- E. Transit
- F. Bike and Pedestrian
- G. Noise
- H. Operational
- I. Strongly Favor
- J. Strongly Oppose

II. Summary of Key Issues Raised

The following chart outlines all of the comments, both written and verbal, received during the scoping period. A strong effort was made to capture as much feedback as possible. Written comments were received at meetings, via fax, or mailed to the Department. Verbal comments were recorded by the Caldecott Improvement Project Team at the scoping meetings (Scoping Meeting Verbal), or the comments were dictated onto the comment board at the meetings (Scoping Meeting Dictated). As mentioned above, some comments address more than one issue and appear in more than one category.

Comments have been placed in chronological order in order of receipt within the following categories:

- A. Scope of Study
- B. Tunnel Alternatives
- C. Process
- D. Traffic and Safety
- E. Transit
- F. Bike and Pedestrian
- G. Noise
- H. Operational
- I. Strongly Favor
- J. Strongly Oppose

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
A. Scope of Study			
26-Nov-02	Explain species responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act.	Government Agency	Letter
3-Dec-02	Recognize importance of commerce.	Government Agency	Comment Card
3-Dec-02	Pleased that actual traffic data would be used to calibrate (validate) the forecast model.	Government Agency	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	Not aware of the project limits go beyond the tunnels. (ie. as potential new lane(s) east or west of the tunnels)	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	Pleased with the intersections that were selected and would like input into the scope for the EIS.	Government Agency	Scoping Meeting Dictated
4-Dec-02	Consider integrating land use along SR24 to minimize air, water, and noise pollution.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
4-Dec-02	Examine landscape vegetation because of risk of fire along the freeway.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
11-Dec-02	The Temescal-Tunnel Road bicycle bridge is not included in the study.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Designate all of Highway 24 as I-980, this might help the funding.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
6-Jan-03	Park service has a number of concerns they would like addressed in the EIR.	Special Interest	Letter
6-Jan-03	Fourth bore would decimate freeway landscaping efforts.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	Impact assessment must consider economic impact to decreased usage of mass transit and long range impacts to low-income residents.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Impact assessment must consider surrounding communities.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Try all the good alternatives before building a fourth bore. Concerned about a fourth bore because of increased traffic, pollution, and environmental damage.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Enlarge area of environmental mitigation.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	Study of tolls should extend to single-occupant vehicles.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	Concerned about objectivity of study – a person who works in the tunnel appeared at Rotary and said that the fourth bore is moving forward.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
21-Jan-03	Suggested that the EIR consider traffic impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and include transit improvements.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Do not restudy alternatives that were discarded in the MTC study.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Use the completed MTC study from January 2001 as the basis for the EIR.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Address how the changes in the tunnel's configuration might impact the rate of growth in Lamorinda.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Address how not building a tunnel would impact the environment ie. Air quality and congestion.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Caltrans should consider implementing the short-term strategies identified in the MTC study.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Suggested that the MTC study may serve as a guide for the environmental document.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	It seems that studying elements that had already been screened out in the Corridor process would be costly and inefficient.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Critical to consider local input in the development of the mitigation measures, ie. Noise impact and mitigation measures.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Project alternatives should only include: no build, transportation systems management, two-lane roadway with standard shoulders on north side, bikeway tunnel, and mass transit.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Review the Orinda General Plan as part of the environmental process.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Assess the impacts on the outdoor Shakespeare amphitheatre located at the Gateway offramp.	Government Agency	Letter
27-Jan-03	Urged Caltrans to consider impacts on residents of Hiller Highlands.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
29-Jan-03	Study should include effects of additional tunnel on I-680 South through San Ramon.	Government Agency	Letter

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
29-Jan-03	Study should include enhanced transit services such as HOV lanes, metering, and Park & Ride facilities.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Study should consider impacts of two and four lane fourth bore.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Examine and quantify impacts of each alternative on transit ridership and revenues.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Analyze growth and land use impacts of each alternative along the entire Route 24 corridor.	Government Agency	Letter
30-Jan-03	Proposed that impact on Contra Costa residents be included in the study.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
30-Jan-03	Proposed a funding program for negatively impacted residents to obtain insulation for their homes.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
30-Jan-03	The EIR/EIS should identify air quality impacts and mitigation measures.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Consider an all-lane tolling option with an HOV toll plaza bypass lane.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Address as a fourth bore mitigation, costs of constructing the proposed BART line that would bypass downtown Oakland.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Include the MacArthur and the I-680/SR24 interchanges in the analysis and discuss how reduced Caldecott delays may adversely impact these interchanges.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Pleased to note that a Mass Transit alternative is being considered. Transit opportunities should be studied as part of other alternatives as well.	Government Agency	Letter
30-Jan-03	Expansion of the Caldecott Tunnel should be consistent with other locally adopted plans.	Government Agency	Letter
5-Feb-03	Request that the EIR include impacts to the Temescal facility at the Southwest corner of the Highway 24/13 intersection.	Government Agency	Letter
13-Feb-03	Advised that the EIS include: purpose and need, alternatives, indirect impacts, air quality, water quality, and cumulative impact analysis.	Government Agency	Letter
B. Tunnel Alternatives			
2-Dec-02	Create a fourth bore as large as possible. Recommended 8 lanes.	Business	Letter

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
3-Dec-02	Concerned about the amount of highway alternatives (large physical presence) we had compared to the very small amount of work that was displayed for non-highway alternatives. Consider more detail out of the MTC study and larger boards made with more specifics of non-highway alternatives would alleviate this.	Government Agency	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	In favor of adding 3-4 lane bore and prefer South alignment.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Can mining start from East side rather than having 4-5 years of construction in front of our houses?	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Prefer 4-lane tunnel option.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Put in a diamond lane starting on 24 through the tunnel to the toll plaza.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Support 3-lane South alignment.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Recommend a 2-lane bore on the North side and enlarge one of the existing bores.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Interested in a fourth bore with exit going East on Fish Ranch Road.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Build the fourth bore with 2 lanes and improve existing South bore.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Support construction of another bore based on dramatically increased traffic in both directions in last 18 months.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Make sure you do something to improve the situation, possibly another bore.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	The two-lane option is probably the least expensive.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Prefers construction on North side because of right of way ownership.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	One person suggested two-lane north bore only.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	One person suggested SR13 onto separate bore.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
11-Dec-02	Support construction of another bore based on dramatically increased traffic in both directions in last 18 months.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
12-Dec-02	Consider adding a lane to the existing North and South tunnels.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Provide 24-hour human powered access.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
12-Dec-02	All lane tolling, consider this as an alternative – how much would people be willing to pay?	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
12-Dec-02	Environmental justice and economics of “hot lanes.”	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
12-Dec-02	Use “BATLUC” alternative to MTC model.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
12-Dec-02	One person asked about widening existing bores.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
15-Dec-02	Double deck the center bore.	Business	Letter
17-Dec-02	Strongly support at least two more bores.	Interested Citizen	Letter
26-Dec-02	Supports a fourth bore with equal lanes going in as there are coming out.	Interested Citizen	Letter
28-Dec-02	Strong support for building a fourth tunnel with three lanes.	Interested Citizen	Letter
3-Jan-03	Strong support for building a fourth tunnel.	Interested Citizen	Letter
9-Jan-03	Extra lane going East to Park Woods when tunnel is blocked, need dedicated lane.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Strongly supports four lanes in each direction. Reverse and non-commuters are getting shafted.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Consider closing the Westbound exit for Shakespeare Festival Way.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Clearly, traffic congestion around the tunnel needs to be addressed. The North alignment seems the least costly and negatively impactful.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	Try all the good alternatives before building a fourth bore. Concerned about a fourth bore because of increased traffic, pollution, and environmental damage.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Opposed to widening Highway 24, but can accept construction of a new bore.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Now reverse commuters are getting shafted.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
22-Jan-03	Project alternatives should only include: no build, transportation systems management, two-lane roadway with standard shoulders on north side, bikeway tunnel, and mass transit.	Government Agency	Letter
26-Jan-03	Caltrans should donate the land near the North Oakland Sports Complex for open space.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	A fourth bore is the most desirable and most needed alternative. The no project alternative is an undesirable option.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Adding a another tunnel or adding new highway lanes is only a short-term solution.	Special Interest	Letter
C. Process			
23-Nov-02	Move to get this job done, any delay means wasted fuel and more smog.	Interested Citizen	Letter
3-Dec-02	Thought that a fourth bore tunnel had already been decided upon. Seems like process is starting over.	Government Agency	Comment Card
3-Dec-02	Two people commented that they liked the Caldecott Improvement Project logo because it is consistent with the graphics on the tunnel.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	There was concern that the current budget deficit would keep the project from moving forward.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	Some people expressed frustration that the tunnel has to be studied again in order to design and construct it.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	There was a request to have team personnel listed on the Internet web site.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	There was a request for a formal presentation at the beginning of the agency scoping meeting to brief attendees.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	One visitor thought that our presentation boards indicated a predisposition for the build alternatives.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
3-Dec-02	Someone asked how coordination will be done with upper management at the Cities, other departments, and politicians, ie. What forum can city staff use to stay involved?	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Recommend removing the scoping board entitled "Bicycle/Pedestrian Access", ideas not supported by the bicycle community.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Sooner is better.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Process is too slow.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Start construction in two years or as soon as possible.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
12-Dec-02	Sudden appearance of the fourth bore on the MTC RFP is questionable.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
18-Dec-02	Concerned that the process is inefficient and redundant to the MTC RTP 2001 study.	Government Agency	Letter
18-Dec-02	Questioned rationale of examining alternatives to the fourth bore.	Government Agency	Letter
2-Jan-03	Concurs with sentiments of Mr. Brittle in his December 18, 2002 letter.	Government Agency	Letter
6-Jan-03	Opposes the fourth bore for a number of reasons and urges an objective decision process.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
8-Jan-03	Formal opposition to fourth bore and stressed objectivity of EIS/EIR process.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	Meeting should be held at Kaiser School, Peralta School is hard to reach.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Hopes for combined meetings for discussion. Public transit and feeder service to BART should be highest priority.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Imperative to construct a fourth tunnel designed to the highest geo-technical standards.	Government Agency	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Suggested that Caltrans continually involve the local community in the process.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	Think of better uses for \$350,000,000.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	One person expressed their thought that the cost is high.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	Some people not happy with meeting format, wanted a formal presentation and an opportunity to debate and hear others.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	Concerned about objectivity of study – a person who works for the Department appeared at Rotary and said that the fourth bore is moving forward.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	One person questioned how the process includes Contra Costa citizens.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	Concern that the project is being done for regular commuters and not reverse commuters.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
22-Jan-03	Caltrans should consider implementing the short-term strategies identified in the MTC study.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Suggested that the MTC study may serve as a guide for the environmental document.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	It seems that studying elements that had already been screened out in the Corridor process would be costly and inefficient.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Critical to consider local input in the development of the mitigation measures, ie. Noise impact and mitigation measures.	Government Agency	Letter
13-Feb-03	Suggested that an additional permit may be necessary regarding water resources and drainage in the project area.	Government Agency	Letter
D. Traffic and Safety			
3-Dec-02	Acquire information on weekend traffic in both directions.	Government Agency	Comment Card
3-Dec-02	Suggested reviewing existing traffic conditions since there are several different perspectives about what the actual condition is.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	Concerned about analyzing increased vehicle trips "induced" by the project; e.g., more people likely to use SR 24 and the Caldecott Tunnel if they know that there will not be a backup.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	One person was not aware that the project includes looking at traffic problems in addition to the reverse commute. (However, they understood the purpose and need was to solve the reverse commute as per the MTC study.)	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
3-Dec-02	Specific questions were asked regarding what traffic model is being used. A preference for real field data to expressed, (ie. do not trust models), asked how the vehicle occupancy rate was determined, how the queues were determined and how the speed profiles were determined.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	Concerned about potential diversion or attraction to San Pablo from the north to go west with the new tunnel. Contra Costa County staff looking for solutions at the 24/680 interchange, concerned about additional impact to the east to north connector.	Government Agency	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	Concerns that alleviating a bottleneck at the tunnel would create downstream problems and in a sense, result in no benefit overall.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
3-Dec-02	Reduce reverse commute delays.	Government Agency	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Was asked: Why not do more transit not highway improvements?	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Slow/stopped traffic is bad for air quality.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
12-Dec-02	End traffic congestion and accidents.	Special Interest	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Question certain transit mitigation – expanding BART service from Baypoint to Fremont does not seem sensible.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
15-Dec-02	Increase BART parking without fees.	Business	Letter
30-Dec-02	Not a question of road versus rail. Tolls can be varied by time of day and levied only in the wesbound direction to reduce delays.	Interested Citizen	Letter
6-Jan-03	Fourth bore would undermine ridership and revenues of public transit and encourage residents to drive their cars.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	Clearly, traffic congestion around the tunnel needs to be addressed. The North alignment seems the least costly and negatively impactful.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Transit cannot serve all of the needs of independent lifestyles.	Government Agency	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Congestion problem; we need to get rid of congestion and move about in a civilized manner.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Automobile use is very costly.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	One person recommended subsidizing BART fares by parking fees.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	One person felt that people will not get out of their cars unless forced.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
21-Jan-03	Suggested that the EIR consider traffic impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and included transit improvements.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Concerned that the tunnel will divert traffic from the East side to the West side.	Government Agency	Letter
30-Jan-03	Transit improvements such as extra traffic lights can help alleviate congestion on city feeder streets.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
30-Jan-03	Concerned about new bore impacts on traffic on freeways and on arterial streets.	Government Agency	Letter
30-Jan-03	Concerned that added tunnel capacity will lead to peak direction traffic.	Government Agency	Letter
31-Jan-03	Consider impacts caused by diverted traffic to adjacent neighborhoods.	Government Agency	Letter
E. Transit			
11-Dec-02	Improve access to BART and bus transportation, bicycle parking at BART and bus terminals.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Consider a Park and Ride as part of mitigation.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Widen BART tube between Orinda and Rockridge, 2 tracks each way.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Put a power booster inside the BART tube to keep it powered.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Convert all buses to natural gas and buy new buses that are only natural gas.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Give adequate weight to transit options. Would like to see data included in the alternatives that look at non-single driver automobiles.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Concerned that there may be money for a fourth bore, but not for transit improvements.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
11-Dec-02	Enlarge BART tunnel between Orinda and Rockridge	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Non-rush hour consideration is important to businesses.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	One person commented that they would rather see another BART tunnel than another car tunnel.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	One person commented that transit is the answer, but it won't work unless people are forced to use it.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Was asked: What are the historical traffic congestion trends of the past ten years?	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Was asked: How does the tunnel compare to the Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge regarding total daily traffic?	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Concerned about cut through traffic onto the ramp at Camino Pablo with a new tunnel.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Concern expressed about more off ramp traffic at the Camino Pablo off ramp.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
12-Dec-02	Strongly opposed to more bores, but supports investing funds in alternatives to the automobile.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Traffic improvements on local streets ie. Broadway, Claremont, Telegraph, and Pleasant Hill Road since no capacity increases are planned at "the maze."	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
6-Jan-03	Add BART parking.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	BART should be the future of transportation in the Bay Area, double deck all BART parking lots.	Interested Citizen	Letter
9-Jan-03	Hopes for combined meetings for discussion. Public transit and feeder service to BART should be highest priority.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Provisions for transit other than automobile options should be increased.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Consider equal and greater expense for subsidy of transit infrastructure ie. Bus systems, 24-hour BART and more frequent trains.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Toll existing system to subsidize and improve mass transit to reduce congestion.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	Study of tolls should extend to single-occupant vehicles.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	The most efficient way to move people is rail; after rail, good, safe buses.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Clean, fast, relatively cheap transit is needed.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Spend more money on transit - less use of car.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Tolls should be considered via plaza on all west bound lanes approaching Caldecott on the Orinda side for three reasons: float a bond issue to get construction underway much sooner than relying on cash-starved state and municipal agencies, mitigate any potential traffic inducement and give buses a time advantage by allowing them to bypass toll gates, long-term revenue source to finance eventual light-rail connection between Cal. Berkeley campus and Orinda BART.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	A request was expressed not to expand highways, public transit is preferred.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	A request to consider that the Lafayette BART station parking lot is full.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
22-Jan-03	Include BART system in the analysis.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Study should include affects of additional tunnel on I-680 South through San Ramon.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Study should include enhanced transit services such as HOV lanes, metering, and Park & Ride facilities.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Widen the Camino Pablo interchange and add an auxillary lane on 24 from 13.	Business	Comment Card
29-Jan-03	Development of a new road is a temporary solution. Focus development on mass transit, relocation of businesses, alternative work schedules etc.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
29-Jan-03	Need to integrate transit coordination and land development.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Increased auto use affects life style, social equity, cost of health related to auto use, mobility for transit dependent people, and improving the environment.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Consider impact of increased transit service compared with the impact of an additional bore. Mitigation should include new land for a park, additional buses, and BART service.	Government Agency	Letter

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
29-Jan-03	Recognize that BART could be part of the solution because reverse-peak and off-peak trains are underutilized.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Examine strengthening bus and shuttle connections from BART to employment sites in Contra Costa County.	Government Agency	Letter
29-Jan-03	Examine and quantify impacts of each alternative on transit ridership and revenues.	Government Agency	Letter
30-Jan-03	Recommends improving existing Route 24 corridor to handle more transit passengers and make it easier for cyclists and pedestrians greater access to transit services.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Employ express bus service if BART cannot accommodate 24-hour transit service.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Express bus service on dedicated HOV lanes should be included in the study.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Recommends the no project alternative, rather, put those dollars into maintenance and transit alternatives.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
30-Jan-03	Increasing BART trains and parking to meet demand is a logical step.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
30-Jan-03	Recommend improved transit service rather than a fourth bore.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Address how reductions in BART service and increased fares adversely impact transit service in the corridor.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Pleased to note that a Mass Transit alternative is being considered. Transit opportunities should be studied as part of other alternatives as well.	Government Agency	Letter
31-Jan-03	Impacts and mitigation resulting from the fourth bore to the Metropolitan Transportation System highway and transit networks should be addressed for future conditions.	Government Agency	Letter
F. Bike and Pedestrian			
4-Dec-02	Include pedestrian crosswalk over Highway 13.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
11-Dec-02	Planning funds can be used more effectively by consulting with the bicycling community.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	"Bicycle issues" do not portray views of the cycling community.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
11-Dec-02	Improve access to BART and bus transportation, bicycle parking at BART and bus terminals.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Recommend removing the scoping board entitled "Bicycle/Pedestrian Access", ideas not supported by the bicycle community.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Consider the old Kennedy Tunnel as a bike and pedestrian crossing.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Add a bike lane on the existing Fish Ranch Road.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Build bicycle trail from Fish Ranch Road to Orinda on Route 24.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Study bicycle options.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	One person expressed concern that there is no bike bore.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Consider Bike access between Gateway and Fish Ranch.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
12-Dec-02	Ensure bicycle access through multiple options including BART, new tunnel, and hill route.	Special Interest	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Include bicycle access.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Consider bicycle access. Kennedy Tunnel is not a solution.	Special Interest	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Walking should be the basic transportation building block for development.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Improve access for cyclists and invest in other non-automobile alternatives.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Asked that the new tunnel be bicycle friendly.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	A Montclair cyclist, offered three comments: complete bike connection across 24 and 13, use air vent in tunnels, and provide security as at Golden Gate Bridge.	Interested Citizen	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	Allow people to cross street on Tunnel Road by Miller Drive.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	Provide bike and pedestrian connection from Lake Temescal at Highway 13.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
23-Jan-03	Bike access is important, but sharing the tunnel with cars is loud and the air quality poor. Recommended more BART and bus opportunities for cyclists.	Special Interest	Letter
26-Jan-03	Build a bike and pedestrian bridge at Highway 13.	Interested Citizen	Letter
29-Jan-03	Another bore is a must, but bike access is not necessary.	Business	Comment Card
30-Jan-03	Provide bike access in a separate, non-motorized facility and include proper ventilation.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Recommends improving existing Route 24 corridor to handle more transit passengers and make it easier for cyclists and pedestrians greater access to transit services.	Special Interest	Letter
G. Noise			
3-Dec-02	El Toyonal area, north of SR 24 in Orinda - Noticed that this residential area was not identified as a "noise sensitive" area on the map on the environmental board. Questioned why not.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
4-Dec-02	Consider integrating land use along SR24 to minimize air, water, and noise pollution.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
4-Dec-02	Study the effects of fourth bore on traffic noise.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
4-Dec-02	Concerned about excess noise during construction.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
4-Dec-02	Consider asphalt resurfacing to minimize noise on freeway.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
11-Dec-02	Noise sensitive areas should include the whole canyon.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Need to reduce noise generated from tunnel West side of tunnel North of Highway.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Need an acoustical consultant to address noise issues.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Favor new bore, but need noise mitigation measures.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
11-Dec-02	Concerned with existing and increased noise from Highway 24 traffic. Consider noise reducing surface material, sound walls, or sound deadening vegetation.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Reduce noise level on Route 24.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Study noise impacts on nearby homes on the West side.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	A request to consider noise impacts.	Government Agency	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Consider noise around newly built condos near Caldecott Tunnel.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Need to study noise impacts throughout Orinda and look at construction noise.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Resident of West Side Hills, is concerned about noise and eucalyptus trees.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Consider the noise on the corridor and quieting the roadway.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
12-Dec-02	Criteria for noise should be 3dba.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Evaluate sound impacts in North Oakland.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
6-Jan-03	Concerned about noise levels.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
9-Jan-03	Some concern expressed about impact on west-side of tunnel ie. Noise, views.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	Opposes the fourth bore because of noise, air pollutants, and increased traffic.	Interested Citizen	Letter
9-Jan-03	Back up alert for trucks too noisy for neighbors.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Noise area on charts is too small.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Consider air quality and noise generation impacts in DEIS.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	Concerned about expanding the freeway in our neighborhood, additional noise due to high speed volume.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Inquiry about sound walls or sound remediation technology for the Rockridge portion of SR 24.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Consider noise and air pollution in the study.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
14-Jan-03	Adding another bore will not alleviate problems of pollution, noise, and environmental degradation.	Interested Citizen	Letter
21-Jan-03	Expresses concern regarding noise and air quality impacts.	Government Agency	Letter
22-Jan-03	Consider noise and light issues that would occur at existing residences.	Government Agency	Letter
27-Jan-03	Residents of SR24 corridor propose to quiet the freeway by decreasing the speed limit and using a video monitoring system.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Do not consider using the Ned Clyde property for a construction yard; both sound and sight would be a problem.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Grizzly Peak Estates is a noise sensitive area. Noise from SR 24 comes in loud and clear.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Noise issues are a concern to Rockridge residents who propose sound walls.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
30-Jan-03	The studies must included the effects that the fourth bore will have on traffic noise.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
31-Jan-03	The analysis should address noise impacts and mitigation measures.	Government Agency	Letter
H. Operational			
3-Dec-02	Concern about potential diversion or attraction to San Pablo from the north to go west with the new tunnel. Look for solutions at the 24/680 interchange, concerned about additional impact to the east to north connector.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
4-Dec-02	Westbound ramp to Highway 24 is too short and very dangerous.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
11-Dec-02	Remove the grating on both ends of the old tunnel because they eliminate the benefits of the new lighting.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
11-Dec-02	Improve the efficiency of switching the 4-lane direction.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Entry ramp from Fish Ranch Road to Westbound Route 24 is too short.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Enlarge BART tunnel between Orinda and Rockridge	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Add diamond lanes on 24 instead of constructing a new bore.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	How do they decide when to switch the traffic in the tunnel?	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Not sure if HOV lanes will help, need to study.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Radio antennae reception is too variable.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	More maintenance on highway 24.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Consider cue jumpers at Camino Pablo.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Caldecott lane, cars parked on the street. Consider casual carpool pick-up options.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Request for more center bore reversals on the weekends and in the evening.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	One request to improve the reversal operation.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	One person suggested a park and ride lot.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
11-Dec-02	Recommendation to maintain fire access from Fish Ranch.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
12-Dec-02	Place local law enforcement on the ramps.	Special Interest	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Suggested a frequent, scheduled reversal of the center bore, funding should be the only issue.	Interested Citizen	Letter

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
12-Dec-02	A Montclair cyclist, offered three comments: complete bike connection across 24 and 13, use air vent in tunnels, and provide security as at Golden Gate Bridge.	Interested Citizen	Scoping Meeting Verbal
15-Dec-02	Consider expedited lanes requiring a special license.	Business	Letter
30-Dec-02	Not a question of road versus rail. Tolls can be varied by time of day and levied only in the westbound direction to reduce delays.	Interested Citizen	Letter
9-Jan-03	Entrance way going West on Park Woods is too short.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Consider closing the Westbound exit for Shakespeare Festival Way.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Toll existing system to subsidize and improve mass transit to reduce congestion.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Oppose North bore and suggest that an HOV lane be part of the solution.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Lighting for signs are insufficient to control light pollution.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Opposed to widening Highway 24, but can accept construction of a new bore.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Study tolls for use of tunnel as is and if improved.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Express bus service is not possible with the existing three-bore configuration, but could make use of permanent HOV lanes designated on the fourth lane in each direction.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Tolls should be considered via plaza on all west bound lanes approaching Caldecott on the Orinda side for three reasons: float a bond issue to get construction underway much sooner than relying on cash-stated state and municipal agencies, mitigate any potential traffic inducement and give buses a time advantage by allowing them to bypass toll gates, long-term revenue source to finance eventual light-rail connection between Cal. Berkeley campus and Orinda BART.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Collection via FasTrak could avoid congestion associated with traditional cash tolls.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	Recommended a toll tunnel with FasTrak.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
9-Jan-03	One suggestion to provide right turn only onto WB on west-side of WB exit portal.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	One person expressed that keeping Fish Ranch Road interchange is critical.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
26-Jan-03	Extend the entrance ramp to Highway 24 at Tunnel Road.	Interested Citizen	Letter
26-Jan-03	Add a dedicated eastbound lane on North Frontage Road to Parkwoods.	Interested Citizen	Letter
26-Jan-03	Install metering lights at Fish Ranch Road for Westbound traffic to help minimize the jam.	Interested Citizen	Letter
29-Jan-03	Development of a new road is a temporary solution. Focus development on mass transit, relocation of businesses, alternative work schedules etc.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
30-Jan-03	Any closure on Fish Ranch Road would result in a significant burden.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Consider adding a two-lane road from the Gateway exit to Grizzly Peak Boulevard.	Interested Citizen	Letter
30-Jan-03	Add a bridge extension of the Temescal Pathway next to SR13.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Recommended charging a toll to support increased feeder service and parking structures at BART stations regardless of whether three or four bores.	Special Interest	Letter
30-Jan-03	Consider auxiliary lanes in the tunnels as lanes.	Interested Citizen	Letter
I. Strongly Favor			
23-Nov-02	Strongly in favor of a fourth bore.	Interested Citizen	Letter
11-Dec-02	Favor new bore, but need noise mitigation measures.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Prefer 4-lane tunnel option.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Support 3-lane South alignment.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Recommend a 2-lane bore on the North side and enlarge one of the existing bores.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
11-Dec-02	The tunnel needs to be started within two years, cut out most of the environmental and get on with the construction.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Interested in a fourth bore with exit going East on Fish Ranch Road.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Build the fourth bore with 2 lanes and improve existing South bore.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	In favor of the fourth bore.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
11-Dec-02	Build four-lane bore as soon as possible, but do not raise taxes to do it.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Support construction of another bore based on dramatically increased traffic in both directions in last 18 months.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
15-Dec-02	Strong support for building a fourth tunnel.	Interested Citizen	Letter
17-Dec-02	Strongly support at least two more bores.	Interested Citizen	Letter
18-Dec-02	Support expansion of Caldecott Tunnels in any form with immediate action.	Business	Letter
26-Dec-02	Supports a fourth bore with equal lanes going in as there are coming out.	Interested Citizen	Letter
28-Dec-02	Strong support for building a fourth tunnel with three lanes.	Interested Citizen	Letter
3-Jan-03	Strong support for building a fourth tunnel.	Interested Citizen	Letter
7-Jan-03	Supports fourth bore as it would have environmental and economical benefits.	Interested Citizen	Letter
9-Jan-03	Strongly supports four lanes in each direction. Reverse and non-commuters are getting shafted.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Strongly support four lanes in each direction.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
9-Jan-03	"bang for the buck" for relieving congestion, pollution, fuel waste and providing new transit alternatives.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
9-Jan-03	One person proclaimed the need for the fourth bore, transit doesn't meet everyone's needs.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Verbal
13-Jan-03	Expand Caldecott as quickly as possible.	Interested Citizen	Letter
21-Jan-03	Expresses support for immediate construction of the fourth bore.	Interested Citizen	Letter
29-Jan-03	Another bore is a must, but bike access is not necessary.	Business	Comment Card
30-Jan-03	A fourth bore is the most desirable and most needed alternative. The no project alternative is an undesirable option.	Interested Citizen	Letter
J. Strongly Oppose			
11-Dec-02	Do not build another bore. Fix checkpoints in BART.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated
11-Dec-02	Opposed to four-lane.	Government Agency	Scoping Meeting Verbal
12-Dec-02	Fourth bore alternative seems inappropriate for CEQA/NEPA review.	Neighborhood Group	Comment Card
12-Dec-02	Strongly opposed to more bores, but supports investing funds in alternatives to the automobile.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
6-Jan-03	Opposes the fourth bore for a number of reasons and urges an objective decision process.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
8-Jan-03	Formal opposition to fourth bore and stressed objectivity of EIS/EIR process.	Neighborhood Group	Letter
8-Jan-03	Stongly opposes the fourth bore.	Interested Citizen	Letter
9-Jan-03	Opposes the fourth bore because of noise, air pollutants, and increased traffic.	Interested Citizen	Letter
9-Jan-03	Oppose North bore and suggest that an HOV lane be part of the solution.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
9-Jan-03	Need to look at solutions that solve problem; the tunnel and more freeways will not solve the problem.	Not Available	Scoping Meeting Dictated

Caldecott Improvement Project Scoping Comments

Date	Comment	Affiliation	Type
29-Jan-03	Building another bore is a short-term solution to Caldecott congestion issues.	Government Agency	Letter
30-Jan-03	Recommends the no project alternative, rather, put those dollars into maintenance and transit alternatives.	Interested Citizen	Comment Card
30-Jan-03	Opposes fourth bore.	Neighborhood Group	Letter