MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA DISTRICT 4 – ALA – 80 (PM 3.1/3.4); 580 (PM 46.2/46.9L, 46.9R); 880 (PM R35.0L/R35.3L) 4K810/0417000363

Initial Study with Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment with Finding of No Significant Impact



Prepared by the State of California, Department of Transportation

The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans.



This page is intentionally left blank.

General Information about This Document

What's in this document:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), as assigned by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), has prepared this Initial Study with Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment with Finding of No Significant Impact, which examines the potential environmental impacts of the proposed MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project (project) located in the City of Oakland, in Alameda County. Caltrans is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Caltrans is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The document tells you why the project is being proposed, what alternatives have been considered for the project, how the existing environment could be affected by the project, the potential impacts of each of the alternatives, and the proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures. The Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) was circulated to the public for 71 days between February 13, 2019 and April 24, 2019. Comments received during this period are included in Chapter 4. Revisions to the IS/EA made after the public review period are indicated by a vertical line in the margin of the IS/EA text, similar to the one shown to the left of this paragraph. Additional copies of this document are available for review at the District 4 Office (111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612), Oakland Public Library: West Oakland Branch (1801 Adeline Street, Oakland, CA 94607), and Golden Gate Branch Library (5606 San Pablo Avenue, Oakland, CA 94608). This document may be downloaded at the following website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/d4/envdocs.htm.

Alternative Formats:

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document can be made available in Braille, in large print, on audiocassette, or on computer disk. To obtain a copy in one of these alternate formats, please call or write to California Department of Transportation, Attn: Lily Mu, Office of Environmental Analysis/Mail Station 8B, Department of Transportation District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612; (510) 622-1746 (Voice) or use the California Relay Service: 1 (800) 735-2929 (TTY to voice), 1 (800) 735-2922 (Voice to TTY), 1 (800) 855-3000 (Spanish TTY to Voice and Voice to TTY), 1 (800) 854-7784 (Spanish and English Speech-to-Speech) or 711.

This page is intentionally left blank.

SCH# 2019029053 04 - ALA - 80 (PM 3.1/3.4) 04 - ALA - 580 (PM 46.2/46.9L, 46.9R) 04 - ALA - 880 (PM R35.0L/R35.3L) 4K810/0417000363

Increase Vertical Clearance at three locations within the MacArthur Maze on Interstate 80 (I-80), Interstate 580 (I-580), and Interstate 880 (I-880) at various Postmiles in Alameda County

INITIAL STUDY WITH NEGATIVE DECLARATION/ ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WITH FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT Submitted Pursuant to: (State) Division 13, California Public Resources Code (Federal) 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C) THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA Department of Transportation

Responsible Agencies: California Transportation Commission

2/7/2020

Date of Approval

∔ONY TAVARES
District 4 Director
California Department of Transportation
NEPA/CEQA Lead Agency

The following person may be contacted for more information about this document:

California Department of Transporation Attn: Lily Mu Office of Environmental Analysis MS 8B 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612 This page is intentionally left blank.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

FOR THE

MACARTHUR MAZE VERTICAL CLEARANCE PROJECT

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has determined that the No-Build Alternative will have no significant impact on the human environment. This FONSI is based on the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) which has been independently evaluated by Caltrans and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and appropriate mitigation measures. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. Caltrans takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the attached EA (and other documents as appropriate).

The environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC 327 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans.

TONY TAVARES District 4 Director California Department of Transportation NEPA/CEQA Lead Agency

2/7/2020

Date of Approval

This page is intentionally left blank

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

Project Description

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to increase vertical clearance for freight vehicles to the current Caltrans standard of 16 feet and 6 inches at three locations in the Oakland MacArthur Maze in Alameda County.

Determination

Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study for this project, and has determined from this study that the preferred project alternative will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

The No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred project alternative, so the proposed project will have no effect on Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Mandatory Findings of Significance.

TONY TAVARES District 4 Director California Department of Transportation NEPA/CEQA Lead Agency

217/2020

Date of Approval

This page is intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	– Proposed Project	1
1.1 Int	roduction	1
1.1.1	NEPA Assignment	1
1.2 Pu	rpose and Need	3
1.2.1	Purpose	3
1.2.2	Need	3
1.3 Inc	lependent Utility and Logical Termini	4
1.4 Pr	oject Description	4
1.4.1	Existing Structure	5
1.4.2	Project Alternatives	5
1.4.3	Permits and Approvals Needed	19
Chapter 2 Minimizati	 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoid on, and/or Mitigation Measures 	ance, 20
2.1 Vis	sual/Aesthetics	25
2.1.1	Regulatory Setting	25
2.1.2	Affected Environment	25
2.1.3 Assess	Environmental Consequences - Summary of Visual Impacts by Visual sment Unit	29
2.1.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	30
2.2 Cu	Itural Resources	31
2.2.1	Regulatory Setting	31
2.2.2	Affected Environment	32
2.2.3	Environmental Consequences	33
2.2.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	33
2.3 Ph	ysical Environment	34
2.3.1	Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff	34
2.3.2	Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography	39
2.4 Cu	imulative Impacts	41
2.4.1	Regulatory Setting	41
2.5 Cc	Instruction Impacts	42
2.5.1	Noise	42
2.5.2	Wetlands and Other Waters	49
2.5.3	Utilities/Emergency Services	50

2.5	5.4	Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	50
Chapte	er 3 ·	 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Evaluation 	52
3.1	De	termining Significance under CEQA	52
3.2	CE	QA Environmental Checklist	53
3.3	Clii	mate Change	83
3.3	5.1	Regulatory Setting	83
3.3	5.2	Environmental Setting	87
3.3	.3	Project Analysis	88
3.3	6.4	CEQA Conclusion	90
3.3	5.5	Project-Level GHG Reduction Strategies	92
3.3	6.6	Adaptation Strategies	93
Chapte	er4·	 Comments and Coordination 	98
4.1	Na	tive American Coordination	98
4.2	Ag	ency Coordination	98
4.3	Pu	olic Participation	99
4.4	Re	sponse to Comments	100
4.5	Do	cument Coordination	101
Chapte	er 5 ·	- List of Preparers	107
Chapte	er 6 ·	- Distribution List	108

Appendices

Appendix A.	Section 4(f)
-------------	--------------

- Appendix B. Title VI Policy Statement Appendix C. Environmental Commitment Record
- Appendix D. List of Technical Studies
- Appendix E. Species List Appendix F. Comments

List of Tables

Table 1-1 Build Alternatives Impacts Comparison	. 18
Table 2-1 Impact Areas of Each Build Alternative	.39
Table 3-1 Summary of GHG Emissions per Build Alternative	. 90
Table 3-2 Projected Sea Level Rise (in feet) for San Francisco	.96

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 Location Map	3
Figure 1-2 Current Clearance	6
Figure 1-3 Project Alternatives	7
Figure 1-4 Potential Staging	8
Figure 1-5 Alternative A: Bridge Lowering	. 10
Figure 1-6 Alternative B: Bridge Raising	. 12
Figure 1-7 Alternative C: Partial Bridge Replacement	. 14
Figure 1-8 Alternative D: Partial Deck Reconstruction	. 16
Figure 2-1 View from WB I-580 to WB I-80 Connector looking West	26
Figure 2-2 Freeway Visual Assessment Unit looking Northwest	.27
Figure 2-3 Commercial/Industrial Visual Assessment Unit looking East	27
Figure 2-4 Residential Visual Assessment Unit looking East	28
Figure 2-5 Bay Bridge Trail Visual Assessment Unit looking Northeast from the Bay	
Bridge	29
Figure 2-6 Residential Areas Assessed during Noise Study	.44
Figure 2-7 Noise Levels for Common Indoor and Outdoor Activities	45
Figure 2-8 Aquatic Areas Assessed during Noise Study	47
Figure 2-9 Temporary Sound Wall Proposed for Alternative C	49
Figure 3-1 Existing Drainage and Water Quality Improvement Infrastructure	.68
Figure 3-2 2020 Business as Usual (BAU) Emissions Projection 2014 Edition	.88
Figure 3-3 The Governor's Climate Change Pillars: 2030 Greenhouse Gas Reduction]
Goals	91
Figure 3-4 Represents 2 Feet of Sea Level Rise (Year 2050)	.97

Chapter 1 – Proposed Project

1.1 Introduction

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project (project or proposed action) to increase the vertical clearances at three locations within the MacArthur Maze Interchange (MacArthur Maze or Maze) in the City of Oakland, Alameda County (Figure 1-1). Two of the locations are along the connector from westbound (WB) Interstate 80 (I-80) to southbound (SB) Interstate 880 (I-880), as it crosses below the WB and eastbound (EB) Interstate 580 (I-580) overcrossings. The third location is along the connector from WB I-80 to EB I-580 as it crosses below the connector from WB I-580 to WB I-80. The existing vertical clearance at these three locations does not meet the current Caltrans standard of 16 feet 6 inches and impedes the safe and efficient movement of oversized vehicles and loads through the Maze. The project is proposed to increase the vertical clearance of the structures in the Maze to allow for more efficient travel of oversized vehicles.

The MacArthur Maze is located approximately one mile east of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (Bay Bridge) toll plaza and within one mile of the Port of Oakland. The Port of Oakland loads and discharges more than 99% of the containerized goods moving through Northern California and is the seventh busiest container port in the United States based on Calendar Year 2016 data. The proposed project would facilitate the movement of goods to and from the Port of Oakland. The MacArthur Maze connects three major freeways: I-80, I-580, and I-880. The connectors serve approximately 300,000 vehicles daily based on Caltrans traffic counts and provide connectivity throughout the Bay Area. The limits of the proposed project are depicted on Figure 1-2.

The project is funded by the 2018 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) under the Transportation Permit Requirements for Bridges Program 201.322 through the environmental phase. While the proposed project is not included in the 2015 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP), it is included in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Bridge Rehabilitation and Construction- SHOPP Program TIP ID VAR 170010. The project is included in Caltrans' Accelerated Freight Corridor Bridge Improvement Program.

This Initial Study with Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) with Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) discusses four Build Alternatives and the No-Build Alternative. The four Build Alternatives are to either lower, raise, partially replace, or partially reconstruct existing bridge structures. These alternatives are discussed in Section 1.4.2.

1.1.1 NEPA Assignment

California participated in the "Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program" (Pilot Program) pursuant to 23 U.S. Code (USC) 327, for more than five years,

beginning July 1, 2007, and ending September 30, 2012. MAP-21 (P.L. 112-141), signed by President Obama on July 6, 2012, amended 23 USC 327 to establish a permanent Surface Transportation Project Delivery Program. As a result, Caltrans entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) pursuant to 23 USC 327 (NEPA Assignment MOU) with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The NEPA Assignment MOU became effective October 1, 2012 and was renewed on December 23, 2016 for a term of five years. Under the NEPA Assignment MOU, Caltrans continues to assume FHWA responsibilities under NEPA and other federal environmental laws in the same manner as was assigned under the Pilot Program, with minor changes. With the NEPA Assignment MOU, the FHWA assigned, and Caltrans assumed, all of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Secretary's responsibilities under NEPA. This assignment includes projects on the State Highway System and Local Assistance Projects off of the State Highway System within the State of California, except for certain categorical exclusions (CEs) that the FHWA assigned to Caltrans under the 23 USC 326 CE Assignment MOU, projects excluded by definition, and specific project exclusions.

Caltrans, as assigned by FHWA, is the federal lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for this project. Caltrans is also the state lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this project.



1.2 Purpose and Need

1.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the project is to remedy vertical clearance deficiencies at three locations within the MacArthur Maze that impede the safe and efficient movement of freight vehicles through the interchange.

1.2.2 Need

Roadway Deficiencies

The proposed project is needed to remedy the vertical clearance deficiencies found at three locations within the MacArthur Maze to allow for freight and oversized vehicles to travel through these major connectors to and from areas such as the Port of Oakland. The current Caltrans vertical clearance standard is 16 feet 6 inches. Within the Maze, there are currently three locations that do not meet this standard, depicted in Figure 1-2. At present, the connector from WB I-80 to EB I-580 has 14 feet 9 inches of vertical

clearance as it passes under the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector. The connector from WB I-80 to SB I-880 has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 3 inches as it passes under the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector, and a vertical clearance of 15 feet 6 inches as it passes under the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector, as depicted in Figure 1-2 which shows the current clearance. The vertical clearance must be increased to the current Caltrans standard in order to correct these deficiencies.

1.3 Independent Utility and Logical Termini

Federal Highway Administration regulations (23 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 771.111 [f]) require that the proposed action being evaluated would:

- Connect logical termini and be of sufficient length to address environmental matters on broad scope;
- Have independent utility or independent significance (be usable and be a reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made): and
- Not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements.

Logical termini for project development are defined as rational end points for a transportation improvement, and rational end points for a review of the environmental impacts. The environmental impact review frequently covers a broader geographic area than the strict limits of the transportation improvements. The project limits extend on I-80 between postmile (PM) 3.0 and 3.5, on I-580 between PM 46.5 and 46 and on I-880 between PM 35.0 and 35.3. The limits of the proposed project are depicted on Figure 1-3. The MacArthur Maze is an interchange of regional significance, leading to and from the Bay Bridge and is a major link in transporting freight to and from the Port of Oakland.

The proposed project has independent utility in and of itself and would not restrict other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements nor trigger new transportation projects. An independent utility analysis focuses on whether a project is a standalone project, that is, if no other project is contemplated, the project serves a distinct purpose or function.

1.4 **Project Description**

This section describes the proposed action and the project alternatives that were developed to meet the identified purpose and need of the project, while avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts. The alternatives are Alternative A: Bridge Lowering, Alternative B: Bridge Raising, Alternative C: Partial Bridge Replacement, Alternative D: Partial Deck Reconstruction, and the No-Build Alternative.

1.4.1 Existing Structure

There are three existing bridge structures involved in the project: The WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector is a two-lane freeway built in 1998 with 4-foot-wide left and right shoulders. The WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector is a three-lane freeway built in 1935 and widened in 2006 with 3-foot-wide left and right shoulders. The EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector is a three-lane freeway built in 1955 and widened in 1962 with 2-foot-wide left and right shoulders.

1.4.2 **Project Alternatives**

All alternatives were designed to meet the purpose and need of the project, minimize environmental impacts, and reduce impacts to the travelling public. This project contains a number of standardized project features which are employed on most, if not all, Caltrans projects and were not developed in response to any specific environmental impact resulting from the proposed project. These features are addressed in more detail in the Environmental Consequences sections found in Chapter 2. All proposed build alternatives are shown in Figure 1-3 and are detailed in the section titled *Unique Features of Build Alternatives*. Common design features of the Build Alternatives are discussed below.

For the No-Build Alternative, there would be no changes to the existing connectors.

Common Design Features of the Build Alternatives

FALSEWORK

During construction of the build alternatives, falsework would be built to strengthen and fortify the connectors. Falsework consists of temporary components used in construction for support to hold the structures in place until the new structures are able to support itself. Falsework normally consists of both wood and metal components. The falsework for all build alternatives could impact existing landscaping and vegetation within the project area. The falsework may also temporarily impact the Bay Bridge Trail during construction, after which the trail would be similar to existing conditions.

STAGING AND SITE ACCESS

Potential staging and storage areas would be required and are depicted in blue on Figure 1-4. The project site will be accessed from existing freeways and local streets; however, staging and storage areas could impact existing landscaped or vegetated areas. The Bay Bridge Trail, a bicycle/pedestrian trail, connecting the Bay Bridge and the City of Emeryville, may require rerouting, realignment, and/or overhead protection during construction. The Bay Bridge Trail is anticipated to be returned to its existing condition after construction is complete.





Figure 1-3 Project Alternatives



Figure 1-4 Potential Staging



SOIL TREATMENT

All build alternatives would incorporate soil treatment to address potential liquefaction¹ from seismic events. Soil treatment would be performed by using grout and/or micropiles². Grout would be injected around the perimeter of the existing structure then micropiles would be placed through the grout.

BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs)

This project would incorporate Caltrans standard Best Management Practices (BMPs). BMPs are implemented on all Caltrans projects to minimize potential environmental impacts from project construction.

VISUAL

New concrete safety barriers and/or railing should match the aesthetics of the existing connectors. See-through barriers and/or railings should be considered where outward views exist to reduce screening of views.

For the No-Build Alternative, there would be no changes to the existing connectors.

¹ Liquefaction: a process by which soil deposits below the water table temporarily lose strength and behave as a liquid rather than a solid, typically during a moderate to large earthquake.

² Micropiles: a deep foundation element constructed using high-strength, small-diameter steel casing and/or threaded bar.

Unique Features of Build Alternatives

ALTERNATIVE A: BRIDGE LOWERING

This alternative, shown in Figure 1-5, consists of lowering the two connectors shown in red.

The WB I-80 to EB I-580 connector currently has a vertical clearance of 14 feet 9 inches below the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector. Under this alternative, the WB I-80 to EB I-580 connector would be lowered 1 foot 9 inches to achieve the Caltrans standard clearance of 16 feet 6 inches. The segment of this connector that would need to be lowered is approximately 665 feet long.

The connector from WB I-80 to SB I-880 has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 3 inches below the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector. Under this alternative, the WB I-80 to SB I-880 would be lowered 1 foot 3 inches to achieve the clearance standard. This same connector also has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 6 inches below the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector and would need to be lowered 1 foot to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard. The segment of this connector that would need to be lowered is approximately 1,515 feet long. The WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector would need to be lowered in both locations simultaneously. For this alternative the connector dimensions would not change as the structure is not being rebuilt.

The staging and access for this alternative is anticipated to be completely within Caltrans Right of Way (ROW). For this alternative, the Bay Bridge Trail may be detoured during construction and returned to its pre-existing conditions after construction. The cost for this alternative is approximately \$68,000,000. The approximate construction duration for this alternative is 26 months and would require the closure of the WB I-80 to EB I-580 connector and the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector intermittently over a period of approximately 5 months.



Figure 1-5 Alternative A: Bridge Lowering

ALTERNATIVE B: BRIDGE RAISING

This alternative, shown in Figure 1-6, consists of raising the two connectors shown in blue.

The EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector currently has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 6 inches above the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector and would need to be raised 1 foot to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard of 16 feet 6 inches. The segment of this connector that would need to be raised is approximately 790 feet long.

The WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector currently has a vertical clearance of 14 feet 9 inches above the WB I-80 to EB I-580 connector and would be raised 1 foot 9 inches to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard. The WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector also has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 3 inches above the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector and would need to be raised 1 foot 3 inches to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard. This segment of the connector that would need to be raised is approximately 800 feet long. Both connectors would be slowly raised until the desired clearance is achieved. The existing deck of this connector would be repaved under this alternative. For this alternative the connector dimensions would not change as the structure is not being rebuilt.

The staging and access for this alternative is anticipated to be completely within Caltrans ROW. For this alternative, the Bay Bridge Trail may be detoured during construction and returned to its pre-existing conditions after construction. The cost for this alternative is approximately \$68,000,000. The approximate construction duration for this alternative is 28 months and would require the closure of the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector and the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector intermittently over a period of approximately 3 months.



Figure 1-6 Alternative B: Bridge Raising

ALTERNATIVE C: PARTIAL BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

This alternative, shown in Figure 1-7, consists of partially replacing and realigning the two connectors shown in green.

The EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector currently has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 6 inches above the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector. Approximately 2,000 linear feet of this connector would be rebuilt to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard of 16 feet 6 inches. The WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector currently has a vertical clearance of 14 feet 9 inches above the WB I-80 to EB I-580 connector and a vertical clearance of 15 feet 3 inches above the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector. Approximately 2,800 linear feet of this connector would be rebuilt to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard.

The rebuilt connectors would each be 60 feet wide and would consist of three 12-footwide lanes, two 10-foot-wide shoulders, and two 2-foot-wide bridge railings. Rebuilding the connectors would result in 1.22 acres of additional impervious surface compared to existing conditions. The design, color, and aesthetic treatment for the new connectors and support columns would match the existing connectors and columns so as to be visually compatible and consistent with the existing structures.

Based on the studies completed for Alternative C, Caltrans would incorporate noise abatement in the form of a temporary sound wall during construction. If during final design conditions have substantially changed, noise abatement may not be necessary. The final decision on temporary noise abatement would be made upon completion of the project design.

The staging and access for this alternative may extend beyond Caltrans ROW; the locations are yet to be determined depending upon if any additional staging area is needed. For this alternative, the Bay Bridge Trail may be detoured during construction and realigned within the project area, and landscaping would be restored to its pre-existing conditions after construction. The cost for this alternative is approximately \$191,000,000. The approximate construction duration for this alternative is 36 months and would require the closure of the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector and the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector intermittently over a period of approximately 15 months.



Figure 1-7 Alternative C: Partial Bridge Replacement

ALTERNATIVE D: PARTIAL DECK RECONSTRUCTION

This alternative, shown in Figure 1-8, consists of partially reconstructing the bridge decks of the two connectors shown in purple.

The EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector currently has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 6 inches above the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector. The EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector bridge deck is currently 4 feet 6 inches thick. Approximately 160 linear feet of the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector bridge deck would be reconstructed to reduce the thickness of the deck to 3 feet 6 inches to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard of 16 feet 6 inches. The WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector currently has a vertical clearance of 14 feet 9 inches above the WB I-80 to EB I-580 connector and a vertical clearance of 15 feet 3 inches above the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector. The deck of the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector is also currently 4 feet 6 inches thick. To achieve the Caltrans clearance standard, the existing profile grade would be raised approximately 9 inches. Additionally, the thickness of the deck would be reduced from 4 feet 6 inches to 3 feet 6 inches to 3 feet 6 inches to 2 feet of the bridge deck of this connector would be reconstructed to achieve the Caltrans clearance standard. For this alternative the connector width would not change.

The staging for this alternative is anticipated to be completely within Caltrans ROW. For this alternative, the Bay Bridge Trail may be detoured during construction and returned to its pre-existing conditions after construction. The cost for this alternative is approximately \$39,000,000. The approximate construction duration for this alternative is 10 months and would require the closure of the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector and the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector intermittently over a period of approximately 4 months.



Figure 1-8 Alternative D: Partial Deck Reconstruction

No-Build (No Action) Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, there would be no changes in the vertical clearance within the Maze. The deficiencies in vertical clearance would not be remedied and would continue to impede the safe and efficient movement of oversize vehicles and loads through the Maze. The No-Build Alternative serves as the baseline for evaluation of the other alternatives.

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 1-1 shows a comparison of the proposed build alternatives. Alternative A and Alternative B have very similar impacts. Alternative C has a larger amount of temporary wetland impacts, a higher project cost, longer estimated closures, a longer construction duration, and would likely require construction noise abatement. Alternative D has the lowest amount of temporary wetland impacts, the lowest estimated project cost, and the lowest anticipated construction duration.

	401/404 Permits	Construction Noise Abatement	Temporary Impacts to Wetlands/Other Waters (acres)	Estimated Cost (millions)	Anticipated Construction Duration (months)	Estimated Closures (months)
Alternative A	Yes	No	0.17	68	26	5
Alternative B	Yes	N	0.17	68	28	3
Alternative C	Yes	Yes	0.25	191	36	15
Alternative D	Yes	N	0.06	39	10	4

 Table 1-1 Build Alternatives Impacts Comparison

Identification of a Preferred Alternative

Following the public circulation and comment period, comments were reviewed and analyzed. Caltrans then selected a preferred alternative and made the final determination of the project's Following the public circulation and comment period, comments were reviewed and analyzed. Caltrans then selected a preferred alternative and made the final determination of the project's effect on the environment.

After the circulation of the IS/EA, the Project Development Team (PDT) met and discussed the input received from the City of Oakland, the City of Emeryville, local agencies, and the public. Most of the comments received favored the No-Build Alternative. All the build alternatives met the purpose and need of this project while the No-Build Alternative did not. However, due to public concerns (see Appendix F for all comments received), the PDT decided to select the No-Build Alternative as the preferred alternative on July 24, 2019.

Under CEQA, if no unmitigable significant adverse impacts are identified, Caltrans will prepare a Negative Declaration (ND). Similarly, if Caltrans, as assigned by the FHWA, determines the NEPA action does not significantly impact the environment, Caltrans will issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion Prior to the IS/EA

No other alternatives were considered for this project as all proposed methods of achieving vertical clearance developed by Caltrans are viable alternatives that are discussed in this document. Therefore, no additional alternatives were presented beyond those outlined in the document.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT (TSM) AND TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) ALTERNATIVES

Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) are integrated strategies that optimize the performance of existing infrastructure through the implementation of multimodal and intermodal, cross-jurisdictional systems, services and projects designed to preserve capacity and improve security, safety and reliability of the transportation system. These measures alone would not satisfy the purpose and need of the project because they would not address vertical clearance and would not improve movement of freight vehicles through the interchange. No TDM or TSM measures have been incorporated into the build alternatives for this project. Caltrans is currently developing a separate project to address traffic management in and through the Maze (FTIP VAR170005). This other project, known as the Maze Traffic Operations System (TOS) Project, proposes to install traffic operation system equipment to monitor and manage traffic conditions in the MacArthur Maze. The construction of this project is planned to be completed in 2024.

1.4.3 Permits and Approvals Needed

As the No-Build Alternative was selected, no permits, licenses, agreements, or certifications (PLACs) are required for this project.

Chapter 2 – Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

This chapter describes the environmental resources of the project areas and how the resources would be affected by the proposed project. Potential environmental impacts of all the Build Alternatives of the proposed project are discussed. Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, recommended avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation (AMM) measures will not be applied to the project, so AMM measures are not discussed. Project features are mentioned in the Project Description and Chapter 2. Chapter 2 also addresses issues of concern pursuant to CEQA and NEPA. Please see Chapter 3 for the CEQA Checklist.

All technical studies prepared for this project analyzed the four proposed Build Alternatives and the No-Build Alternative. The technical reports for this document are listed in Appendix D. The results of the technical studies showed that while there are four unique build alternatives, the impacts of each build alternative were generally similar. As such, the topics covered in this chapter have only one discussion of impacts unless explicitly stated otherwise.

As part of the scoping and environmental analysis carried out for the project, the environmental issues listed below were considered but no permanent adverse impacts were identified. As a result, there is no further discussion of these issues in this document, except to those that may experience temporary impacts during construction (these are addressed in detail in the subsequent sections).

- <u>Existing and Future Land Use:</u> The MacArthur Maze is located adjacent to developed areas of Oakland and Emeryville. The alternatives for this project would not impact the current or future land use in this area. There will be no changes in access or permanent impacts to any parks or trails, residences, or undeveloped land from this project.
- <u>Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans and Programs:</u> The proposed project complies with the following plans:
 - California State Transportation Plan State of California
 - 2016 Countywide Transportation Plan Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC)
 - Department of Transportation's Strategic Plan The City of Oakland
 - The Bay Trail Plan Association of Bay Area Governments
 - Sustainable Transportation Plan The City of Emeryville

This project would allow freight vehicles more direct access to and from the Port of Oakland as the reliability of freight movement in these corridors is essential to the nation's economy. The project would not change the classification of the project area and would not change State, Regional, and Local Plans and Programs.

- <u>California Coastal Zone</u>: The MacArthur Maze is located adjacent to San Francisco Bay. I-80 is designated a Scenic Drive in the San Francisco Bay Plan, which is the coastal plan for San Francisco Bay as defined by the federal Coastal Zone Management Act. The project as proposed will not change the views of the Bay or the surrounding area from I-80. The project site is not within the Coastal Zone as defined by the California Coastal Act.
- <u>California Wild and Scenic Rivers:</u> There are no designated wild and scenic rivers within the project area.
- <u>Parks and Recreation Facilities:</u> There are no parks, recreation facilities, or section 4(f) properties within the project area. While the Bay Bridge Trail is within the project area, the trail is considered a transportation facility. The Bay Bridge Trail is owned and maintained by Caltrans meaning the facility is classified as transportation, not as recreation. The proposed project would have no permanent impacts to the trail. A discussion about potential temporary impacts to the trail can be found in Section 2.5.4 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.
- <u>Farmlands/Timberlands:</u> There are no farmlands and timberlands within the project area.
- <u>Growth:</u> The MacArthur Maze is a connection point for three major freeway connectors leading to and from the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and the Port of Oakland. No alternatives for this project would impact the current or future land use in this area. There would be no changes in access to employment, shopping, or other destinations, or permanent impacts to travel times, travel behavior, trip patterns, or the attractiveness of some areas to development. The project would have no potential for influencing growth in the project area.
- <u>Community Character and Cohesion:</u> The project would continue to serve the region in the same manner as the existing interchange; therefore, no impact to community character and cohesion would occur.
- <u>Relocations and Real Property Acquisition:</u> The proposed project would not require relocations or property acquisitions. Caltrans will coordinate with Union Pacific Rail Road and East Bay Municipal Utility District if any potential impacts are anticipated to existing aerial easements during construction.
- <u>Environmental Justice</u>: No minority or low-income populations have been identified that would be adversely impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, this project is not subject to the provisions of Executive Order (EO) 12898.
- <u>Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities:</u> The project would have no permanent impacts to traffic or transportation or pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as the project will not change the capacity or configuration of the MacArthur Maze

roadways or the Bay Bridge Trail. Temporary impacts that may occur to these resources during construction are discussed in Section 2.5.4 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.

- <u>Hydrology and Floodplain:</u> There would be no effects to floodplains because the project is not located within a 100-year base floodplain. The project would not alter the hydrology within the project area.
- <u>Paleontology</u>: There are no anticipated paleontological resources within the project area that would be affected by the proposed project.
- <u>Hazardous Waste/Materials</u>: A search of environmental regulatory databases was conducted in January 2018 and did not identify any known hazardous materials or hazardous waste sites in the vicinity of the project that could likely impact the project schedule or construction. There is the potential for soil to have been contaminated from motor vehicle exhaust (from aerially deposited lead due to historically leaded gas). Soil and groundwater testing would be performed as necessary during the design phase of the project. If found, Asbestos Containing Material (ACM), Lead Containing Paint (LCP), and regulated lead-contaminated soils will be managed and mitigated according to applicable legal and regulatory requirements.
- <u>Air Quality:</u> The proposed project is exempt from transportation conformity requirements per 40 CFR 93.126, Table 2 Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes). The project area is in a nonattainment area for Ozone and PM_{2.5} but is determined by the Air Quality Conformity Taskforce to be "not a Project of Air Quality Concern" for PM_{2.5}. The project is in a maintenance area for Carbon Monoxide but transportation conformity requirements in the project area ceased to apply on June 1, 2018. There are no anticipated air quality impacts that would result from the proposed project, including changes to the current levels of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀.
- <u>Noise:</u> This is not a Type 1 project³ and no permanent noise impacts are anticipated due to the project. However, the project may have temporary noise impacts during

³ A Type 1 project as defined in 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 772, is a federal or Federal-aid project for:

[•] The construction of a highway on a new location; or

[•] The physical alteration of an existing highway where there is either:

Substantial horizontal alteration A project that halves the distance between the traffic noise source and the closest receptor between the existing condition to the future build condition; or Substantial vertical alteration. A project that removes shielding thereby exposing the line-of-sight between the receptor and the traffic noise source. This is done by altering either the vertical alignment of the highway or the topography between the highway traffic noise source and the receptor; or
construction of Alternative C; further discussion can be found in Section 2.5.1 Noise.

- <u>Natural Communities:</u> The proposed project would not affect any natural communities. The project will have no impacts on listed species or sensitive habitats due to a lack of suitable habitat at the proposed project site. There are wetlands and water features present at the proposed project site which are discussed separately.
- <u>Wetlands and Other Waters:</u> An aquatic resources field survey and wetland delineation of the project site was conducted in August 2018, and a Delineation of Aquatic Resources Report was completed for the project in November 2018. These surveys and studies identified 0.25 acre of wetlands, 0.62 acre of Other Waters of the United States, and approximately 885 linear feet of culverted waters within the project area. No permanent impacts to wetlands or other jurisdictional features are anticipated from the project. All build alternatives have the potential to disturb soil during construction. These construction impacts are further described within Section 2.5 Construction Impacts.
- <u>Plant Species</u>: The proposed project would not affect any listed or special-status plant species due to lack of suitable habitat within the project boundary.
- <u>Animal Species</u>: The proposed project is not anticipated to affect any listed or special-status animal species. It is possible that certain bat species and common migratory or other bird species may be temporarily displaced by habitat alteration or disturbance due to construction activities.
- <u>Threatened and Endangered Species:</u> The proposed project would not affect any listed or special-status species due to lack of suitable habitat within the project boundary.
- <u>Invasive Species</u>: The proposed project would not introduce invasive species into the project area.

- The addition of an auxiliary lane, except for when the auxiliary lane is a turn lane; or
- The addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps added to a quadrant to complete an existing partial interchange; or
- Restriping existing pavement for the purpose of adding a through traffic lane or an auxiliary lane; or
- The addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot, or toll plaza.

[•] The addition of a through-traffic lane(s). This includes the addition of a through-traffic lane that functions as a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane, bus lane, or truck climbing lane; or

2.1 Visual/Aesthetics

2.1.1 Regulatory Setting

NEPA establishes that the federal government use all practicable means to ensure all Americans safe, healthful, productive, *aesthetically* (emphasis added), and culturally pleasing surroundings (42 United States Code [USC] 4331[b][2]). To further emphasize this point, the FHWA, in its implementation of NEPA (23 USC 109[h]), directs that final decisions on projects are to be made in the best overall public interest, taking into account adverse environmental impacts, including among others, the destruction or disruption of aesthetic values.

CEQA establishes that it is the policy of the state to take all action necessary to provide the people of the state "with...enjoyment of *aesthetic*, natural, scenic and historic environmental qualities" (CA Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21001[b]).

2.1.2 Affected Environment

The information in this section originates from the Visual Impact Analysis (VIA) prepared for the proposed project. The VIA was approved on August 7, 2018, with VIA addenda approved on November 6, 2018 and December 13, 2018.

The proposed project is situated in the MacArthur Maze, a multi-level freeway interchange east of the Bay Bridge Toll Plaza. The landscape is characterized by flat and level landforms surrounded by urban development on three sides and San Francisco Bay to the west. The land use within the project area is primarily urban, with land uses dominated by residential, commercial, and industrial uses, but also includes areas of wetlands and the San Francisco Bay shoreline. Within the footprint of the interchange, grass-lined basins and plantings of California blackberry, oat grass, salt grass, coyote brush, and monkey flower create a "rain water garden" to naturally treat storm water runoff in the winter months. The Bay Bridge Trail runs from the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge through the garden before heading north toward Berkeley and has viewing/educational stations along the path.

North- and west- bound motorists on the interchange structure have long-distance scenic views of the San Francisco Bay shoreline, the Bay Bridge, the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco City skyline, Treasure Island, and the Marin Headlands, as shown in Figure 2-1. Southbound motorists on the elevated connector ramps have filtered views of San Francisco Bay, San Francisco skyline, and San Francisco Bay shoreline. Motorists from the Bay Bridge headed toward the cities of Emeryville/Berkeley have heavily filtered views of the Berkeley Hills through the Maze structures.



Figure 2-1 View from WB I-580 to WB I-80 Connector looking West

While none of the freeways that pass through the Maze are officially designated scenic highways, I-80 is designated as a Scenic Drive in the San Francisco Bay Plan.

To assess visual impacts of the project, the project corridor was divided into four visual assessment units based on visual character and visual quality. The visual assessment units were defined based upon the limits of a particular viewshed or areas of similar visual character. For this project, the following visual assessment units and their associated key views have been identified.

Freeway Visual Assessment Unit

This unit consists of Interstates 80, 580, and 880 and related connector ramps as shown in Figure 2-2. The principal image type dominating the landscape of the Freeway Visual Assessment Unit is the convergence of the freeway connectors both at grade and elevated.

Commercial/Industrial Visual Assessment Unit

This unit consists of the adjacent commercial/retail properties in and around the MacArthur Maze, some of the industrial uses are shown in Figure 2-3, as well as the East Bay Municipal Utilities District Treatment Facility located southwest of the MacArthur Maze.



Figure 2-2 Freeway Visual Assessment Unit looking Northwest

Figure 2-3 Commercial/Industrial Visual Assessment Unit looking East



Residential Visual Assessment Unit

This unit consists of residential properties along Hannah Street, two streets east of Mandela Parkway. This street has direct views of the eastern termination point of the project on I-580 as shown in Figure 2-4.

Bay Bridge Trail Visual Assessment Unit

This unit is comprised of the Bay Bridge Trail that is adjacent to and under the MacArthur Maze. The trail is exclusively for bicyclists and pedestrians and is closed to motorists. The trail is surrounded by native and ornamental grasses, shrubs, small trees, and seasonal wetland areas. The connectors cross over the pathway at multiple locations as shown in Figure 2-5. The East Bay Municipal Utilities District Treatment Facility is located directly south of the Bay Bridge Trail.



Figure 2-4 Residential Visual Assessment Unit looking East

Figure 2-5 Bay Bridge Trail Visual Assessment Unit looking Northeast at the Bay Bridge



2.1.3 Environmental Consequences - Summary of Visual Impacts by Visual Assessment Unit

Freeway Visual Assessment Unit

For project Alternatives A, B, C, and D, the visual impacts in the Freeway Visual Assessment Unit would be moderate. Commuters and commercial drivers would be focused on getting to their destination and not on scenic views. The project improvements would resemble existing structures, resulting in moderately perceivable changes. Tourists and passengers are anticipated to have moderate sensitivity and moderate exposure levels to the project. Their attention is on scenic vistas such as the San Francisco Bay, the Bay Bridge, and distant mountains. Views of these vistas would not change for both users of the freeway and for those viewing the connectors from outside Caltrans ROW. Overall viewer response is predicted to be moderate, as the completed project will look very similar and have similar outward views. No anticipated degradation in view quality is expected. For the No-Build Alternative, the visual quality would remain as per current existing conditions.

Commercial/Industrial Visual Assessment Unit

For project Alternatives A, B, C, and D, the visual impacts in the Commercial/Industrial Visual Assessment Unit would be low. Views in this assessment unit are considered low in visual character and quality, as they consist mainly of the undersides of the multiple connectors and support columns, and distant views are heavily screened from view. Viewers here are primarily focused on the task at hand (work, retail sales, etc.) not on views of the freeway structure. For the No-Build Alternative, the visual quality would remain as per current existing conditions.

Residential Visual Assessment Unit

For project Alternatives A, B, C, and D, the visual impacts in the Residential Visual Assessment Unit would be moderate to low. Views in this assessment unit are considered low in visual character and quality, as they consist mainly of the undersides of the multiple I-580 connectors and support columns, and distant views are screened from view by chain-link fencing and mature trees. Viewers here are primarily focused on various tasks (yard work, house work, etc.) and not on views of the freeway structure. The project is expected to blend in visually and not result in change to visual quality. For the No-Build Alternative, the visual quality would remain as per current existing conditions.

Bay Bridge Trail Visual Assessment Unit

For project Alternatives A, B, C, and D, the visual impacts in the Bay Bridge Trail Visual Assessment Unit would be moderate to low for the Bridge Lowering, Bridge Raising, and Partial Deck Reconstruction alternatives (Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D), and moderate to high for the Partial Bridge Reconstruction (Alternative C) due to the realignment and rebuilt structure. Views from lookout areas, as well as from the trail, are dominated by the convergence of the connector structures and associated support columns. Long distance views of the Berkeley Hills can barely be seen through the structures. The project is expected to blend in visually and not result in change to visual quality. There would be minor change to the views under Alternative C due to the realignment and rebuilt structure. Visual quality is rated moderate, as planted vegetation of texture and colors raise the visual interest level along the Bay Bridge Trail. Any landscaping that is disturbed by construction would be restored upon completion of the project. For the No-Build Alternative, the visual quality would remain as per current existing conditions.

2.1.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, AMM measures will not apply to this project.

2.2 Cultural Resources

2.2.1 Regulatory Setting

The term "cultural resources" as used in this document refers to all "built environment" resources (structures, bridges, railroads, water conveyance systems, etc.), culturally important resources, and archaeological resources (both prehistoric and historic), regardless of significance. Laws and regulations dealing with cultural resources include:

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, sets forth national policy and procedures for historic properties, defined as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects included in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on those undertakings, following regulations issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (36 CFR 800). On January 1, 2014, a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the Advisory Council, FWHA, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Caltrans went into effect for Caltrans projects, both state and local, with FHWA involvement. The PA implements the Advisory Council's regulations (36 CFR 800) streamlining the Section 106 process and delegating certain responsibilities to Caltrans. The FHWA's responsibilities under the PA have been assigned to Caltrans as part of the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Program (23 USC 327).

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) applies when a project may involve archaeological resources located on federal or tribal land. The ARPA requires that a permit be obtained before excavation of an archaeological resource on such land can take place.

Historic properties may also be covered under Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act, which regulates the "use" of land from historic properties.

CEQA requires the consideration of cultural resources that are historical resources and tribal cultural resources, as well as "unique" archaeological resources. California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1 established the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and outlined the necessary criteria for a cultural resource to be considered eligible for listing in the CRHR and, therefore, a historical resource. Historical resources are defined in PRC Section 5020.1(j). In 2014, Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) added the term "tribal cultural resources" to CEQA, and AB 52 is commonly referenced instead of CEQA when discussing the process to identify tribal cultural resources (as well as identifying measures to avoid, preserve, or mitigate effects to them). Defined in PRC Section 21074(a), a tribal cultural resource is a CRHR or local register eligible site, feature, place, cultural landscape, or object which has a cultural value to a California Native American tribe. Tribal cultural resources are referenced in PRC Section 21083.2.

Historical resources are considered under CEQA, as well as PRC Section 5024.1, which establishes the CRHR. PRC Section 5024 requires state agencies to identify and protect State-owned resources that meet the NRHP listing criteria. It further specifically requires Caltrans to inventory State-owned structures in its ROW. Sections 5024(f) and 5024.5 require State agencies to provide notice to and consult with the SHPO before altering, transferring, relocating, or demolishing state-owned historical resources that are listed on or are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or are registered or eligible for registration as California Historical Landmarks.

2.2.2 Affected Environment

The following cultural resources technical reports were completed for this project: Archaeological Survey Report, approved January 2018; Extended Phase I Report, approved September 2018; and, Historical Resources Evaluation Report, approved September 2018. A Historic Property Survey Report was completed in September 2018.

In accordance with Section 106 PA Stipulation VIII.A, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the project was established by Jennifer Blake, Caltrans Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) Principal Investigator – Prehistoric Archaeology, Michael Meloy, Caltrans PQS Principal Architectural Historian, and Laurie Lau, Caltrans Project Manager, and was signed and approved on August 10, 2018. The APE includes the proposed construction footprint for the project, including bridgework, falsework, equipment staging, access roads, utility relocation, and vegetation removal. The vertical APE extends from the ground surface to a depth of at least 100 feet, the proposed depth of piles.

A records search of Caltrans archives and materials housed at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System was conducted on September 4, 2017. An intensive pedestrian survey was conducted on December 7, 2017 to identify any potential archaeological materials in the APE. Archival research, pedestrian survey, and consultation with local Native American tribes and individuals failed to identify any cultural materials within the APE. Due to potential for submerged, previously unrecorded prehistoric-era resources along the shoreline, and due to sensitivity for historic-era resources within West Oakland, subsurface testing was conducted within the APE on February 7 and 13, 2018.

Subsurface testing resulted in the discovery of one historic-era archaeological site, P-01-012011/CA-ALA-700H. The site consists of two refuse deposits containing artifacts dating to the early 1930s. Archaeological deposits within CA-ALA-700H were disturbed and displaced, likely during the original construction and subsequent expansion of the highway structure. The site was determined not eligible for the NRHP.

For the built environment, the Caltrans Cultural Resource Database (CCRD), the NRHP, the CRHR, Caltrans Right of Way Division maps and property files, and Caltrans District 4 As-Built Plan Collections were reviewed. Listings of California Historical Landmarks and California Points of Historical Interest, as well as information available in the collection of the California History Room at the Oakland Public Library, and the California Digital Newspaper Collection were also reviewed. In addition, Caltrans PQS reviewed several on-line sources including the San Francisco Public eLibrary.

Architectural history research and surveys identified five built resources within the APE: the Key System Subway Tunnel, the Union Pacific Railroad tracks, and three bridges within the MacArthur Maze distribution structure: the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector, the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector, and the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector. The Key System Subway Tunnel is a historic-era transportation structure constructed between 1902 and 1903. The Union Pacific Railroad tracks are present with the APE as a 675-foot-long segment of trackway.

The Key System Subway Tunnel, recorded and evaluated for this project, was determined not eligible for the NRHP due to lack of integrity. Pursuant to Stipulation VIII.C.4 of the Section 106 PA, the Union Pacific Railroad tracks, as a segment of a large linear resource, was assumed eligible for the NRHP for the purposes of this project only since evaluation was not possible due to the large size of this linear resource. Construction of a scaffold system over the railroad will allow operations to continue while preventing debris from entering the rail facilities.

The three connectors within the Maze are listed as Category 5 (previously determined ineligible for the NRHP) in the Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory.

On October 23, 2018, the SHPO concurred with Caltrans that neither P-01-012011/CA-ALA-700H nor the Key System Subway Tunnel meet the requirements for inclusion into either the NRHP or the CRHR.

2.2.3 Environmental Consequences

Within the APE, there are five cultural resources that have been determined not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. One is a historic-era archaeological site, CA-ALA-700H, one is the Key System Subway Tunnel, and three are Category 5 bridges within the MacArthur Maze (previously determined not eligible for the NRHP). The segment of Union Pacific Railroad tracks within the APE, while assumed eligible for the NRHP, would not be affected because construction of a scaffold system over the railroad would allow operations to continue unimpeded and prevent debris from entering the rail facilities. Overall, the finding for the undertaking as a whole is No Historic Properties Affected.

2.2.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, AMM measures will not apply to this project.

2.3 Physical Environment

2.3.1 Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff

Regulatory Setting

FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS: CLEAN WATER ACT

In 1972, Congress amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, making the addition of pollutants to the waters of the United States (U.S.) from any point source⁴ unlawful unless the discharge is in compliance with a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. This act and its amendments are known today as the Clean Water Act (CWA). Congress has amended the act several times. In the 1987 amendments, Congress directed dischargers of storm water from municipal and industrial/construction point sources to comply with the NPDES permit scheme. The goal of the CWA is "to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters." The following are important CWA sections:

- Sections 303 and 304 require states to issue water quality standards, criteria, and guidelines.
- Section 401 requires an applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge to waters of the U.S. to obtain certification from the state that the discharge will comply with other provisions of the act. This is most frequently required in tandem with a Section 404 permit request (see below).
- Section 402 establishes the NPDES, a permitting system for the discharges (except for dredge or fill material) of any pollutant into waters of the U.S. Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) administer this permitting program in California. Section 402(p) requires permits for discharges of storm water from industrial/construction and municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s).
- Section 404 establishes a permit program for the discharge of dredge or fill material into waters of the U.S. This permit program is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

The USACE issues two types of 404 permits: General and Individual. There are two types of General permits: Regional and Nationwide. Regional permits are issued for a general category of activities when they are similar in nature and cause minimal environmental effect. Nationwide permits are issued to allow a variety of minor project activities with no more than minimal effects.

Ordinarily, projects that do not meet the criteria for a Regional or Nationwide permit may be permitted under one of the USACE's Individual permits. There are two types of Individual permits: Standard permits and Letters of Permission. For Individual permits, the USACE decision to approve is based on compliance with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA) Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines

⁴ A point source is any discrete conveyance such as a pipe or a man-made ditch.

(40 CFR Part 230), and whether the permit approval is in the public interest. The Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (Guidelines) were developed by the U.S. EPA in conjunction with the USACE and allow the discharge of dredged or fill material into the aquatic system (waters of the U.S.) only if there is no practicable alternative which would have less adverse effects. The Guidelines state that the USACE may not issue a permit if there is a least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) to the proposed discharge that would have lesser effects on waters of the U.S. and not have any other significant adverse environmental consequences. According to the Guidelines, documentation is needed that a sequence of avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures has been followed, in that order. The Guidelines also restrict permitting activities that violate water quality or toxic effluent⁵ standards, jeopardize the continued existence of listed species, violate marine sanctuary protections, or cause "significant degradation" to waters of the U.S. In addition, every permit from the USACE, even if not subject to the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, must meet general requirements. See 33 CFR 320.4. A discussion of the LEDPA determination, if any, for the document is included in Section 2.5.2 Wetlands and Other Waters.

STATE REQUIREMENTS

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act: California's Porter-Cologne Act, enacted in 1969, provides the legal basis for water quality regulation within California. This act requires a "Report of Waste Discharge" for any discharge of waste (liquid, solid, or gaseous) to land or surface waters that may impair beneficial uses for surface and/or groundwater of the state. It predates the CWA and regulates discharges to waters of the state. Waters of the state include more than just waters of the U.S., such as groundwater and surface waters not considered waters of the U.S. Additionally, it prohibits discharges of "waste" as defined, and this definition is broader than the CWA definition of "pollutant." Discharges under the Porter-Cologne Act are permitted by Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and may be required even when the discharge is already permitted or exempt under the CWA.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and RWQCBs are responsible for establishing the water quality standards (objectives and beneficial uses) required by the CWA and regulating discharges to ensure compliance with the water quality standards. Details about water quality standards in a project area are included in the applicable RWQCB Basin Plan. In California, RWQCBs designate beneficial uses for all water body segments in their jurisdictions and then set criteria necessary to protect those uses. As a result, the water quality standards developed for particular water segments are based on the designated use and vary depending on that use. In addition, the SWRCB identifies waters failing to meet standards for specific pollutants. These waters are then state-listed in accordance with CWA Section 303(d). If a state determines that waters are impaired for one or more constituents and the standards cannot be met through point source or non-point source controls (NPDES permits or WDRs), the CWA

⁵ The U.S. EPA defines "effluent" as "wastewater, treated or untreated, that flows out of a treatment plant, sewer, or industrial outfall."

requires the establishment of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). TMDLs specify allowable pollutant loads from all sources (point, non-point, and natural) for a given watershed.

State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards

The SWRCB administers water rights, sets water pollution control policy, and issues water board orders on matters of statewide application, and oversees water quality functions throughout the state by approving Basin Plans, TMDLs, and NPDES permits. RWCQBs are responsible for protecting beneficial uses of water resources within their regional jurisdiction using planning, permitting, and enforcement authorities to meet this responsibility.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program/Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4): Section 402(p) of the CWA requires the issuance of NPDES permits for five categories of storm water discharges, including MS4s. An MS4 is defined as "any conveyance or system of conveyances (roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, human-made channels, and storm drains) owned or operated by a state, city, town, county, or other public body having jurisdiction over storm water, that is designed or used for collecting or conveying storm water." The SWRCB has identified Caltrans as an owner/operator of an MS4 under federal regulations. Caltrans' MS4 permit covers all Caltrans ROWs, properties, facilities, and activities in the state. The SWRCB or the RWQCB issues NPDES permits for five years, and permit requirements remain active until a new permit has been adopted.

Caltrans' MS4 Permit, Order No. 2012-0011-DWQ (adopted on September 19, 2012 and effective on July 1, 2013), as amended by Order No. 2014-0006-EXEC (effective January 17, 2014), Order No. 2014-0077-DWQ (effective May 20, 2014) and Order No. 2015-0036-EXEC (conformed and effective April 7, 2015) has three basic requirements:

- 1. Caltrans must comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit (see below);
- 2. Caltrans must implement a year-round program in all parts of the State to effectively control storm water and non-storm water discharges; and,
- 3. Caltrans storm water discharges must meet water quality standards through implementation of permanent and temporary (construction) Best Management Practices (BMPs), to the maximum extent practicable, and other measures as the SWRCB determines to be necessary to meet the water quality standards.

To comply with the permit, Caltrans developed the Statewide Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) to address storm water pollution controls related to highway planning, design, construction, and maintenance activities throughout California. The SWMP assigns responsibilities within Caltrans for implementing storm water management procedures and practices as well as training, public education and participation, monitoring and research, program evaluation, and reporting activities. The SWMP describes the minimum procedures and practices Caltrans uses to reduce pollutants in storm water and non-storm water discharges. It outlines procedures and responsibilities for protecting water quality, including the selection and implementation of BMPs. The proposed project will be programmed to follow the guidelines and procedures outlined in the latest SWMP to address storm water runoff.

<u>Construction General Permit:</u> Construction General Permit, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ (adopted on September 2, 2009 and effective on July 1, 2010), as amended by Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ (effective February 14, 2011) and Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ (effective on July 17, 2012). The permit regulates storm water discharges from construction sites that result in a Disturbed Soil Area (DSA) of one acre or greater, and/or are smaller sites that are part of a larger common plan of development. By law, all storm water discharges associated with construction activity where clearing, grading, and excavation result in soil disturbance of at least one acre must comply with the provisions of the General Construction Permit. Construction activity that results in soil disturbances of less than one acre is subject to this Construction General Permit if there is potential for significant water quality impairment resulting from the activity as determined by the RWQCB. Operators of regulated construction sites are required to develop Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs); to implement sediment, erosion, and pollution prevention control measures; and to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit.

The Construction General Permit separates projects into Risk Levels 1, 2, or 3. Risk levels are determined during the planning and design phases and are based on potential erosion and transport to receiving waters. Requirements apply according to the Risk Level determined. For example, a Risk Level 3 (highest risk) project would require compulsory storm water runoff pH and turbidity monitoring, and before construction and after construction aquatic biological assessments during specified seasonal windows. For all projects subject to the permit, applicants are required to develop and implement an effective SWPPP. In accordance with Caltrans' SWMP and Standard Specifications, a Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) is necessary for projects with a DSA of less than one acre.

<u>Section 401 Permitting:</u> Under Section 401 of the CWA, any project requiring a federal license or permit that may result in a discharge to a water of the U.S. must obtain a 401 Certification, which certifies that the project would be in compliance with state water quality standards. The most common federal permits triggering 401 Certification are CWA Section 404 permits issued by the USACE. The 401 permit certifications are obtained from the appropriate RWQCB, dependent on the project location, and are required before the USACE issues a 404 permit.

In some cases, the RWQCB may have specific concerns with discharges associated with a project. As a result, the RWQCB may issue WDRs under the State Water Code (Porter-Cologne Act) that define activities, such as the inclusion of specific features, effluent limitations, monitoring, and plan submittals that are to be implemented for

protecting or benefiting water quality. WDRs can be issued to address both permanent and temporary discharges of a project.

Affected Environment

A Water Quality Study was prepared on November 8, 2018, to assess the proposed project's potential effects to water quality and storm water management in the area.

The project is located within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay RWQCB (Region 2), which is responsible for implementation and enforcement of state and federal laws and regulations concerning water quality. The proposed project is located within Hydrologic Sub-Area (HSA) 204.20, primarily within the Angel Island watershed of the Frontal San Francisco Bay Estuaries. The open waters of San Francisco Bay are less than 200 feet northwest of the project area.

San Francisco Bay is on the 2014-2016 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies, and is impaired for chlordane, DDT (dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane), dieldrin, dioxin compounds (including 2,3,7,8-TCDD), furan compounds, invasive species, mercury, PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls), PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) (dioxin-like), selenium, and trash.

The Region 2 Basin Plan establishes beneficial uses for waterways and water bodies within the region. San Francisco Bay's beneficial uses include commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; industrial service supply; navigation; industrial process supply; rare, threatened, or endangered species; contact and non-contact water recreation; shellfish harvesting; migration of aquatic organisms; spawning, reproduction, and/or early development of aquatic organisms; and, wildlife habitat.

Three detention basins are designed to correct and treat runoff from the 46.3 acres of roadway within the general area. The detention basins within the project area include a forebay detention basin and two bioretention basins. The retention basins are connected by inlets and outlets, which are irrigated to promote vegetation growth for the biofiltration of storm water runoff. Storm water flows into the forebay detention basin, water is pumped into the bioretention basins where it is held and allowed to percolate into the subsurface and eventually into San Francisco Bay. If water in the bioretention basin's capacity, the excess water is pumped back into the forebay. If this retained storm water exceeds the capacity of the forebay, the water is pumped out and released into San Francisco Bay.

Environmental Consequences

All Build Alternatives would disturb soil and wetlands within the detention basins during construction. These construction impacts would be minimized by implementing appropriate avoidance and minimization measures and BMPs.

One alternative, Alternative C-Partial Bridge Replacement, would result in 1.22 acres of additional impervious surface compared to existing conditions. No other alternative would increase the amount of currently existing impervious surface. Table 2-1 summarizes the area that would be affected by the project under each build alternative.

ALTERNATIVE	Disturbed Soil Area (acres)	Net New Impervious Surface (acres)	Replaced Impervious Surface (acres)	New Impervious Surface (acres)
Α	2.8	0	1.3	1.3
В	3.3	0	1.6	1.6
С	12.8	1.22	4.86	6.08
D	2.0	0	0.5	0.5

|--|

Project Features

TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION SITE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs)

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, BMPs will not apply to this project.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, AMM measures will not apply to this project.

2.3.2 Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography

Regulatory Setting

For geologic and topographic features, the key federal law is the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which establishes a national registry of natural landmarks and protects "outstanding examples of major geological features." Topographic and geologic features are also protected under CEQA.

This section also discusses geology, soils, and seismic concerns as they relate to public safety and project design. Earthquakes are prime considerations in the design and retrofit of structures. Structures are designed using Caltrans' Seismic Design Criteria (SDC). The SDC provides the minimum seismic requirements for highway bridges designed in California. A bridge's category and classification would determine its seismic performance level and which methods are used for estimating the seismic demands and structural capabilities. For more information, please see Caltrans' Division of Engineering Services, Office of Earthquake Engineering, Seismic Design Criteria.

Affected Environment

A District Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the proposed project was approved on April 17, 2018. The information discussed below is from that report.

The project area is located on the low-lying bay plain to the east of the San Francisco Bay. The depression forming the bay is a result of combination of regional faults. Sediments from the surrounding mountains and the Sacramento-San Joaquin river system that drains the Central Valley have gradually been filling in the bay with young bay mud. The west side of the project area is blanketed by fill materials consisting of loose to medium dense materials, and under the fill is soft bay mud. Geologists and seismologists recognize the San Francisco Bay Area as one of the most active seismic regions in the United States. There are three major faults that trend in a northwest direction through the Bay Area, which have generated about 12 earthquakes per century large enough to cause significant structural damage. These earthquakes occur on faults that are part of the San Andreas Fault system that extends for at least 700 miles along the California Coast, and includes the San Andreas, Hayward, and Calaveras faults. Some seismic effects result from various soil responses to ground acceleration. The subsurface soils within the project site are susceptible to the following:

Liquefaction – Liquefaction is a process by which soil deposits below the water table temporarily lose strength and behave as a liquid rather than a solid, typically during a moderate to large earthquake. The liquefaction susceptibility at the project area is very high. A preliminary evaluation was performed for this project and confirmed that the site has high liquefaction potential which can induce settlement ranging from 2 to 10 inches.

Cracking – Cracks may develop in the soil overlying the site. Since the project is underlain by artificial fill, there is a moderate to high potential for cracking.

Differential Compaction – During moderate and large earthquakes, soft or loose, natural or fill soils can densify and consolidate, often unevenly across a site. Since the project area is underlain by fill, it is susceptible to differential compaction.

Ground Shaking – Moderate to large earthquakes are probable along several active faults in the greater Bay Area. Therefore, strong ground shaking should be expected at some time during the design life of the proposed development.

Shrink Swell – The expansion and/or contraction of soil can cause foundations to shift and roadways to crack. The potential for shrink swell in the project area is considered moderate to high.

Environmental Consequences

The project design and features would be built to address liquefaction, cracking, differential compaction, ground shaking, shrink swell, and other existing geological, soils, and seismic concerns per Caltrans standards. All build alternatives of the proposed project would incorporate soil treatment to address potential seismic events. Soil treatment would be performed by using grout and/or micropiles. Grout would be injected around the perimeter of the existing structure then micropiles would be placed through the grout. The use of grouting would increase soil strength of the site. The grouting would have no effect on the environmental setting and would in general

improve the geology and soil conditions. The grouting and implementation of micropiles would withstand the seismic demand from the Hayward Fault.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, AMM measures will not apply to this project.

2.4 Cumulative Impacts

2.4.1 Regulatory Setting

Cumulative impacts are those that result from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, combined with the potential impacts of the proposed project. A cumulative effect assessment looks at the collective impacts posed by individual land use plans and projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively substantial impacts taking place over a period of time.

Cumulative impacts to resources in the project area may result from residential, commercial, industrial, and highway development, as well as from agricultural development and the conversion to more intensive agricultural cultivation. These land use activities can degrade habitat and species diversity through consequences such as displacement and fragmentation of habitats and populations, alteration of hydrology, contamination, erosion, sedimentation, disruption of migration corridors, changes in water quality, and introduction or promotion of predators. They can also contribute to potential community impacts identified for the project, such as changes in community character, traffic patterns, housing availability, and employment.

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 describes when a cumulative impact analysis is necessary and what elements are necessary for an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts. The definition of cumulative impacts under CEQA can be found in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines. A definition of cumulative impacts under the NEPA can be found in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1508.7.

The cumulative impact analysis focuses on the resources that the project may affect. If the project would not result in impacts on a resource, it would not contribute to a cumulative impact. The impact used in the cumulative impact analysis is the net impact: that is, the project impact minus proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures. For resource areas where the impact will be fully offset by the proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

The proposed project would not have net impacts on any resources. Because the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative and no impacts have been identified, the project would not result in cumulative impacts.

2.5 Construction Impacts

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, this project will not have construction impacts.

2.5.1 Noise

A Construction Noise Assessment for the proposed project was approved May 22, 2018 to ensure that construction activities would not impact nearby residents. This project is not a Type 1 project⁶ as defined in 23 CFR 772. Typically, work taking place within the Caltrans ROW is not subject to local noise ordinances. If construction noise level is expected to exceed the contract specification criteria or the construction noise levels is expected to exceed the ambient (baseline) noise level, and there are sensitive receptors near the project site, Caltrans would work with the contractor to meet local requirements where feasible.

Affected Environment

Figure 2-6 shows the residential study areas where the noise analysis was conducted. The residences are to the southeast of the MacArthur Maze where the blue and red dots are concentrated. These areas were chosen for study to capture anticipated construction noise levels in relation to nearby residences. The goal was to understand the noise levels of construction and ensure noise levels would not exceed 86 decibels (dBA) Lmax (maximum noise level) at 50 feet from the job site from 9PM to 6APM, per Caltrans standards, at the residences within the study areas; a decibel (db) is a unit

- The construction of a highway on a new location; or
- The physical alteration of an existing highway where there is either:
- Substantial horizontal alteration A project that halves the distance between the traffic noise source and the closest receptor between the existing condition to the future build condition; or Substantial vertical alteration. A project that removes shielding thereby exposing the line-of-sight between the receptor and the traffic noise source. This is done by altering either the vertical alignment of the highway or the topography between the highway traffic noise source and the receptor; or
- The addition of a through-traffic lane(s). This includes the addition of a through-traffic lane that functions as a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane, bus lane, or truck climbing lane; or
- The addition of an auxiliary lane, except for when the auxiliary lane is a turn lane; or
- The addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps added to a quadrant to complete an existing partial interchange; or
- Restriping existing pavement for the purpose of adding a through traffic lane or an auxiliary lane; or
- The addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot, or toll plaza.

⁶ A Type 1 project as defined in 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 772, is a federal or Federal-aid project for:

describing the amplitude of sound. Figure 2-7 shows the dB for common indoor and outdoor activities which can be compared to the construction dBs.



Figure 2-6 Residential Areas Assessed during Noise Study

Blue- short term measurements taken every few minutes over a day. Red- long term measurements ran consistently over a week.



Figure 2-7 Noise Levels for Common Indoor and Outdoor Activities

Figure 2-8 shows the aquatic study areas in the Emeryville Crescent where the noise analysis was conducted. The noise levels were studied at the points of the San Francisco Bay that are northwest of the MacArthur Maze, shown in green and red. These areas were chosen for study to capture anticipated noise levels in relation to wildlife that may be present. The goal was to understand the noise levels of construction and ensure noise levels would not exceed 86 dBA at the locations within the study areas.



Figure 2-8 Aquatic Areas Assessed during Noise Study

Green- short term measurements taken every few minutes over a day within the water.

Red- long term measurements ran consistently over a week. Blue- short term measurements taken every few minutes over a day.

Environmental Consequences

Under Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D, construction noise levels calculated at the nearest points along the bridge to the nearby noise-sensitive receptors would be at or below existing ambient noise levels. The existing ambient noise levels are the compilation of noise from all sources near and far measured at the Oakland residences to the southeast of the MacArthur Maze (Figure 2-6). During the demolition and excavation phases of Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D, construction noise would not exceed the ambient noise levels in the Emeryville Crescent at locations within 1,000 feet of the nearest points along both bridges. The remaining phases would not generate noise levels in excess of ambient conditions in the Emeryville Crescent.

Alternative C would involve reconstructing the bridges in a new alignment. When construction activities occur at the easternmost point along this alignment, ambient noise levels would be exceeded during the demolition, bridge building, and excavation phases of the project at the location of the residences located in Oakland within 300 feet of the active construction site. During demolition and excavation phases, ambient noise levels would also be exceeded at residences located within 500 feet of the active construction site, leading to the implementation of a temporary sound wall. Paving activities would occur further west from the residences than all other phases of construction. This distance would prevent construction noise levels during paving activities to exceed ambient noise levels. Ambient noise levels in the Emeryville Crescent would be exceeded at receptors located within 1,000 feet of the active construction site during the demolition, excavation, and paving phases. The studies conducted found that the noise levels during construction would be temporary and minimal. There would be a minor increase in ambient noise levels during construction hours.

Based on the studies completed, Caltrans proposed construction of a temporary sound wall for Alternative C, as depicted in green in Figure 2-9, with a length of approximately 800 feet and a height of approximately 16 feet. Because the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, temporary noise abatement will not be needed for this project.



Figure 2-9 Temporary Sound Wall Proposed for Alternative C

Avoidance and Minimization Measures

Since the No Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, AMM measures will not apply to this project.

2.5.2 Wetlands and Other Waters

Affected Environment

A preliminary evaluation of jurisdictional wetlands was performed. Wetlands totaling 0.25 acre were identified within the project area. Other waters of the U.S. within the project area totaled approximately 0.62 acre. The project area includes wetlands and "other waters" subject to USACE jurisdiction under Section 404 of the CWA.

Environmental Consequences

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected, a RWQCB Section 401 certification and USACE Nationwide 404 Permit will not be needed. There will be no impacts to wetlands or other waters of the United States.

Temporary impacts to wetlands and other waters of the United States would be as follows: Alternatives A and B would impact 0.17 acre, Alternative C would impact 0.25 acre, and Alternative D would impact .06 acre. All temporary impacts would be associated with staging, construction access, and falsework. Temporary impact areas would be restored at the end of one construction season. The bioretention ponds would continue to function during construction. No permanent impacts to wetlands or other

jurisdictional features are anticipated. The No-Build Alternative will not impact wetlands and other waters.

2.5.3 Utilities/Emergency Services

Affected Environment

The project area including the I-80, I-580, and I-880 connectors serves approximately 300,000 vehicles daily based on Caltrans traffic counts. Among these vehicles are emergency service vehicles. There are utilities present within the project area, but they are not anticipated to be impacted by the proposed project.

Environmental Consequences

Emergency services, including police, fire, and medical responders could be impacted by closures of the Maze connectors during construction. Under Alternative A, Bridge Lowering, the WB I-80 to EB I-580 connector and the WB I-80 to SB I-880 connector could be closed intermittently over a period of approximately 5 months. Under Alternative B, Bridge Raising, the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector and the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector could be closed intermittently over a period of approximately 3 months. Under Alternative C, Partial Bridge Replacement, the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector and the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector could be closed intermittently over a period of approximately 15 months. Under Alternative D, Partial Deck Reconstruction, the WB I-580 to WB I-80 connector and the EB I-80 to EB I-580 connector could be closed intermittently over a period of approximately 4 months.

Project Feature

• A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which would identify ways to reduce traffic congestion resulting from project construction and could include detours would be developed prior to project construction of the Build Alternatives; however, because the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, traffic and emergency services will not be affected, and a TMP is not needed.

2.5.4 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Affected Environment

The MacArthur Maze interchange is the major traffic distribution center that enables the public to access San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, and the Port of Oakland, etc. The interchange connectors distribute traffic to and from the Bay Bridge.

The Bay Bridge Trail, which is a segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail system, extends from a trailhead on Shellmound Street in Emeryville to the East Span of the Bay Bridge. The trail is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Environmental Consequences

Traffic in the project area could potentially be impacted by lane or connector closures required by construction activities.

The Bay Bridge Trail extends through the MacArthur Maze project area and could be potentially disturbed during construction activities. The proposed project would likely require a temporary detour of the trail during construction activities. The Bay Bridge Trail would be restored to existing conditions following construction of the project for Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D. For Alternative C, the Bay Bridge Trail would be realigned within the project area and would be repaved and landscaped to match existing conditions following construction of the project.

Project Features

• Because the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, traffic and the trail will not be affected and a TMP is not needed.

Chapter 3 – California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Evaluation

3.1 Determining Significance under CEQA

The proposed project is a joint project by Caltrans and the FHWA and is subject to state and federal environmental review requirements. Project documentation, therefore, has been prepared in compliance with both CEQA and NEPA. FHWA's responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and any other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by Caltrans pursuant to 23 USC Section 327 (23 USC 327) and the MOU dated December 23, 2016 and executed by FHWA and Caltrans. Caltrans is the lead agency under CEQA and NEPA.

One of the primary differences between NEPA and CEQA is the way significance is determined. Under NEPA, significance is used to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or a lower level of documentation, will be required. NEPA requires that an EIS be prepared when the proposed federal action (project) as a whole has the potential to "significantly affect the quality of the human environment." The determination of significance is based on context and intensity. Some impacts determined to be significant under CEQA may not be of sufficient magnitude to be determined significant under NEPA. Under NEPA, once a decision is made regarding the need for an EIS, it is the magnitude of the impact that is evaluated and no judgment of its individual significance is deemed important for the text. NEPA does not require that a determination of significant impacts be stated in the environmental documents.

CEQA, on the other hand, does require Caltrans to identify each "significant effect on the environment" resulting from the project and ways to mitigate each significant effect. If the project may have a significant effect on any environmental resource, then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared. Each and every significant effect on the environment must be disclosed in the EIR and mitigated if feasible. In addition, the CEQA Guidelines list a number of "mandatory findings of significance," which also require the preparation of an EIR. There are no types of actions under NEPA that parallel the findings of mandatory significance.

3.2 CEQA Environmental Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects will indicate that there are no impacts to a particular resource. A "no impact" answer in the last column reflects this determination. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

Project features, which can include both design elements of the project, standardized measures that are applied to all or most Caltrans projects such as BMPs, and measures included in the Standard Plans and Specifications or as Standard Special Provisions, are considered to be an integral part of the project and have been considered prior to any significance determinations documented below; see Chapters 1 and 2 for a detailed discussion of these features. The annotations to this checklist are summaries of information contained in Chapter 2 in order to provide the reader with the rationale for the significance determinations; for a more detailed discussion of the nature and extent of impacts, please see Chapter 2. This checklist incorporates by reference the information contained in Chapters 1 and 2. All Avoidance and Minimization Measures for the build alternatives are found in Appendix C.

AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\square
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				\boxtimes
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				\boxtimes
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Aesthetics

<u>No Impact</u>

A-D

The visual quality of the Maze will not be altered by the proposed project and existing plantings will not be impacted by the project's construction and staging operations.

AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				

Would the project:	Significant	Less Than	Less Than	No
	and	Significant	Significant	Impact
	Unavoidable	with	Impact	
	Impact	Mitigation		
		Incorporated		
e) Involve other changes in the				\boxtimes
existing environment which, due				
to their location or nature, could				
result in conversion of Farmland,				
to non-agricultural use or				
conversion of forest land to non-				
forest use?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Agriculture and Forest Resources

<u>No Impact</u>

A-E

There are no farmlands or forest resources within the project limits or in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, no further studies of impacts are necessary.

AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				\boxtimes
 b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? 				\boxtimes
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				\boxtimes
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				\boxtimes

CEQA Significance Determinations for Air Quality

<u>No Impact</u>

A-E

This project is exempt under the Clean Air Act transportation conformity rule under 40 CFR 93.126, Table 2- widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes). An air quality study is not required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				\boxtimes

CEQA Significance Determinations for Biological Resources

No Impact

A-F

The proposed project will not impact any special-status plant or animal species due to lack of suitable habitat within the project boundary. The project will also not impact wetlands or other jurisdictional features.
CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				\boxtimes
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				\boxtimes
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				\boxtimes

CEQA Significance Determinations for Cultural Resources

No Impact

A-D

The proposed project will have no impact on prehistoric or historical resources, paleontological resources, unique geological features, and will not disturb any human remains.

Please refer to Section 2.2 Cultural Resources for further discussion.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				\boxtimes
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				\boxtimes
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liguefaction?				\boxtimes
iv) Landslides?				\boxtimes
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				\square
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Geology and Soils

No Impact

A-E

The proposed project will not change the configuration of the existing structures, nor will it create any new seismic or geologic risks or exposures to users of the MacArthur Maze.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Caltrans has used the best available information based to the extent possible on scientific and factual information, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that may occur related to this project. The analysis included in the climate change section of this document, Section 3.3, provides the public and decision-makers as much information about the project as possible. It is Caltrans' determination that in the absence of statewide-adopted thresholds or GHG emissions limits, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding an individual project's direct and indirect impacts with respect to global climate change. Caltrans remains committed to implementing measures to reduce the potential effects of the project. These measures are outlined in the climate change section that follows the CEQA checklist and related discussions.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Significant and	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact
	Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Impact	
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				\boxtimes
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				\boxtimes
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one- quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\boxtimes
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<u>No Impact</u>

A-H

The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre- existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off- site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				\square
g) Place housing within a 100- year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow				\square

Affected Environment

The project area is surrounded by the San Francisco Bay with anticipated groundwater throughout. There are existing drainage facilities under the structures and existing water quality improvement devices as shown in Figure 3-1. The MacArthur Maze project area contains a subset of the total 143 acres of the water treatment facilities. The key objective of the basins under the structures of the MacArthur Maze is to capture and treat storm water runoff from the project area. The basins function to reduce the concentration of storm water pollutants in urban runoff.



Figure 3-1 Existing Drainage and Water Quality Improvement Infrastructure

CEQA Significance Determinations for Hydrology and Water Quality

No Impact

A-J

The proposed project would not impact water quality, groundwater, or drainage.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				\boxtimes
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Land Use and Planning

<u>No Impact</u>

A-C

There would be no impacts to land use and planning.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		Incorporated		
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes

CEQA Significance Determinations for Mineral Resources

No Impact

A-B

There are no mineral resources mapped within the vicinity of the proposed project. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Furthermore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

NOISE

Would the project result in:	Significant	Less Than	Less Than	No
	and	Significant	Significant	Impact
	Unavoidable	with	Impact	
	Impact	Mitigation		
		Incorporated		
a) Exposure of persons to or				\boxtimes
generation of noise levels in				
excess of standards established				
in the local general plan or noise				
ordinance, or applicable				
standards of other agencies?				N
b) Exposure of persons to or				\bowtie
generation of excessive				
groundborne vibration or				
groundborne noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent				\bowtie
increase in ambient noise levels				
in the project vicinity above				
levels existing without the				
project?				
d) A substantial temporary or				\bowtie
periodic increase in ambient				
noise levels in the project vicinity				
above levels existing without the				
a) For a project located within an				\square
airport land use plan or where				
such a plan has not been				
adopted within two miles of a				
public airport or public use				
airport would the project expose				
people residing or working in the				
project area to excessive noise				
levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity				\square
of a private airstrip, would the				
project expose people residing or				
working in the project area to				
excessive noise levels?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Noise

<u>No Impact</u> A-F

The project would not create any permanent increase in noise levels.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

Affected Environment

The project area is currently used for transportation purposes. The eastern and southern portions of the project area is adjacent to developed areas of Emeryville and Oakland. These developed areas are mixed-use and include housing.

CEQA Significance Determinations for Population and Housing

<u>No Impact</u>

A-C

This project will not cause population growth or effect housing and will not displace individuals from housing.

PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?				\boxtimes
Police protection?				\boxtimes
Schools?				\boxtimes
Parks?				\boxtimes
Other public facilities?				\boxtimes

CEQA Significance Determinations for Public Services

<u>No Impact</u>

Because the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, the proposed project will have no impact on public services.

RECREATION

	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Recreation

<u>No Impact</u>

A-B

The proposed project will have no effect on recreational parks or recreational facilities.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?		Incorporated		
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				\square

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				\boxtimes

CEQA Significance Determinations for Transportation/Traffic

<u>No Impact</u>

A-F

Because the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, transportation and traffic will not be affected by the proposed project.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Tribal Cultural Resources

<u>No Impact</u>

A-B

Caltrans contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on August 11, 2017, requesting a search of their sacred lands file and a list of interested Native American parties. Individuals and tribes provided by the NAHC were contacted on August 24, 2017. Representatives from the Costanoan Rumsen tribe, the Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan Indians, and the Ohlone Indian tribe requested to

be kept informed as the project progresses and provided no comment on the build alternatives. The proposed project will not cause any change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				\square

CEQA Significance Determinations for Utilities and Service Systems

<u>No Impact</u>

A-G

The proposed project will not create additional wastewater, create/treat solid waste, require new storm water drainage that would result in a significant environmental effect, require additional water supplies, or be served by landfill.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Significant	Less Than	Less Than	No
	and	Significant	Significant	Impact
	Unavoidable	with	Impact	-
	Impact	Mitigation	-	
		Incorporated		
a) Does the project have the				\square
potential to degrade the quality of				
the environment, substantially				
wildlife species, cause a fish or				
wildlife population to drop below				
self-sustaining levels, threaten to				
eliminate a plant or animal				
community, substantially reduce				
the number or restrict the range				
of a rare or endangered plant or				
animal or eliminate important				
examples of the major periods of				
California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts				\bowtie
that are individually limited, but				
cumulatively considerable?				
("Cumulatively considerable"				
means that the incremental				
effects of a project are				
considerable with the offects of				
past projects the effects of other				
current projects, the effects of other				
of probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have				\square
environmental effects which will				
cause substantial adverse effects				
on human beings, either directly				
or indirectly?				

CEQA Significance Determinations for Mandatory Findings of Significance

No Impact

A-C

The proposed project will not degrade the environment, will not have a cumulative impact, and will not result in indirect or direct environmental impacts on human beings.

3.3 Climate Change

Climate change refers to long-term changes in temperature, precipitation, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system. An ever-increasing body of scientific research attributes these climatological changes to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, particularly those generated from the production and use of fossil fuels.

While climate change has been a concern for several decades, the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization in 1988 has led to increased efforts devoted to GHG emissions reduction and climate change research and policy. These efforts are primarily concerned with the emissions of GHGs generated by human activity, including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), tetrafluoromethane, hexafluoroethane, sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), HFC-23 (fluoroform), HFC-134a (1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane), and HFC-152a (difluoroethane).

In the U.S., the main source of GHG emissions is electricity generation, followed by transportation.⁷ In California, however, transportation sources (including passenger cars, light-duty trucks, other trucks, buses, and motorcycles) are the largest contributors of GHG emissions.⁸ The dominant GHG emitted is CO₂, mostly from fossil fuel combustion.

Two terms are typically used when discussing how Caltrans address the impacts of climate change: GHG mitigation and adaptation. Greenhouse gas mitigation covers the activities and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions to limit or mitigate the impacts of climate change. Adaptation, on the other hand, is concerned with planning for and responding to impacts resulting from climate change (such as adjusting transportation design standards to withstand more intense storms and higher sea levels).

3.3.1 Regulatory Setting

Federal

To date, no national standards have been established for nationwide mobile-source GHG reduction targets, nor have any regulations or legislation been enacted specifically to address climate change and GHG emissions reduction at the project level.

NEPA (42 USC Part 4332) requires federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making a decision on the action or project.

The FHWA recognizes the threats that extreme weather, sea-level change, and other changes in environmental conditions pose to valuable transportation infrastructure and those who depend on it. FHWA therefore supports a sustainability approach that assesses vulnerability to climate risks and incorporates resilience into planning, asset

⁷ <u>https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/us-greenhouse-gas-inventory-report-1990-2014</u>

⁸ <u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm</u>

management, project development and design, and operations and maintenance practices.⁹ This approach encourages planning for sustainable highways by addressing climate risks while balancing environmental, economic, and social values—"the triple bottom line of sustainability."¹⁰ Program and project elements that foster sustainability and resilience also support economic vitality and global efficiency, increase safety and mobility, enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve the quality of life. Addressing these factors up front in the planning process will assist in decision-making and improve efficiency at the program level and will inform the analysis and stewardship needs of project-level decision-making.

Various efforts have been made widely known at the federal level to improve fuel economy and energy efficiency to address climate change and its associated effects.

<u>The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPACT92, 102nd Congress H.R.776.ENR)</u>: With this act, Congress set goals, created mandates, and amended utility laws to increase clean energy use and improve overall energy efficiency in the United States. EPACT92 consists of 27 titles detailing various measures designed to lessen the nation's dependence on imported energy, provide incentives for clean and renewable energy, and promote energy conservation in buildings. Title III of EPACT92 addresses alternative fuels. It gave the U.S. Department of Energy administrative power to regulate the minimum number of light-duty alternative fuel vehicles required in certain federal fleets beginning in fiscal year 1993. The primary goal of the program is to cut petroleum use in the United States by 2.5 billion gallons per year by 2020.

<u>Energy Policy Act of 2005 (109th Congress H.R.6 (2005–2006)</u>: This act sets forth an energy research and development program covering: (1) energy efficiency; (2) renewable energy; (3) oil and gas; (4) coal; (5) Indian energy; (6) nuclear matters and security; (7) vehicles and motor fuels, including ethanol; (8) hydrogen; (9) electricity; (10) energy tax incentives; (11) hydropower and geothermal energy; and (12) climate change technology.

<u>Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (42 USC Section 6201) and Corporate</u> <u>Average Fuel Standards:</u> This act establishes fuel economy standards for on-road motor vehicles sold in the United States. Compliance with federal fuel economy standards is determined through the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) program on the basis of each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of its vehicles produced for sale in the United States.

U.S. EPA's authority to regulate GHG emissions stems from the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Massachusetts v. EPA (2007). The Supreme Court ruled that GHGs meet the definition of air pollutants under the existing Clean Air Act and must be regulated if these gases could be reasonably anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Responding to the Court's ruling, U.S. EPA finalized an endangerment finding in December 2009. Based on scientific evidence it found that six GHGs constitute a threat

⁹ <u>https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/</u>

¹⁰ <u>https://www.sustainablehighways.dot.gov/overview.aspx</u>

to public health and welfare. Thus, it is the Supreme Court's interpretation of the existing Clear Air Act and EPA's assessment of the scientific evidence that form the basis for EPA's regulatory actions.

U.S. EPA, in conjunction with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), issued the first of a series of GHG emission standards for new cars and lightduty vehicles in April 2010¹¹ and significantly increased the fuel economy of all new passenger cars and light trucks sold in the United States. The standards required these vehicles to meet an average fuel economy of 34.1 miles per gallon by 2016. In August 2012, the federal government adopted the second rule that increases fuel economy for the fleet of passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles for model years 2017 and beyond to average fuel economy of 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025. Because NHTSA cannot set standards beyond model year 2021 due to statutory obligations and the rules' long timeframe, a mid-term evaluation is included in the rule. The mid-term evaluation is the overarching process by which NHTSA, EPA, and Air Resources Board (ARB) will decide on CAFE and GHG emissions standard stringency for model years 2022–2025. NHTSA has not formally adopted standards for model years 2022 through 2025. However, the EPA finalized its mid-term review in January 2017, affirming that the target fleet average of at least 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025 was appropriate. In March 2017, President Trump ordered EPA to reopen the review and reconsider the mileage target.¹²

NHTSA and EPA issued a Final Rule for "Phase 2" for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles to improve fuel efficiency and cut carbon pollution in October 2016. The agencies estimate that the standards will save up to 2 billion barrels of oil and reduce CO_2 emissions by up to 1.1 billion metric tons over the lifetimes of model year 2018–2027 vehicles.

State

With the passage of legislation including State Senate and Assembly bills, and executive orders, California has been innovative and proactive in addressing GHG emissions and climate change.

<u>Assembly Bill 1493, Pavley Vehicular Emissions: Greenhouse Gases, 2002:</u> This bill requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions. These stricter emissions standards were designed to apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009-model year.

¹¹ https://one.nhtsa.gov/Laws-&-Regulations/CAFE-%E2%80%93-Fuel-Economy

¹² <u>http://www.nbcnews.com/business/autos/trump-rolls-back-obama-era-fuel-economy-standards-n734256</u> and https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/03/22/2017-05316/notice-of-intention-to-

https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/03/22/2017-05316/notice-of-intention-toreconsider-the-final-determination-of-the-mid-term-evaluation-of-greenhouse Executive Order S-3-05 (June 1, 2005): The goal of this executive order (EO) is to reduce California's GHG emissions to: (1) year 2000 levels by 2010, (2) year 1990 levels by 2020, and (3) 80 percent below year 1990 levels by 2050. This goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 in 2006 and Senate Bill 32 in 2016.

<u>Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), Chapter 488, 2006: Núñez and Pavley, The Global Warming</u> <u>Solutions Act of 2006:</u> AB 32 codified the 2020 GHG emissions reduction goals as outlined in EO S-3-05, while further mandating that ARB create a scoping plan and implement rules to achieve "real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases." The Legislature also intended that the statewide GHG emissions limit continue in existence and be used to maintain and continue reductions in emissions of GHGs beyond 2020 (Health and Safety Code Section 38551(b)). The law requires ARB to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG reductions.

<u>Executive Order S-01-07 (January 18, 2007)</u>: This order sets forth the low carbon fuel standard (LCFS) for California. Under this EO, the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels is to be reduced by at least 10 percent by the year 2020. ARB readopted the LCFS regulation in September 2015, and the changes went into effect on January 1, 2016. The program establishes a strong framework to promote the low-carbon fuel adoption necessary to achieve the Governor's 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction goals.

<u>Senate Bill 97 (SB 97), Chapter 185, 2007, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>: This bill requires the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop recommended amendments to CEQA Guidelines for addressing GHG emissions. The amendments became effective on March 18, 2010.

<u>SB 375, Chapter 728, 2008, Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection:</u> This bill requires ARB to set regional emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles. The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for each region must then develop a "Sustainable Communities Strategy" (SCS) that integrates transportation, land-use, and housing policies to plan how it will achieve the emissions target for its region.

<u>SB 391, Chapter 585, 2009, California Transportation Plan:</u> This bill requires the State's long-range transportation plan to meet California's climate change goals under AB 32.

<u>EO B-16-12 (March 2012)</u>: This EO orders State entities under the direction of the Governor, including ARB, the California Energy Commission, and the Public Utilities Commission, to support the rapid commercialization of zero-emission vehicles. It directs these entities to achieve various benchmarks related to zero-emission vehicles.

<u>EO B-30-15 (April 2015)</u>: This EO establishes an interim statewide GHG emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 in order to ensure California meets its target of reducing GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. It further orders all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions to

implement measures, pursuant to statutory authority, to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 GHG emissions reductions targets. It also directs ARB to update the Climate Change Scoping Plan to express the 2030 target in terms of million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO₂e). Finally, it requires the Natural Resources Agency to update the state's climate adaptation strategy, *Safeguarding California*, every 3 years, and to ensure that its provisions are fully implemented.

<u>SB 32 Chapter 249, 2016</u>: This SB codifies the GHG reduction targets established in EO B-30-15 to achieve a mid-range goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

3.3.2 Environmental Setting

In 2006, the Legislature passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (<u>AB 32</u>), which created a comprehensive, multi-year program to reduce GHG emissions in California. AB 32 required ARB to develop a Scoping Plan that describes the approach California will take to achieve the goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Scoping Plan was first approved by ARB in 2008 and must be updated every 5 years. The second updated plan, *California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan*, adopted on December 14, 2017, reflects the 2030 target established in EO B-30-15 and SB 32.

The AB 32 Scoping Plan and the subsequent updates contain the main strategies California will use to reduce GHG emissions. As part of its supporting documentation for the updated Scoping Plan, ARB released the GHG inventory for California.¹³ ARB is responsible for maintaining and updating California's GHG Inventory per H&SC Section 39607.4. The associated forecast/projection is an estimate of the emissions anticipated to occur in the year 2020 if none of the foreseeable measures included in the Scoping Plan were implemented.

An emissions projection estimates future emissions based on current emissions, expected regulatory implementation, and other technological, social, economic, and behavioral patterns. The projected 2020 emissions provided in Figure 3-2 represent a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario assuming none of the Scoping Plan measures are implemented. The 2020 BAU emissions estimate assists ARB in demonstrating progress toward meeting the 2020 goal of 431 MMTCO2e¹⁴. The 2018 edition of the GHG emissions inventory found total California emissions of 429 MMTCO₂e for 2016.

The 2020 BAU emissions projection was revisited in support of the First Update to the Scoping Plan (2014). This projection accounts for updates to the economic forecasts of fuel and energy demand as well as other factors. It also accounts for the effects of the 2008 economic recession and the projected recovery. The total emissions expected in

¹³ 2018 Edition of the GHG Emission Inventory released (July 2018): <u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm</u>

¹⁴ The revised target using Global Warming Potentials (GWP) from the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4)

the 2020 BAU scenario include reductions anticipated from Pavley I and the Renewable Electricity Standard (30 MMTCO₂e total). With these reductions in the baseline, estimated 2020 statewide BAU emissions are 509 MMTCO₂e.





3.3.3 Project Analysis

An individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Rather, global climate change is a cumulative impact. This means that a project may contribute to a potential impact through its *incremental* change in emissions when combined with the contributions of all other sources of GHG.¹⁵ In assessing cumulative impacts, it must be determined if a project's incremental effect is "cumulatively considerable" (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(1) and 15130). To make this determination, the incremental impacts of the project must be compared with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and future projects to make this determination is a difficult, if not impossible, task.

GHG emissions for transportation projects can be divided into those produced during operations and those produced during construction. The following represents a best faith effort to describe the potential GHG emissions related to the proposed project.

¹⁵ This approach is supported by the AEP: *Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze GHG Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents* (March 5, 2007), as well as the South Coast Air Quality Management District (Chapter 6: The CEQA Guide, April 2011) and the US Forest Service (Climate Change Considerations in Project Level NEPA Analysis, July 13, 2009).

Operational Emissions

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, there will be no increase in operational GHG emissions.

Construction Emissions

Construction GHG emissions would result from material processing, on-site construction equipment, and traffic delays due to construction. These emissions will be produced at different levels throughout the construction phase; their frequency and occurrence can be reduced through innovations in plans and specifications and by implementing better traffic management during construction phases.

In addition, with innovations such as longer pavement lives, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials, the GHG emissions produced during construction can be offset to some degree by longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation activities.

The analysis was focused on CO_2 emissions, as it is the single most important GHG pollutant due to its abundance when compared with other vehicle-emitted GHGs, including CH₄, N₂O, hydrofluorocarbon (HFCs), and black carbon (BC). Based on project information available for environmental studies, the construction-related CO_2 emissions were calculated using the Road Construction Emissions Model (RCEM), version 8.1.0, provided by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. The estimated amounts of CO_2 produced during construction of the build alternatives are as follows:

- 1. Alternative A (project construction time of 26 months) 1472.16 tons (CO₂)
- 2. Alternative B (project construction time of 28 months) 1655.85 tons (CO₂)
- 3. Alternative C (project construction time of 36 months) 4003.29 tons (CO₂)
- 4. Alternative D (project construction time of 10 months) 900.03 tons (CO₂)

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected, no CO2 would be produced from construction.

A summary of all GHG emissions is provided in Table 3-1.¹⁶

¹⁶ For this analysis, "carbon dioxide equivalent," or CO_2e , consists of CH_4 and N_2O converted to units of CO_2 , then added to CO_2 emissions to obtain CO_2e . The conversion uses the global warming potential (GWP) of each gas. The GWP of each gas is a multiple of the GWP of CO_2 , which is 1, by definition.

Alternatives	CO ₂ (tons)	CH₄ (tons)	N ₂ O (tons)	CO ₂ e (MT)
Alternative A- Lower Connectors Total	1472.16	0.25	0.01	1345.06
Alternative B- Raise Connectors Total	1655.85	0.26	0.02	1512.49
Alternative C- Realign Connectors Total	4003.29	0.88	0.05	3678.32
Alternative D- Partial Reconstruction of Connectors Total	900.03	0.19	0.01	823.39

Table 3-1 Summar	y of	Con	structio	on-related	GHG I	Emissions	per B	uild Alternativ	/ e ¹⁷
			-		-		-		

Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 14-9.02, Air Pollution Control, a part of all construction contracts, requires that contractors comply with all federal, state, and local rules, regulations, statutes, and ordinances related to air quality, some of which also reduce GHG emissions. Measures to reduce construction GHG emissions include maintenance of construction equipment and vehicles, limiting construction vehicle idling time, and scheduling and routing of construction traffic to reduce engine emissions.

3.3.4 CEQA Conclusion

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected, this project will not have any construction activities. No CO2 or GHG emissions will result from this project. The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Caltrans is firmly committed to implementing measures to help reduce GHG emissions. These measures are outlined in the following section.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

STATEWIDE EFFORTS

In an effort to further the vision of California's GHG reduction targets outlined an AB 32 and SB 32, then-Governor Jerry Brown identified key climate change strategy pillars (concepts). These pillars highlight the idea that several major areas of the California economy will need to reduce emissions to meet the 2030 GHG emissions target. These

¹⁷ Gases are converted to CO_2e by multiplying by their Global Warming Potential (GWP). Specifically, GWP is a measure of how much energy the emissions of 1 ton of a gas will absorb over a given period of time, relative to the emissions of 1 ton of CO_2 .

pillars are (1) reducing today's petroleum use in cars and trucks by up to 50 percent; (2) increasing from one-third to 50 percent our electricity derived from renewable sources; (3) doubling the energy efficiency savings achieved at existing buildings and making heating fuels cleaner; (4) reducing the release of methane, black carbon, and other short-lived climate pollutants; (5) managing farm and rangelands, forests, and wetlands so they can store carbon; and, (6) periodically updating the state's climate adaptation strategy, Safeguarding California.

Figure 3-3 The Governor's Climate change pillars: 2030 Greenhouse gas reduction goals



The transportation sector is integral to the people and economy of California. To achieve GHG emission reduction goals, it is vital that we build on our past successes in reducing criteria and toxic air pollutants from transportation and goods movement activities. GHG emission reductions will come from cleaner vehicle technologies, lower-carbon fuels, and reduction of vehicle miles traveled. One of Governor Brown's key pillars sets the ambitious goal of reducing today's petroleum use in cars and trucks by up to 50 percent by 2030.

Governor Jerry Brown called for support to manage natural and working lands, including forests, rangelands, farms, wetlands, and soils, so they can store carbon. These lands have the ability to remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through biological processes, and to then sequester carbon in above- and below-ground matter.

CALTRANS **A**CTIVITIES

Caltrans continues to be involved on the Governor's Climate Action Team as the ARB works to implement EOs S-3-05 and S-01-07 and help achieve the targets set forth in AB 32. EO B-30-15, issued in April 2015, and SB 32 (2016), set a new interim target to cut GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The following major initiatives are underway at Caltrans to help meet these targets.

California Transportation Plan (CTP 2040)

The California Transportation Plan (CTP) is a statewide, long-range transportation plan to meet our future mobility needs and reduce GHG emissions. The CTP defines performance-based goals, policies, and strategies to achieve our collective vision for California's future statewide, integrated, multimodal transportation system. It serves as an umbrella document for all of the other statewide transportation planning documents.

SB 391 (Liu 2009) requires the CTP to meet California's climate change goals under AB 32. Accordingly, the CTP 2040 identifies the statewide transportation system needed to achieve maximum feasible GHG emission reductions while meeting the state's transportation needs. While MPOs have primary responsibility for identifying land use patterns to help reduce GHG emissions, CTP 2040 identifies additional strategies in Pricing, Transportation Alternatives, Mode Shift, and Operational Efficiency.

Caltrans Strategic Management Plan

The Strategic Management Plan, released in 2015, creates a performance-based framework to preserve the environment and reduce GHG emissions, among other goals. Specific performance targets in the plan that will help to reduce GHG emissions include:

- Increasing percentage of non-auto mode share
- Reducing VMT per capita
- Reducing Caltrans' internal operational (buildings, facilities, and fuel) GHG emissions

Funding and Technical Assistance Programs:

In addition to developing plans and performance targets to reduce GHG emissions, Caltrans also administers several funding and technical assistance programs that have GHG reduction benefits. These include the Bicycle Transportation Program, Safe Routes to School, Transportation Enhancement Funds, and Transit Planning Grants. A more extensive description of these programs can be found in *Caltrans Activities to Address Climate Change* (2013).

Caltrans Director's Policy 30 (DP-30) Climate Change (June 22, 2012) is intended to establish a department policy that will ensure coordinated efforts to incorporate climate change into departmental decisions and activities.

Caltrans Activities to Address Climate Change (April 2013) provides a comprehensive overview of activities undertaken by Caltrans statewide to reduce GHG emissions resulting from agency operations.

3.3.5 Project-Level GHG Reduction Strategies

Since the No-Build Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative, the GHG reduction strategies below will not be used. If a Build Alternative had been chosen as the preferred alternative, the following measures would have been implemented to reduce GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from the project.

- Caltrans Standard Specifications Sections 7-1.02C, Emissions Reduction, and 14-9.02, Air Pollution Control, a part of all construction contracts, require that contractors certify awareness of and comply with all federal, state, and local rules, regulations, statutes, and ordinances related to air quality, some of which also reduce GHG emissions.
- All construction equipment and vehicles will be properly tuned and maintained to minimize emissions.
- Construction vehicle idling time will be limited to 2 minutes.
- A transportation construction management plan will be developed to minimize construction traffic delays and reduce engine emissions.
- A transportation construction plan will be prepared for all phases of construction.
- A construction phasing/staging schedule and sequence will be established that minimizes impacts of a work zone on traffic by using operationally sensitive phasing and staging throughout the life of the project.
- Arrival/departure times for trucks and construction workers will be identified to avoid peak periods of adjacent street traffic and minimize traffic affects.
- Optimal delivery and haul routes to and from the site will be identified to minimize impacts to traffic, transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
- Appropriate detour routes for bicycles and pedestrians in areas affected by construction will be identified.
- Current and/or real-time information will be provided to road users regarding the project work zone (e.g., changeable message sign to notify road users of lane and road closures and work activities, temporary conventional signs to guide motorists through the work zone).

3.3.6 Adaptation Strategies

"Adaptation strategies" refer to how Caltrans and others can plan for the effects of climate change on the state's transportation infrastructure and strengthen or protect the facilities from damage—or, put another way, planning and design for resilience. Climate change is expected to produce increased variability in precipitation, rising temperatures, rising sea levels, variability in storm surges and their intensity, and the frequency and intensity of wildfires. These changes may affect the transportation infrastructure in various ways, such as damage to roadbeds from longer periods of intense heat, increasing storm damage from flooding and erosion, and, inundation from rising sea levels. These effects will vary by location and may, in the most extreme cases, require that a facility be relocated or redesigned. These types of impacts to the transportation infrastructure may also have economic and strategic ramifications.

Federal Efforts

At the federal level, the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, co-chaired by the CEQ, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), released its interagency task force progress report

on October 28, 2011¹⁸, outlining the federal government's progress in expanding and strengthening the nation's capacity to better understand, prepare for, and respond to extreme events and other climate change impacts. The report provided an update on actions in key areas of federal adaptation, including: building resilience in local communities, safeguarding critical natural resources such as fresh water, and providing accessible climate information and tools to help decision-makers manage climate risks.

The federal Department of Transportation issued *U.S. DOT Policy Statement on Climate Adaptation* in June 2011, committing to "integrate consideration of climate change impacts and adaptation into the planning, operations, policies, and programs of DOT in order to ensure that taxpayer resources are invested wisely and that transportation infrastructure, services and operations remain effective in current and future climate conditions."¹⁹

To further the DOT Policy Statement, on December 15, 2014, FHWA issued order 5520 (*Transportation System Preparedness and Resilience to Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events*).²⁰ This directive established FHWA policy to strive to identify the risks of climate change and extreme weather events to current and planned transportation systems. The FHWA will work to integrate consideration of these risks into its planning, operations, policies, and programs in order to promote preparedness and resilience; safeguard federal investments; and, ensure the safety, reliability, and sustainability of the nation's transportation systems.

FHWA has developed guidance and tools for transportation planning that fosters resilience to climate effects and sustainability at the federal, state, and local levels.²¹

State Efforts

On November 14, 2008, then-Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed EO S-13-08, which directed a number of state agencies to address California's vulnerability to sealevel rise caused by climate change. This EO set in motion several agencies and actions to address the concern of sea-level rise and directed all state agencies planning to construct projects in areas vulnerable to future sea-level rise to consider a range of sea-level rise scenarios for the years 2050 and 2100, assess project vulnerability and, to the extent feasible, reduce expected risks and increase resiliency to sea-level rise. Sea-level rise estimates should also be used in conjunction with information on local uplift and subsidence, coastal erosion rates, predicted higher high-water levels, and storm surge and storm wave data.

Governor Schwarzenegger also requested the National Academy of Sciences to prepare an assessment report to recommend how California should plan for future sea-

¹⁸ <u>https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/eop/ceq/initiatives/resilience</u>

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/policy_and_guidance/usdot.cfm²⁰ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm

²¹ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/

level rise. The final report, <u>Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and</u> <u>Washington</u> (Sea-Level Rise Assessment Report)²² was released in June 2012 and included relative sea-level rise projections for the three states, taking into account coastal erosion rates, tidal impacts, El Niño and La Niña events, storm surge and land subsidence rates; and, the range of uncertainty in selected sea-level rise projections. It provided a synthesis of existing information on projected sea-level rise impacts to state infrastructure (such as roads, public facilities, and beaches), natural areas, and coastal and marine ecosystems; and, a discussion of future research needs regarding sea-level rise.

In response to EO S-13-08, the California Natural Resources Agency (Resources Agency), in coordination with local, regional, state, federal, and public and private entities, developed <u>The California Climate Adaptation Strategy</u> (Dec 2009)²³, which summarized the best available science on climate change impacts to California, assessed California's vulnerability to the identified impacts, and outlined solutions that can be implemented within and across state agencies to promote resiliency. The adaptation strategy was updated and rebranded in 2014 as <u>Safeguarding California:</u> <u>Reducing Climate Risk</u> (Safeguarding California Plan).

Governor Jerry Brown enhanced the overall adaptation planning effort by signing EO B-30-15 in April 2015, requiring state agencies to factor climate change into all planning and investment decisions. In March 2016, sector-specific Implementation Action Plans that demonstrate how state agencies are implementing EO B-30-15 were added to the Safeguarding California Plan. This effort represents a multi-agency, cross-sector approach to addressing adaptation to climate change-related events statewide.

EO S-13-08 also gave rise to the <u>State of California Sea-Level Rise Interim Guidance</u> <u>Document</u> (SLR Guidance), produced by the Coastal and Ocean Working Group of the California Climate Action Team (CO-CAT), of which Caltrans is a member. First published in 2010, the document provided "guidance for incorporating Sea Level Rise (SLR) projections into planning and decision making for projects in California," specifically, "information and recommendations to enhance consistency across agencies in their development of approaches to SLR."²⁴

Climate change adaptation for transportation infrastructure involves long-term planning and risk management to address vulnerabilities in the transportation system from increased precipitation and flooding; the increased frequency and intensity of storms and wildfires; rising temperatures; and rising sea levels. Caltrans is actively engaged in working towards identifying these risks throughout the state and will work to incorporate this information into all planning and investment decisions as directed in EO B-30-15.

²²Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future (2012) is available at: <u>http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13389</u>.

²³ <u>http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/adaptation/strategy/index.html</u>

²⁴ <u>http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/</u>
2018 guidance on future sea level rise published by the Ocean Protection Council projected that sea levels in San Francisco, California are to rise as follows:

Year	Median (50% Probability)	Likely Range (66% Probability)	1 in 20 Chance (5% Probability)	1 in 200 Chance (0.5% Probability)	Extreme Risk Aversion Scenario
2050	0.9	0.6 – 1.1	1.4	1.9	2.7
2100 (High Emissions)	2.5	1.6 – 3.4	4.4	6.9	10.2

 Table 3-2 Projected Sea Level Rise (in feet) for San Francisco

The SLR information from the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) guidance, is available at http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20180314/Item3_Exhibit-A_OPC_SLR_Guidance-rd3.pdf. A SLR risk screening for the proposed project was conducted in the accordance with OPC. According to Figure 3-4 and compared to the information stated in Table 3-2, both sourced from the OPC, the proposed project is in a low-lying area subject to SLR inundation impacts. However, the project would not be directly impacted from SLR, and is not anticipated to have a risk of future damage from SLR.

The project has no anticipated impacts involving erosion, wave action, coastal or riverine flood hazards, tsunamis, SLR, or beach nourishment.



Figure 3-4 Represents 2 feet of Sea Level Rise (year 2050)

Chapter 4 – Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. It helps planners determine the necessary scope of environmental documentation and the level of analysis required, and to identify potential impacts and avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures and related environmental requirements. Agency and tribal consultation for this project has been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including interagency coordination meetings, public meetings, public notices, Project Development Team (PDT) meetings, and Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) meetings. This chapter summarizes the results of Caltrans' efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

4.1 Native American Coordination

Caltrans contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on August 11, 2017, requesting a search of their sacred lands file and a list of interested Native American parties. Individuals and tribes provided by the NAHC were contacted on August 24, 2017. Representatives from the Costanoan Rumsen Tribe, the Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan Indians, and the Ohlone Indian Tribe requested to be kept informed as the project progressed.

4.2 Agency Coordination

On February 6, 2019, Caltrans held a stakeholders meeting to introduce this project, and to coordinate the projects occurring along the Interstate 80 corridor. The Port of Oakland, East Bay Municipal Utility District, City of Emeryville, and City of Oakland were invited.

On February 11, 2019, the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) was released to the public, including the public agencies listed in Chapter 6. A public hearing was held for the project on February 28, 2019 (see section 4.3 for more information).

On March 5, 2019, a City of Emeryville councilmember contacted the Caltrans District Director to request that Caltrans set up an additional public meeting located in the City of Emeryville.

On March 8, 2019, the City of Oakland's Department of Transportation Director contacted the Caltrans District Director for an extension of the comment period (see Appendix F, comment 48). On March 13, 2019, the Oakland City Council's Chief of Staff requested that Caltrans delay the environmental review process.

On March 26, 2019, Caltrans conducted a conference call with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to discuss West Oakland's Assembly Bill (AB) 617²⁵ process.

Caltrans met with the City of Emeryville's City Manager and staff on April 3, 2019 and the City of Oakland's Department of Transportation Director and staff on April 5, 2019. These meetings were to discuss the cities' concerns about construction traffic impacts, impacts to alternate forms of transportation, and truck detour information.

On April 8, 2019, an informational meeting was held between Caltrans and Bike East Bay, Bay Area Metro, CalBike, and Easy Bay Regional Park District. Caltrans disclosed at this meeting that no potential bicycle detour routes had yet been identified and discussed plans to avoid bicycle detours for the Bay Bridge Trail.

On April 9, 2019, the Caltrans representatives met with the West Oakland Indicators Project to discuss air quality concerns and Assembly Bill 617 in West Oakland.

On April 9, 2019, due to concerns from local groups and the cities of Emeryville and Oakland, the project was placed on hold.

On April 16, 2019, Caltrans, CARB, and BAAQMD continued their conference call from March 26, 2019. This follow-up call was to discuss air quality impacts from traffic detours and construction, plans for interagency working groups and community engagement, and next steps after the project's pause.

On July 24, 2019, the PDT met and chose the No-Build Alternative.

4.3 **Public Participation**

After the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) was released on February 11, 2019, Caltrans published Notices of Availability via quarter-page ads. An ad was printed in the East Bay Times on February 14, 2019 and February 17, 2019 and an ad was printed in the San Francisco Chronicle on February 17, 2019. 150,000 online ads were run on both EastBayTimes.com and SFChronicle.com from February 10 to February 28, 2019. An informational mail notice was sent to approximately 30,000 residents/businesses near the project area (zip codes 94607, 94608, and 94612). The Notice of Availability was also posted onto the Caltrans District 4 Facebook and Twitter accounts. The public comment period started on February 13, 2019 and was anticipated to end on March 15, 2019. However, given the public input, Caltrans decided on March 14, 2019 to extend the comment period to April 24, 2019. Comments were taken through comment cards at public meetings, through the project email (MacArthurMaze@dot.ca.gov), electronically through the project website

²⁵ AB 617 is a law that aims to reduce air pollution exposure and preserve public health. It requires CARB and local air districts to create plans to monitor and reduce emissions in communities, focusing on communities disproportionally impacted by air pollution.

(https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-4/d4-projects/d4-alameda-80macarthurmazeproject), or through postal mail sent to the Caltrans District 4 office.

A public hearing was held on February 28, 2019 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Caltrans District 4 cafeteria (111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612). The hearing was an open-house format, where informational boards were available for viewing and the public could ask questions regarding the project. There were 12 attendees. Comments could be submitted in-person via comment cards or through oral statements made to a court reporter. One comment card was received that showed support for Alternative C (see Comment 58 in Appendix F).

An online public meeting was also available starting February 28, 2019 at the project website (https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-4/d4-projects/d4-alameda-80-macarthurmazeproject). The online public meeting was comprised of a welcome video and a comparison video of the build alternatives. The website also included links to the IS/EA, the mail notice, and the project factsheet. Comments could be submitted through the online form.

At the request of the cities of Oakland and Emeryville, two additional public meetings were held. These encore public meetings were held on April 10, 2019 in Emeryville at the Emeryville Center of Community Life (1170 47th Street, Emeryville, CA 94608) and on April 11, 2019 in Oakland at the Caltrans District 4 auditorium (111 Grand Ave, Oakland, CA 94612). The public was notified of these meetings by mail notices; approximately 42,000 mail notices were sent on March 21, 2019 to zip codes 94607, 94608, 94609, 94610, and 94612. Both meetings ran from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. with a presentation at 6:00 p.m. and a question and answer session after the presentation. Informational boards shown at the first hearing were present during these encore meetings, with additional boards showing preliminary motor vehicle detour routes. The Caltrans District 4 Director announced at both meetings that the project was on hold to allow further analysis regarding the project. Comments could be submitted in-person via comment cards or through oral statements made to a court reporter.

All comments are included in Appendix F and a response to the comments is in section 4.4.

4.4 Response to Comments

Caltrans has reviewed all the approximately 230 comments received. Most of the comments favored the No-Build Alternative. The comments covered the following topics:

- Air quality Idling trucks on the Maze would worsen air quality, especially in West Oakland.
- Noise Concerns regarding noise impacts from rerouted traffic during construction.
- Bicycle and pedestrian paths Detour streets need protected bicycle and pedestrian lanes.

- Project funding Conduct a cost-benefit analysis of completing the project versus selecting the No-Build Alternative. Include other work in this project or use the funding elsewhere, such as repaving, creating Complete Streets²⁶ policies and solutions, building bus-only lanes, or preventing homeless encampments.
- Truck data Insufficient data on current number of trucks unable to travel on the Maze, routes these oversized trucks take instead, and number of trucks this project would benefit if built.
- Construction closures and detours Duration of closures and detours during construction would create significant delays to the traveling public.

The PDT selected the No-Build Alternative after evaluating the input and concerns received. Because the No-Build Alternative was chosen, individual responses to comments were unwarranted, so they were not prepared. Appendix F includes all comments received for the project. Profane and vulgar language have been censored with asterisks in the place of letters and are denoted with square brackets; the connotation and intent have not been altered.

4.5 Document Coordination

During the preparation of this document, the following agencies were consulted:

Federal

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

State

State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

All interagency correspondence is listed below:

December 18, 2017 – A technical assistance meeting was held in the field with Sara Cortez (USFWS) to describe the proposed project.

March 1, 2018 – An email was sent to Monica DeAngelis (NMFS) to notify NMFS about the proposed project.

April 11, 2018 – A technical assistance phone call was held with Darren Howe (NMFS) to describe the proposed project.

²⁶ Complete Streets are facilities that provide safe mobility for users of all modes of transportation.

April 25, 2018 – A technical assistance meeting was held in the field with Robert Stanley (CDFW) to describe the proposed project.

November 13, 2018 – Submitted Delineation of Aquatic Resources to USACE for verification (see transmittal letter).

December 4, 2018 – Field meeting with USACE to review the delineation of aquatic resources.

Caltrans does not intend to have any further consultations with USFWS, CDFW, or NMFS, due to the lack of impacts on resources regulated by these agencies.

December 11, 2018 – USFWS and CDFW lists were populated, attached in Appendix E.

December 14, 2018 – NMFS list was populated, attached in Appendix E.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA-CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 4 OFFICE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES AND PERMITS P.O. BOX 23660, MS- 8E OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660 PHONE (510) 286-6046 FAX (510) 286-6347 TTY 711 www.dol.ca.gov EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor



Making Conservation a California Way of Life.

November 9, 2018

Ms. Holly Costa Acting Chief, Regulatory Division U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1455 Market Street San Francisco, California 94103-1398

Dear Ms. Costa,

We are planning to increase the vertical clearances at three locations within the MacArthur Maze Interchange in the City of Oakland, Alameda County. The MacArthur Maze connects Interstates 80, 580, and 880. The purpose of the project is to remedy vertical clearance deficiencies within the MacArthur Maze that impedes the safe and efficient movement of freight vehicles through the interchange.

We have delineated and mapped the portions of the project's Biological Study Area that qualify as wetlands and other waters of the U.S. under federal jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. Please find the delineation of aquatic resources enclosed for your preliminary approval.

Thank you for your consideration of our request. If you have any questions, please call me at (510) 286-6046 or John Yeakel at (510) 286-5681. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Jeann Cullon

Jo Ann Cullom, Chief Office of Biological Sciences and Permits

Enclosure: Delineation of Aquatic Resources

cc: Katerina Galacatos, United State Army Corps of Engineers Daniel Breen, Caltrans Liaison, United State Army Corps of Engineers

> "Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Ms. Holly Costa, November 9, 2018 Page 2

bcc: Laurie Lau, Project Manager, Caltrans

Cristin Hallissy, Branch Chief, Office of Environmental Planning, Caltrans John Yeakel, Branch Chief, Office of Biological Science and Permits, Caltrans

ALA - 80 (PM 2.8) ALA 580 (PM 46.5r & 46.5l) ALA 880 (PM 34.5l) 0417000363 04-4K810

> "Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and itvability''

=	

State of California • Natural Resources Agency

Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Lisa Ann L. Mangat, Director

OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer 1725 23rd Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95816-7100 Telephone: (916) 445-7000 FAX: (916) 445-7053 calshpo.ohp@parks.ca.gov www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

October 23, 2018

VIA EMAIL

In reply refer to: FHWA_2018_1002_001

Mr. Christopher Caputo, Chief Office of Cultural Resource Studies Caltrans District 4 PO Box 23660 Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Subject: Determinations of Eligibility for the Proposed MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project in Alameda County, CA

Dear Mr. Caputo:

Caltrans is initiating consultation for the above project in accordance with the January 1, 2014 First Amended Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California (PA). As part of your documentation, Caltrans submitted a Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR), Historical Resources Evaluation Report, an Archaeological Survey Report, and an Extended Phase I Report for the proposed project.

Caltrans proposes to modify and reconstruct the MacArthur Maze, the distribution structure for Interstates 80, 580 and 880. The project is intended to increase vertical clearances to current standards in order to accommodate oversized vehicles and loads. Various alternatives are being considered for both the project and any temporary construction easements. Alternatives include raising, lowering, or completely replacing bridges throughout the structure. The project also includes construction of a scaffold system over the railroad lines that will allow railroad operations to continue unimpeded and will protect rail facilities from debris and other potential impacts. A full project description is on Page 1 of the HPSR.

In accordance with Stipulation VIII.C.6 of the PA, Caltrans is requesting concurrence that the following properties are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP):

The Key System Subway Tunnel

Mr. Caputo October 23, 2018 Page 2 FHWA_2018_1002_001

CA-ALA-700H (P-01-012001)

Based on my review of the submitted documentation, I concur.

If you have any questions, please contact Natalie Lindquist at (916) 445-7014 with e-mail at <u>natalie.lindquist@parks.ca.qov</u> or Alicia Perez at (916) 445-7020 with e-mail at <u>alicia.perez@parks.ca.qov</u>.

Sincerely,

Julianne Polanco State Historic Preservation Officer

Chapter 5 – List of Preparers

The following Caltrans staff and consultants contributed to the preparation of this document and its related technical studies.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Project Management

Ron Kiaaina, Project Manager Laurie Lau, Project Manager

Environmental Analysis

Lily Mu, Associate Environmental Planner Rebecca De Pont, Associate Environmental Planner Cristin Hallissy, Branch Chief

Cultural Resource Studies

Michael Meloy, Architectural History Noah Stewart, Branch Chief, Architectural History Jennifer Blake, Archaeology Kathryn Rose, Branch Chief, Archaeology

Hazardous Waste

Chris Wilson, Branch Chief

Landscape Architecture

Lydia Mac, Branch Chief Keith Suzuki, Landscape Associate

Biological Sciences and Permits

John Yeakel, Branch Chief

Air Quality and Noise

Kevin Krewson, Branch Chief

Hydraulics Engineering

Craig Tomimatsu, Office Chief

East County Design

Van Hew, Transportation Engineer Peter Aguilera, Transportation Engineer

GARCIA & ASSOCIATES

Denis Coghlan, Biologist Robert Solotar, Environmental Planner

Chapter 6 – Distribution List

The following agencies, organizations, and individuals received printed or electronic copies of this document. Organizations, businesses, and individuals on the project mailing list were notified of the availability of this document and public meetings.

Federal Agencies

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office 2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605 Sacramento, CA 95825

Gary Stern NOAA Fisheries San Francisco Bay Branch Santa Rosa, CA 95404 777 Sonoma Avenue, Room 325

State Agencies

California State Clearinghouse P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Terry Young, Chair Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400 Oakland, CA 94612

Eileen Sobeck, Executive Officer California State Water Resources Control Board P.O. Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

Karla Nemeth, Director California Department of Water Resources P.O. Box 942836 Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

California Highway Patrol 3601 Telegraph Avenue Oakland, CA 94609 Richard Bottoms, Regulatory Division Chief U.S. Army Corps of Engineers San Francisco District 450 Golden Gate Ave, 4th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102

Susan Bransen, Executive Director California Transportation Commission 1120 N Street, Room, MS-52 Sacramento, CA 95814 Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer Office of Historic Preservation 1725 23rd Street, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95816

Christina Snider, Executive Secretary Native American Heritage Commission 1550 Harbor Boulevard, Suite 100 West Sacramento, CA 95691

Jennifer Lucchesi, Executive Officer California State Lands Commission 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95825

Gregg Erickson, Regional Manager California Department of Fish and Wildlife Bay Delta Region 2825 Cordelia Route, Suite 100 Fairfield, CA 94534 Lisa Mangat, Director California Department of Parks and Recreation 1416 9th Street Sacramento, CA 95814

David Bunn, Director California Department of Conservation 801 K Street, MS 24-01 Sacramento, CA 95814

John Laird, Secretary California Natural Resources Agency 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311 Sacramento, CA 95814

Regional and Local Agencies

Robert E. Doyle, General Manager East Bay Regional Park District 2950 Peralta Oak Court P.O. Box 5381 Oakland, CA 94605-0381

Brian Holt, Chief of Planning East Bay Regional Park District 2950 Peralta Oak Court P.O. Box 5381 Oakland, CA 94605-0381

Steve Heminger, Executive Director Metropolitan Transportation Commission Bay Area Metro Center 375 Beale Street, Suite 800 San Francisco, CA 94105-2066

Lee Huo, Planner San Francisco Bay Trail Project 375 Beale Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94105 Barbara A. Lee, Director California Department of Toxic Substances Control P.O. Box 806 Sacramento, CA 95812-0806

Jessica Fain, Planning Director San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600 San Francisco, CA 94102-7019

Henry Hilken, Director Planning and Climate Protection Division Bay Area Air Quality Management District 375 Beale Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94105

Alameda County Clerks-Recorder's Office 1106 Madison Street Oakland, CA 94607

Thanh Vuong, Principal Engineer Port of Oakland 530 Water Street Oakland, CA 94607

Matt Hoeft East Bay Municipal Utility District 375 11th Street Oakland, CA 94607-4240

Ryan Russo, Director Oakland Department of Transportation 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4314 Oakland, CA 94612

Elected Officials

Kamala Harris United States Senator 333 Bush Street, Suite 3225 San Francisco, CA 94104

Dianne Feinstein United States Senator One Post Street, Suite 2450 San Francisco, CA 94104

Barbara Lee U.S. House of Representatives California District 13 1301 Clay Street, Suite 1000-N Oakland, CA 94612

Buffy Wicks California State Assembly District 15 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2201 Oakland, CA 94612 Rob Bonta California State Assembly District 18 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2204 Oakland, CA 94612

Nancy Skinner California State Senate District 9 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2202 Oakland, CA 94612

Keith Carson, Supervisor Alameda County Board of Supervisors 1221 Oak Street, Suite 536 Oakland, CA 94612 Christian R. Patz, Mayor City of Emeryville 1333 Park Avenue Emeryville, CA 94608

John J. Bauters, Councilmember City of Emeryville 1333 Park Avenue Emeryville, CA 94608

Libby Schaaf, Mayor City of Oakland 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 3rd Floor Oakland, CA 94612

Lynette Gibson McElhaney, Councilmember City of Oakland 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 232 Oakland, CA 94612

Dan Kalb, Councilmember City of Oakland 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor Oakland, CA 94612

Jesse Arreguin, Mayor City of Berkeley 2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor Berkeley, CA 94704

Community Organizations

Igor Tregub, Chair Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter Executive Committee 2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite 1 Berkeley, CA 94702

Andy Kelley, Chair Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter Northern Alameda County Group 2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite 1 Berkeley, CA 94702

David Lewis, Executive Director Save The Bay 1330 Broadway, Suite 1800 Oakland, CA 94612-2519

Ginger Jui, Executive Director Bike East Bay PO Box 1736 Oakland, CA 94604

Dave Campbell, Advocacy Director Bike East Bay PO Box 1736 Oakland, CA 94604

Tony Dang, Executive Director California Walks 1904 Franklin Street, Suite 709 Oakland, CA 94612

Stuart Cohen, Executive Director TransForm 436 14th Street, Suite 600 Oakland, CA 94612

Margaret Gordon, Co-Director West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project 349 Mandela Parkway Oakland, CA 94607 Brian Beveridge, Co-Director West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project 349 Mandela Parkway Oakland, CA 94607

Individuals

Kevin Johnston 2288 Buena Vista Avenue Livermore, CA 94550

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Section 4(f)

Resources Evaluated Relative to the Requirements of Section 4(f): No-Use Determination(s)

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, codified in federal law at 49 United States Code (USC) 303, declares that "it is the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites."

This section of the document discusses parks, recreational facilities, wildlife refuges, and historic properties found within or next to the project area that do not trigger Section 4(f) protection because: 1) they are not publicly owned, 2) they are not open to the public, 3) they are not eligible historic properties, or 4) the project does not permanently use the property and does not hinder the preservation of the property.

The following locations are potential 4(f) resources within 0.5 mile of the project area: Lakeside Park, Willie Keyes Community Recreation Center, DeFremery Park, Wade Johnson Park, Lowell Park, McClymonds High School, Marston Campbell Park, Emery High School, Stanford Park, Doyle Hollis Park, Golden Gate Recreation Center, San Pablo Park, Mosswood Park, Astro Park, Splash Pad Park, Lafayette Square Park, Union Plaza, Middle Harbor Shoreline Park, and McLaughlin Eastshore State Park, and the San Francisco Bay Trail. With the exception of the San Francisco Bay Trail, there are no potential impacts to these locations. As no use will occur to any of these properties, the provisions of Section 4(f) do not apply. Discussion regarding the San Francisco Bay Trail is included below.

The Bay Bridge Trail (trail) is the segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail system located within the proposed project footprint. It extends from the trailhead on Shellmound Street in Emeryville to the East Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The trail is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Under alternatives A, B and D, the trail may require a temporary detour and/or overhead protection during construction. Alternative C may require overhead protection and a temporary detour of the trail during construction, and a minor trail realignment after project construction is complete. For all alternatives the trail is anticipated to be returned to its existing condition after construction is complete.

The segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail known as the Bay Bridge Trail is considered a transportation trail, as it is owned and maintained by Caltrans. Impacts to this trail are exempt from 4(f) as they meet the criteria set forth in 23 CFR 774.13 (F) (4) which states that trails, paths, bikeways, and sidewalks that are part of the local transportation system and which function primarily for transportation meet the requirements for a 4(f) exception. All properties discussed above either have no use per

section 4(f) or are exempt from 4(f). Therefore, the provisions of Section 4(f) do not apply.

Appendix B. Title VI Policy Statement

STATE OF CALIFORNIA-CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR P.O. BOX 942873, MS-49 SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001 PHONE (916) 654-6130 FAX (916) 653-5776 TTY 711 www.dot.ca.gov Gavin Newsom, Governor



Making Conservation a California Way of Life.

November 2019

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, ensures "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."

Related federal statutes, remedies, and state law further those protections to include sex, disability, religion, sexual orientation, and age.

For information or guidance on how to file a complaint, or obtain more information regarding Title VI, please contact the Title VI Branch Manager at (916) 324-8379 or visit the following web page: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/business-and-economic-opportunity/title-vi.

To obtain this information in an alternate format such as Braille or in a language other than English, please contact the California Department of Transportation, Office of Business and Economic Opportunity, at 1823 14th Street, MS-79, Sacramento, CA 95811; (916) 324-8379 (TTY 711); or at Title.VI@dot.ca.gov.

Toks Omishakin Director

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability'

Environmental Commitments	Record	for E/	A 04-4M	(810_	ID 041	7000363		Last updated 11/18/2019
MacArthur Maze/Increase Vertical Cleara	nnce					Ē	e: Lily Mu	
ALA-080-0.000/0.000						CI	t: Lauren Ross	510-286-6032
Current Project Phase: 0						RI	й	
			Pei	rmits				
Age	ncy		Date Submitted	Date Received	Expiration	Requirements Name	s Completed Date	Comments
			Сотт	itments				
Task and Brief Description	Source	SSP/ NSSP	Responsil Staff	ole ,	Action to Con	ylqr	Task Completed	Remarks/Due Date
N/A								
N/A								
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
						Sig	jnature	1

Appendix C. Environmental Commitment Record

Date

Appendix D. List of Technical Studies

- 4(f) Analysis- A 4(f) memo was completed December 3, 2018 to capture that no 4(f) resources would be impacted by the proposed project
- Air Quality Assessment- An air quality assessment memo for the proposed project was completed on September 19, 2017.
- Hydraulics Report- A Location Hydraulics Study and Preliminary Hydraulic Investigation for the proposed project was completed on March 5, 2018.
- Noise Study- A Construction Noise Assessment for the proposed project was approved on May 22, 2018.
- Geotechnical Report- A District Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the proposed project was approved on April 17, 2018.
- Water Quality Study- An aquatic resource field survey and wetland delineation of the proposed project site was conducted in August 2018, and a Delineation of Aquatic Resources report was completed for the project in November 2018. A Water Quality Study was prepared on November 8, 2018, to assess the proposed project's potential effects to water quality and storm water management in the area.
- Cultural Findings- The following cultural resources technical reports were completed for the proposed project: Archaeological Survey Report (ASR), approved January 2018; Extended Phase I (XPI) Report, approved September 2018; and Historical Resources Evaluation Report (HRER), approved September 2018. A Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) was completed in September 2018.
- Natural Environment Study- A Natural Environment Study (NES) was prepared in December 2018 to analyze the proposed project's environmental setting and to determine potential impacts from the project. In addition, a wildlife habitat assessment was conducted in February 2018 to evaluate the potential for the project to impact any animal species within the project boundary.
- Summary Floodplain Encroachment Report- A floodplain map was generated by Caltrans' Hydraulics group from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on March 5, 2018 that shows that the proposed project is not in a floodplain.
- Visual Impact Assessment- The Visual Impact Analysis (VIA) prepared for the proposed project was approved on August 7, 2018, with VIA addenda approved on November 6, 2018 and December 13, 2018.

• Hazardous Waste Memo- A search of environmental regulatory databases was conducted for the project in January 2018 and did not identify any known nearby hazardous materials or hazardous waste sites in the vicinity of the project that could likely impact the proposed project schedule or construction.

Appendix E. Species List



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE San Francisco Bay-Delta Fish And Wildlife 650 Capitol Mall Suite 8-300 Sacramento, CA 95814 Phone: (916) 930-5603 Fax: (916) 930-5654 http://kim_squires@fws.gov



November 21, 2019

In Reply Refer To: If Consultation Code: 08FBDT00-2019-SLI-0064 Event Code: 08FBDT00-2020-E-00078 Project Name: Ala 80/580/880 MacArthur Maze Verticle Clearance 04-4K810

Subject: Updated list of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

2

11/21/2019

Event Code: 08FBDT00-2020-E-00078

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 *et seq.*), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/ eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm; http://www.towerkill.com; and http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/correntBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

Official Species List

1

11/21/2019

Event Code: 08FBDT00-2020-E-00078

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

San Francisco Bay-Delta Fish And Wildlife

650 Capitol Mall Suite 8-300 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 930-5603

This project's location is within the jurisdiction of multiple offices. Expect additional species list documents from the following office, and expect that the species and critical habitats in each document reflect only those that fall in the office's jurisdiction:

Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office

Federal Building 2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605 Sacramento, CA 95825-1846 (916) 414-6600 11/21/2019

2

Project Summary

Consultation Code:	08FBDT00-2019-SLI-0064
Event Code:	08FBDT00-2020-E-00078
Project Name:	Ala 80/580/880 MacArthur Maze Verticle Clearance 04-4K810
Project Type:	TRANSPORTATION
Project Description:	The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to increase the vertical clearance to current standards at three locations in the MacArthur Maze along Interstate (I-)80, I-580, and I-880 to allow for more efficient and uninterrupted travel of modern freight vehicles. The Project will take place along the I-80, I-580, and I-880 connectors in the MacArthur Maze, approximately 2 miles northwest of downtown Oakland.

Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <u>https://www.google.com/maps/place/37.82780329039595N122.29383871339314W</u>



Counties: Alameda, CA

3

11/21/2019

Event Code: 08FBDT00-2020-E-00078

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 9 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries¹, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

 <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Mammals

NAME	STATUS
Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse <i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/613</u>	Endangered
Birds	
NAME	STATUS
California Clapper Rail Rallus longirostris obsoletus No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4240</u>	Endangered
California Least Tern Sterna antillarum browni No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8104</u>	Endangered
 Western Snowy Plover Charadrius nivosus nivosus Population: Pacific Coast population DPS-U.S.A. (CA, OR, WA), Mexico (within 50 miles of Pacific coast) There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8035</u> 	Threatened

4

NAME	STATUS
Alameda Whipsnake (=striped Racer) Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5524</u>	Threatened
Amphibians	
NAME	STATUS
California Red-legged Frog <i>Rana draytonii</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2891</u>	Threatened
Fishes	
NAME	STATUS
Delta Smelt Hypomesus transpacificus There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/321</u>	Threatened
Insects	
NAME	STATUS
San Bruno Elfin Butterfly Callophrys mossii bayensis There is proposed critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3394</u>	Endangered
Flowering Plants	
NAME	STATUS
California Seablite Suaeda californica No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://acos.fas.gov/orp/species/6310	Endangered

Event Code: 08FBDT00-2020-E-00078

Critical habitats

11/21/2019

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

January 7, 2020

NMFS Species List

Quad Name Oakland West Quad Number 37122-G3

ESA Anadromous Fish

SONCC Coho ESU (T) -CCC Coho ESU (E) -CC Chinook Salmon ESU (T) -CVSR Chinook Salmon ESU (T) -SRWR Chinook Salmon ESU (E) -NC Steelhead DPS (T) -CCC Steelhead DPS (T) -SCCC Steelhead DPS (T) -SC Steelhead DPS (E) -CCV Steelhead DPS (E) -CCV Steelhead DPS (T) -SC Steelhead DPS (T) -SDPS Green Sturgeon (T) -SDPS Green Sturgeon (T) -SC Steelhead Sturgeon (T) -

ESA Anadromous Fish Critical Habitat

SONCC Coho Critical Habitat -CCC Coho Critical Habitat -CC Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat -CVSR Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat -SRWR Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat -NC Steelhead Critical Habitat -CCC Steelhead Critical Habitat -SCCC Steelhead Critical Habitat -SC Steelhead Critical Habitat -SC Steelhead Critical Habitat -CCV Steelhead Critical Habitat -Eulachon Critical Habitat -

ESA Marine Invertebrates

Range Black Abalone (E) -Range White Abalone (E) - January 7, 2020

NMFS Species List

ESA Marine Invertebrates Critical Habitat

Black Abalone Critical Habitat -

ESA Sea Turtles

East Pacific Green Sea Turtle (T) -Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (T/E) -Leatherback Sea Turtle (E) -North Pacific Loggerhead Sea Turtle (E) -

ESA Whales

Blue Whale (E) -Fin Whale (E) -Humpback Whale (E) -Southern Resident Killer Whale (E) -North Pacific Right Whale (E) -Sei Whale (E) -Sperm Whale (E) -

ESA Pinnipeds

Guadalupe Fur Seal (T) -Steller Sea Lion Critical Habitat -

Essential Fish Habitat

Coho EFH -	X
Chinook Salmon EFH -	X
Groundfish EFH -	X
Coastal Pelagics EFH -	X
Highly Migratory Species EFH -	

MMPA Species (See list at left)

ESA and MMPA Cetaceans/Pinnipeds See list at left and consult the NMFS Long Beach office 562-980-4000

January 7, 2020

NMFS Species List

MMPA Cetaceans -MMPA Pinnipeds - <mark>X</mark>

Appendix F. Comments

Comment 1

From:	Lori_kaufman@berkeley.edu
Sent:	Thursday, February 28, 2019 3:02 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Lori_kaufman@berkeley.edu on February 28th, 2019 at 03:02PM (PST).

name: Lori Kaufman email: Lori_kaufman@berkeley.edu telephone: 2403471235 comment: Will this construction affect access to the bay bridge bicycle trail?

Thanks.

Comment 2

From:	dscarritt@springmail.com
Sent:	Thursday, February 28, 2019 4:46 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Cc:	Libby Schaaf
Subject:	Macarthur Maze changes

Please DO NOT make changes that will increase the use of the Macarthur Maze by diesel trucks. I suffer from asthma and live in Oakland a couple blocks from 580, near the intersection with 24. I commuted to work for years to Bayview Hunter's Point in San Francisco. Diesel trucks left the freeway to use Third St. My health was impacted. My breathing improved initially after retiring, but recently the trucks are coming close to home. We must find clean ways to transport both people and materials. Building or repairing freeways is not the answer. Sincerely,

Diane Scarritt

Comment 3

From:	david.hindley@gmail.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 8:01 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by david.hindley@gmail.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 08:00AM (PST).

name: David Hindley email: david.hindley@gmail.com comment: Hello,

I don't see anything in the documentation the justifies whether this is a good investment or not? How many trucks are diverted because they are too tall? What is the value of those goods? It has worked for decades as is. The only return I can see to justify is "safe and efficient movement of oversize vehicles and loads through the Maze". Is this worth \$1? \$1M? \$1B? How do you justify?

Comment 4

From:	oakland1634@gmail.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 8:02 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by oakland1634@gmail.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 08:02AM (PST).

name: Cathi Sweeney

email: oakland1634@gmail.com

telephone: 530 544 4374

comment: I support the No Build alternative. The purpose of this project is solely to benefit freight companies and does not consider the disruption for commuters and local traffic.

How does the project benefit automobile drivers who are the majority users of this interchange?

Some trucks with oversize loads supposedly produce excess emissions due to rerouting around the Maze. Please include in your environmental review an in depth analysis of the actual number (percent) of trucks required to reroute and the incremental amount of increased emissions thus produced. Compare that with the increased emissions from the rerouted plus newly congested traffic idling on city streets during the construction program.

I am appalled that CalTrans plans to force thousands of drivers onto city streets. Please include in your environmental review a thorough analysis of the damage rerouted automobile and truck traffic will cause to local streets and how CalTrans will repair that damage. Cities should not shoulder the cost to repair damage caused by CalTrans construction. Please include in your environmental review a detailed analysis of the cost to commuters of the increased commute time required by rerouting onto city streets. How many people will lose their jobs because commuting is no longer an option with nightmare commute times? What is the increased fuel cost for commuters stuck in city street traffic during construction?

I do not find this project to be environmentally beneficial. It is a waste of taxpayer money.

Comment 5

From:	deliaser@gmail.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 12:58 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by deliaser@gmail.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 12:57PM (PST).

name: David H. Eliaser email: deliaser@gmail.com

telephone: 9255862478

comment: I see the need for this project for commercial trucking. However, I so no relief for those using westbound State Route 24 to get to the Bay Bridge. Are there no plans to remove the crossover bottleneck between those trying to move left once on Westbound Interstate 580 and those already on I-580 trying to get to the right to continue on I-580 while joining Eastbound I-80 at the Berkeley exit. It seems that this need for remediation needs to be included in the project.

Comment 6

From:	rhole2001@gmail.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 5:31 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by rhole2001@gmail.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 05:30PM (PST).

name: Robert Hole Jr email: rhole2001@gmail.com telephone: 9255862083 comment: It seems to me that alternative D is the only sensible alternative. Lower in cost and less disruption.

If there are reasons to not choose that alternative, the information provided does not address them.

Comment 7

From:	VERONICA JEFFERSON <raggedyny@msn.com></raggedyny@msn.com>
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 7:03 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Changes proposed for I-80 / Interstate 580 / Interstate 880 (Re-construct freeway connectors)

Good Evening,

I received a notice in the mail about changes proposed Interstate 80, 880 and 580 in regards to restructuring the freeway connectors for freight vehicles. Does that mean that the restructuring will allow the "big 18-wheeler trucks" to utilize the WB and EB-580 freeways in Oakland? I know the "big trucks" are frequent on 80 and 880, but not on 580 (Oakland). Please advise if this is what's going to happen if this change was to happen or get approved – will the big trucks use 580 in Oakland?

Thank you, Veronica
From:	cheekiestgrin@gmail.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 11:36 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by cheekiestgrin@gmail.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 11:35PM (PST).

name: Alex Lawrence email: cheekiestgrin@gmail.com

telephone: 5418081200

comment: This is outrageous. As a waste of cash to support unsustainable traffic it's ideal of course. Why the money is not invested into making people's lives easier for commuting, or better public transport.. is bizarre stuff. Why is freight not encouraged to be shipped on rail or some sea borne method. The money involved would buy a lot of battery powered tugs.

Why are you encouraging retarded larger goods vehicles to clog up the roads?

Did iq's drop sharply, recently?

Have drivers not suffered enough? No alternative worth mentioning is provided. This is an outrageous waste of time, money, CO2 and resource, and not strategically thinking about the future or how we OUGHT to be responsible with freight and our roads.

Appalling and disgusting. There is clearly something fishy going on here.

Comment 9

stevemanglin@gmail.com
Monday, March 04, 2019 12:00 PM
MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Carl@DOT
MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by stevemanglin@gmail.com on March 4th, 2019 at 11:59AM (PST).

name: Steve Anglin email: stevemanglin@gmail.com comment: Maybe, these special trucks should just take the surface streets, instead.

From:	davdaven@gmail.com
Sent:	Monday, March 04, 2019 5:38 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by davdaven@gmail.com on March 4th, 2019 at 05:37PM (PST).

name: David Davenport email: davdaven@gmail.com telephone: 510-316-2669 comment: Dear Caltrans:

I am writing to express my concern with all four build alternatives of the MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project. This project is a giveaway of taxpayer money to private trucking companies that are too cheap to use infrastructure that has been perfectly sufficient for the past 50 years. For companies that choose to carry overly tall loads, they should be directed to use surrounding surface streets that have adequate clearance. This is a very simple solution to a manufactured problem.

If trucking companies consider the no build alternative unacceptable, then they should tax themselves at a rate that covers all anticipated project expenses. To minimize impacts to the public that this project would cause, the trucking companies should be permitted to proceed with Alternative D only.

Thank you, David Davenport

Comment 11

From:	rally5617@gmail.com
Sent:	Monday, March 04, 2019 8:32 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by rally5617@gmail.com on March 4th, 2019 at 08:31PM (PST).

name: Stephanie

email: rally5617@gmail.com

comment: This shouldn't be the highest priority, if this is to be done you need to make sure all the roads the traffic would spill over to are in tiptop shape. But with the potholes and general terrible condition of the roads (lack of painted lines, debris, etc.) in *all* of the bay area, traffic would not just be terrible from the closure, but you would need to expect more accidents and break downs due to the terrible road conditions. Fix the existing roads first!!!

From:	noradave@sbcglobal.net
Sent:	Monday, March 04, 2019 8:32 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by noradave@sbcglobal.net on March 4th, 2019 at 08:32PM (PST).

name: David Simmons email: noradave@sbcglobal.net telephone: 510-654-4755 comment: I read the article written by Phillip Matier in the SF Chronicle yesterday (3/3/19) and wanted to let you know I'm howling about the proposed MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project!

I was born and live in North Oakland and have used the I-80, I-580 and I-880 for years. This portion of the Bay Area is one of the most stressful areas in the nation to operate a motor vehicle and has only become worse over the years due to increased density.

I find it unbelievable and astounding to think that your agency would embark on a project like this which could take up to 3 years to complete; create road closures for up to 15 months at a cost that could reach \$182 million in order to accommodate larger trucks.

Why not maintain the structures of the maze as they are and simply require trucks to comply with current vertical height limits?

This plan illustrates the tail wagging the dog--which is loudly howling over such an absurd project proposal!

Comment 13

From:	Matt77callahan@gmail.com
Sent:	Monday, March 04, 2019 9:10 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Matt77callahan@gmail.com on March 4th, 2019 at 09:09PM (PST).

name: Matt Callahan email: Matt77callahan@gmail.com

telephone: 9253305234

comment: This project will create massive environmental impact and massively impact traffic through a critical junction. Doing nothing is better then any of the proposed solution. This is a terrible waste of money and thousands of commuters time. The corridor is completely over saturated including mas transit options such as BART. This is terrible project and should not be done. It will create far more harm to the Bay Area then any good.

From:	prinzrob@gmail.com
Sent:	Monday, March 04, 2019 9:44 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by prinzrob@gmail.com on March 4th, 2019 at 09:43PM (PST).

name: Robert Prinz

email: prinzrob@gmail.com

comment: The only responsible choice for this project is the "no build" alternative. Oversized semi clearance is not a reasonable justification to spend up to \$180M on this project. Design the vehicle for the roadway, not the roadway for the vehicle.

I also propose reallocating all funding for this project to the oversubsribed Active Transportation Program. Castastrophic climate change and sea level rise is breathing down our necks. We don't have the luxury of business as usual freeway [f***ery] anymore. Sorry not sorry.

From:	williamgkane@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 9:57 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by williamgkane@gmail.com on March 5th, 2019 at 09:56AM (PST).

name: Will Kane email: williamgkane@gmail.com

telephone: 415-516-0484

comment: We should consider the no-build alternative. With rising seas and the threat of climate change it is ludicrous to me that we are spending this amount of money on a project to help trucks navigate through the maze. The money should instead be put to transit/road infrastructure that will help us cut emissions, reduce vehicle trips and prepare for a changing climate.

From:	kintner@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 10:10 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by kintner@gmail.com on March 5th, 2019 at 10:09AM (PST).

name: Christopher Kintner email: kintner@gmail.com telephone: 6082502558 comment: In Chapter 1 of the draft EIR the purpose of this project is explained as:

> The existing vertical clearance at these three locations does not meet

> the current Caltrans standard of 16 feet 6 inches and impedes the safe

> and efficient movement of oversized vehicles and loads through the

> Maze. The project is proposed to increase the vertical clearance of

> the structures in the Maze to allow for more efficient travel of oversized vehicles.

In section the 1.2.2 the need of this project is explained as:

> The proposed project is needed to remedy the vertical clearance

> deficiencies found at three locations within the MacArthur Maze to

> allow for freight and oversized vehicles to travel through these major

> connectors to and from areas such as the Port of Oakland.

As this project will lower the costs of using oversized vehicles for transporting freight at the Port of Oakland by "allow[ing] for more efficient travel of oversized vehicles" this project has the potential of changing the freight transportation mode share at the Port of Oakland and it is feasible that project will induce the use of additional oversized vehicles to transport goods that are currently transported by rail or other modes.

However the draft EIR does not consider the impact of this project in the overall transportation network and thus is able to hand wave away the potential increases of VMT, GHG, and MSAT by stating this project will not increase the capacity of I80, I580, or I880 and "this project will not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix [...] that would cause a meaningful increase in MSAT impacts"

Given the entire rational of this project is to increase the capacity of the MacArthur Maze for oversized vehicles which is currently zero I ask Caltrans to fully document the environmental impact of this project including:

* the current volume of oversized trucks using local streets instead of the Maze

* the expected volume of oversized trucks using the Maze after project completion and after suitable periods of time

* the impact of the additional freight traffic on the Maze and any potential additional congestion

* the impact of any additional freight traffic that is induced to be transported by oversized vehicles on GHG, VMT, and MSAT

In addition Caltrans, in my opinion, has not sufficiently documented in the EIR how it will route freeway traffic during construction closures onto local Oakland streets while preserving safe access for people walking, biking, and riding

Comment 16 (Continued)

transit. Without sufficient planning Caltrans will cause additional harm to the communities of concern that are located near this project by routing traffic onto neighborhood streets and exposing vulnerable road users to freeway level volumes of traffic and bus riders to congestion. Caltrans should coordinate with Oakland Department of Transportation and AC Transit and providing funding to mitigate any impact to neighborhood streets including the construction of curb bulbouts, separated bike lanes, and transit priority features including queue jumps, boarding islands, and bus only lanes.

Given the reality of catastrophic climate change and sea level rise this project is a bridge too far and the "no build" alternative is the only responsible choice.

Comment 17

From:	pjsanders@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 10:59 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by pjsanders@gmail.com on March 5th, 2019 at 10:59AM (PST).

name: Phil Sanders email: pjsanders@gmail.com telephone: 5108945839 comment: This is a huge waste of state transportation funds and is evidence of either corruption or ineptitude and should immediately be referred to a state auditor for investigation.

Simply mark these routes as not available for oversize loads using large, clear, repeated signage and lane paint.

From:	ricks.steven@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 1:08 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ricks.steven@gmail.com on March 5th, 2019 at 01:08PM (PST).

name: Steven Ricks email: ricks.steven@gmail.com telephone: 6194953521 comment:

https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.reddit.com%2Fr%2FUrbanHell%2Fcomment s%2Faq0i3g%2Femeryville_ca%2F&data=02%7C01%7CMacArthurMaze%40dot.ca.gov%7C0e75d78e1373427e015f 08d6a1aeb062%7C621b0a64174043cc8d884540d3487556%7C0%7C1%7C636874168994253875&sdata=FKgRMjl1L uGtoCl6yXDCmaFXYHRiLq4xa4E6B7HKy1A%3D&reserved=0

1.) I have no confidence in Caltrans ability to do this on time and within budget.

2.) MAKE THE TRUCKS GO AROUND! This project won't benefit anyone but the dying TRUCKING industry. This is nothing but corporate welfare at the expense of taxpayers! How about expanding lanes and alleviating the soul-crushing traffic this depressing stretch of highway experiences daily? How about us little people who need to get through here daily? Please, please, please, l'm begging you! The Bay area is already a nightmare for so many drivers...Don't do this! Think of another way! Hundreds of millions of tax dollars being spent that will benefit No ONE! it seems crazy useless to me. Please don't cause us any more suffering...

From:	Imccamy9@gmail.com Tuesday, March 05, 2019 2:47 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Subject:	Carl@DOT MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Imccamy9@gmail.com on March 5th, 2019 at 02:47PM (PST).

name: Laura McCamy email: Imccamy9@gmail.com telephone: 415-626-7821 comment: I live in Emeryville, very close to the maze. Traffic on my city's streets will be heavily impacted by this project. Yet I didn't receive notice of recent public meetings about the project. The only reason I found out about this construction is that someone from Bike East Bay mentioned it.

I support the Do Nothing alternative. The proposed project adapts the Maze for the traffic needs of the past, not the future.

Climate change is a crisis. We should be spending public money on adaptation and mitigation, not renovations that will encourage more and bigger trucks to move through the East Bay.

At the same time, this project will have a big negative impact on carbon-free modes of transportation, such as walking and biking, by sending freeway traffic onto local streets during construction.

I'm a member of Emeryville BPAC. I would like a Caltrans representative to come to our meeting to talk about this project and get feedback. Emeryville is the city that will be most impacted by the construction. We deserve much better outreach than we have already gotten.

From:	soren.peterson@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 6:36 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by soren.peterson@gmail.com on March 5th, 2019 at 06:35PM (PST).

name: Soren Peterson email: soren.peterson@gmail.com telephone: 5108512271 comment: Hello,

I strongly suggest that Caltrans consider alternative means of reducing high clearance emissions in the Maze area rather than pursue the proposed Vertical Clearance Project (or alternatively Alternative A if the project must be pursued). The MacArthur Maze is one of the most heavily trafficked interchanges not only in the region, but in the nation, due to the small number of bridges that traverse the SF Bay. Disruption to the interchange, particularly for traffic proceeding to and from the Bay Bridge would be a disaster for the region. In the current era of high housing prices and related housing displacement, greater number of commuters are necessitated to live in the East Bay and commute to the Peninsula via this corridor. The proposed intermittent shutdowns between 3-15 months across Alternatives would cripple the daily lives of these commuters, ultimately leading to people leaving the region and reduced economic competitiveness for the entire region. Public transit !

is not a viable alternative for many of these folks. Thus, despite the statutory requirement around providing clearance, I strongly suggest that Caltrans both (1) think more creatively around alternate solutions to this problem that will not disrupt the interchange and (2) if an Alternative must be chosen, focus on Alternative A, a proposal that would have reduced impact on the cross-Bay travel or any Alternative that strives to minimize the duration of traffic disruption to the corridor.

Best, Soren Peterson

Comment 21

From:	Ppolishuk@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 10:11 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ppolishuk@gmail.com on March 5th, 2019 at 10:11PM (PST).

name: Phil Polishuk email: Ppolishuk@gmail.com comment: This is a tremendous amount of money, hassle and inconvenience for some tall trucks. These resources are better spent on BART improvements.

From: Sent:	streetcars4us@gmail.com Wednesday, March 06, 2019 4·54 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by streetcars4us@gmail.com on March 6th, 2019 at 04:53PM (PST).

name: John Scheuerman email: streetcars4us@gmail.com telephone: 5106538799 comment: I would like to see the reworking of the maze include a dedicator

comment: I would like to see the reworking of the maze include a dedicated bus lane that allows for a direct connection from the Bay Bridge to Emeryville. While this may be costly, it's much cheaper than a new transbay bridge or tube. We need to better utilize our existing roads for public transit.

Comment 23

From:	karl.stinson@comcast.net
Sent:	Wednesday, March 06, 2019 5:21 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by karl.stinson@comcast.net on March 6th, 2019 at 05:21PM (PST).

name: Karl Stinson email: karl.stinson@comcast.net telephone: 9253223587

comment: What would be more effective in reducing the impacts of increased carbon emissions from trucks not able to pass through the maze would be to eliminate the incredible, non-stop back up at the I580 westbound and I80 interchange. The west bound I580 traffic headed to northbound I80 needs to be separated from the westbound I980 traffic trying to make its way to the Bay Bridge. Eliminating this cross over would reduce accidents, the usually long normal delay in traffic and carbon emissions.

From: Sent:	yakuba42@gmail.com Wednesday, March 06, 2019, 7:24, RM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by yakuba42@gmail.com on March 6th, 2019 at 07:33PM (PST).

name: Jacob Nasim email: yakuba42@gmail.com comment: D seems like a no brainer. So "innovative"! Shortest anticipated construction. Cheapest by far. Only 4 months of intermittent closures.

Comment 25

From:	Johnnavolio@yahoo.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 8:37 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Johnnavolio@yahoo.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 08:37AM (PST).

name: John Navolio

email: Johnnavolio@yahoo.com

comment: It seems to me that a project such as this is unnecessary. All truckers and transportation companies know (or should) what the height restrictions are. They are free to chose to use taller trucks and go around (with whatever impact on thier profit that has) or use trucks that clear the height. That is a lot of money to spend to accommodate the trucking industry. Not to mention the impact to the communities that will be effected by the surface street traffic. I oppose this project. Respectfully, John Navolio

From:	Marvinyeesf@yahoo.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 9:22 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Marvinyeesf@yahoo.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 09:21AM (PST).

name: Marvin Yee email: Marvinyeesf@yahoo.com comment: When will Caltrans finally clean up the homeless tents and illegal dumping along the westbound off-ramp at MacArthur/Hollis Streets, and under the Hollis St. underpass? These are both long-standing public safety and health concerns.

Comment 27

From:	pegmo@usa.net
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 9:51 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by pegmo@usa.net on March 3rd, 2019 at 09:51AM (PST).

name: Peggy Simmons email: pegmo@usa.net telephone: 5102835853 comment: Hello.

One small thing that could have a big impact to make the MacArthur Maze project tolerable to those of us who travel through it is to give the project a catchy name. Yes, really. Think of The Big Dig in Boston. TREX ("T Rex") in Colorado.

Names like these help the public own the project, because they make it easy to identify and refer to the disruption in a way that everyone understands. When I lived and worked in Colorado, my colleagues and friends immediately sympathized and understood a late arrival; it was because I had to traverse TREX construction.

Start a contest to let the public offer names for the project. Let the public vote on them. The prize is that Caltrans uses the winning name to refer to the project in news articles and other public forums.

If you have already planned to do any of this, that would be great, and thank you!

From:	jzweiback@yahoo.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 10:05 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jzweiback@yahoo.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 10:04AM (PST).

name: Jason Zweiback email: jzweiback@yahoo.com telephone: 9252081657 comment: You need to use this

comment: You need to use this opportunity to fix (or at least plan to deal with) the issue with cars coming from 24W that want to go to the Bay Bridge having to cross the usual slow traffic of the cars on 580 heading north to 580 and 80. This almost always causes a backup and I imagine many accidents. Adding capacity should help traffic to keep moving and make this less hazardous.

Comment 29

From:	mlgriffi@pacbell.net	
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 12:38 PM	
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weir	garten,
	Carl@DOT	
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments	

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by mlgriffi@pacbell.net on March 3rd, 2019 at 12:37PM (PST).

name: Julie Griffith email: mlgriffi@pacbell.net telephone: 6503623151 comment: Wouldn't it be easier and cheaper to require trucking companies to lower their load heights? What a boondoggle this will be. Please, please reconsider this plan.

Thank you.

From:	zandr@milewski.org
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 2:23 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by zandr@milewski.org on March 3rd, 2019 at 02:22PM (PST).

name: Zandr Milewski email: zandr@milewski.org telephone: 831 419 3312 comment: Your intro video mer

comment: Your intro video mentions the "No build" alternative, but that's the last we hear of this. As there are no serious alternatives for access to the peninsula from the Oakland/Berkeley area, any closure is likely to be disastrous, and the beneficiary if this project (oversized trucks) are a problem in their own right. Forget this project: \$100MM will fix a lot of potholes elsewhere.

If this project is somehow required by law, Alternative D is the no-brainer. It's cheaper, faster, and less disruptive.

Comment 31

From:	pegmo@usa.net
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 3:55 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by pegmo@usa.net on March 3rd, 2019 at 03:55PM (PST).

name: Peggy Simmons email: pegmo@usa.net telephone: 5102835853 comment: Hi.

I sent an email at 9:52 am today with the idea of developing a catchy name for the vertical clearance project at the MacArthur Maze. I misspelled the name of the Colorado transportation project. It's T-REX (not TREX). You would have found this out, of course, in your research, but it bothered me that I accidentally left out the hyphen, as that makes all the difference in how the name is pronounced.

I urge you again to get a fun, easy-to-remember, easy-to-pronounce name or acronym for the project. Iit help locals own it, and it becomes a readily identifiable reference for the rest of the nation.

Thank you.

From:	Kinglear3@aol.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 4:03 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten.
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kinglear3@aol.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 04:03PM (PST).

name: Leary Wong

email: Kinglear3@aol.com

comment: Don't change the MacArthur Maze to accommodate the trucking industry. Why must the motorist suffer at the construction detours? Why must the public pay for the benefits that the trucking industry would gain. It would be much cheaper to continue to use lower height trucks.

As we all know, the project will be delayed by many years and the cost will double.

Don't reconstruct the Maze

Comment 33

From:	amy@badore.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 7:03 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by amy@badore.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 07:03PM (PST).

name: Amy Badore

email: amy@badore.com

telephone: 5102820694

comment: The last thing we need is more trucks here. It's already crowded enough. This is corrupt and not for the good of most of the users of this infrastructure. Which one of you guys was bribed by the logistics industry? I will complain loudly about this to my representatives.

From:	mclothier@mac.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 03, 2019 8:08 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten.
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by mclothier@mac.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 08:08PM (PST).

name: Michael Clothier email: mclothier@mac.com telephone: 4154077404

comment: I do not think this is a fiscally responsible plan on multiple accounts. First and foremost there is no mass transit alternative. BART and AC Transit already struggle to perform on a daily basis in their current states. Secondly this plan benefits only a small percentage of trucks driving through the region, and an even smaller percentage of the total amount of drivers all together. Finally I believe your focus should be on repaving and maintaining the existing roads as the current condition of our regions roads are terrible at best. Let's use some logic please?

Comment 35

From: Sent:	Keemosabe22@outlook.com Sunday, March 03, 2019 10:09 PM
10:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Keemosabe22@outlook.com on March 3rd, 2019 at 10:09PM (PST).

name: Hakim Taylor email: Keemosabe22@outlook.com telephone: 510-123-4567 comment: I strongly oppose this, as it would greatly impact my daily commute which is already an hour with no traffic. I completely understand the impact that this project would have on the greater society, but the traffic at this area is already terrible and I think another way needs to be found. Thank you for your time.

Hakim Taylor

From:	debdug2000@yahoo.com
Sent:	Monday, March 04, 2019 6:41 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by debdug2000@yahoo.com on March 4th, 2019 at 06:41AM (PST).

name: Debra Dugger email: debdug2000@yahoo.com comment: I believe this proposal will wreck unnecessary havoc on the working class here.

Comment 37

From:	ghostlightmater@yahoo.com
Sent:	Monday, March 04, 2019 10:06 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ghostlightmater@yahoo.com on March 4th, 2019 at 10:06AM (PST).

name: Jackson Hurst email: ghostlightmater@yahoo.com telephone: 6786284232 comment: hi i would like to be added to the mailing list for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project. My mailing address is 4216 Cornell Crossing, Kennesaw, Georgia, 30144.

From:	omar@omaryak.net
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 1:01 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by omar@omaryak.net on March 5th, 2019 at 01:01AM (PST).

name: Omar Yacoubi email: omar@omaryak.net telephone: 415-254-3586 comment: I am concerned about the impact of having taller, heavier vehicles travel this corridor without a capacity increase since the area is already logjammed during commute hours, and many non-commute hours as well.

Have the air quality considerations included an analysis of these larger vehicles sitting in traffic on the spans?

And has there been any consideration of the added weight of these vehicles on the spans, as it pertains to the lifespan of the existing structures, which are already quite old?

Could a freight-only corridor be considered that does not use the existing spans? For example: 880 southbound runs to 980, which could provide an alternate route to 580. And it occurs to me: trucks are already banned on 580 through Oakland. Why not focus construction efforts for this project on 880 only, providing drivers with a detour to 880 via 580/980? This would minimize construction impacts, as well as speeding up the effort and preserving construction dollars for the most valuable bridge replacement/modification.

Comment 39

From:	the_archt@yahoo.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 10:02 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by the_archt@yahoo.com on March 5th, 2019 at 10:02AM (PST).

name: Alfred Lau email: the_archt@yahoo.com telephone: 510.7036453 comment: Pending better understanding of the detailed engineering proposal, with its potential lowest cost, least amount and duration of closures, I would suggest Alternative D - Partial Reconstruction of the I-80/I-580 connecting ramps appears to be the most prudent.

From:	dwsmiegiel@aol.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 05, 2019 6:20 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by dwsmiegiel@aol.com on March 5th, 2019 at 06:20PM (PST).

name: Don Smiegiel email: dwsmiegiel@aol.com telephone: 4156066610

comment: Only Caltrans could possibly believe that the proposed project makes any sense at all. The estimated cost ranges from \$37 to \$182 million, with cost overruns virtually assured. But this cost—incurred to save a few truckers some gas and time—will cost the usual users of the maze many many millions of dollars in lost time and car expenses. And of course, if past is prologue, Caltrans will make the same kind of mistakes it made in building the eastern span of the Bay Bridge after a couple of decades of passive aggressive delays in even beginning the work. Then there are the non-marine bolts and the faulty caulking, etc., etc. We should not be subjected to three to four years of disruption to help out trucking companies who don't need to use these bigger trucks and who can use streets if need be. A farce of a project.

Comment 41

From:	David@Schonbrunn.org
Sent:	Wednesday, March 06, 2019 10:30 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by David@Schonbrunn.org on March 6th, 2019 at 10:29AM (PST).

name: DAVID SCHONBRUNN email: David@Schonbrunn.org telephone: 4153311982

comment: The fact that this project has advanced to the stage of environmental review is an indication of the failure of Caltrans management to apply cost-benefit analysis and common sense to a request by the trucking industry. After a preliminary review, it should have been obvious that the project would be far too costly in terms of public financial resources and the inconvenience of the public to take it any further. This is not a problem that needs fixing. There are far more pressing transportation problems that need dealing with. See our website, transdef.org

--David Schonbrunn, President TRANSDEF

From: Diana Keena <<u>dkeena@emeryville.org</u>> Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 12:10 PM To: Kiaaina, Ron@DOT <<u>ron.kiaaina@dot.ca.gov</u>> Cc: Ryan O'Connell <<u>roconnell@emeryville.org</u>>; Charles S. Bryant <<u>cbryant@emeryville.org</u>>; Andrew Clough <<u>aclough@emeryville.org</u>>; Roni Hattrup - Gray-Bowen-Scott (<u>roni@graybowenscott.com</u>) <<u>roni@graybowenscott.com</u>> Subject: MacArthur Maze alternative effect on our BART shuttle

HI Ron,

It was good to meet you at Monday's meeting on the Ashby Interchange. I am sure Laurie is glad to have you as the new project manager for the I-80 corridor projects.

As promised, here is some info on the effect of Alternative C of the MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project on our BART shuttle.

The Emery Go-Round is a free shuttle between MacArthur BART station and stops throughout Emeryville. It is operated by the Emeryville Transportation Management Association (ETMA), and is open to the public.

The Emery Go-Round is on a temporary yard in Emeryville, whose lease and Conditional Use Permit will expire on April 15, 2020. The site owner is exploring developing the site, and a residential project has been approved on an adjacent site. So renewal is unlikely for both the lease and the Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the Emery Go-round yard will need to move two years before expected start of construction on the Maze project in April of 2022.

The ETMA has been working with the Caltrans Airspace Lease department to lease space under the Maze for its yard. Alternative C of the Maze project would rule out that site. If that alternative were chosen, the ETMA would have to find another site, probably in Oakland or Richmond. A different site would likely be so far from the service area that it would seriously impact the efficiency of shuttle operation.

I hope you can include this information in any description of pros and cons of the alternatives, and guide the project toward another alternative.

I am copying our Senior Engineer Ryan O'Connell (who was at the Ashby Interchange meeting on Monday), our Community Development Director Charlie Bryant, our Public Works Director Andrew Clough, and Emery Go-Round Executive Director Roni Hattrup. I thought they would all be interested.

Best regards, Diana

Diana Keena, AICP, Associate Planner City of Emeryville Community Development Department, Planning Division 1333 Park Avenue, Emeryville CA 94608 <u>dkeena@emeryville.org</u> Phone (510) 596-4335; Fax (510) 658-8095

From:Oseguera, Jose@CATCSent:Thursday, March 07, 2019 2:30 PMTo:MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOTSubject:MacArthur Maze Increase Vertical Clearance Project

Hello Rebecca,

We received your Notice of Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration for the MacArthur Maze Increase Vertical Clearance Project. At this time, the California Transportation Commission has no comments. Please notify the Commission as soon as the environmental process is complete.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you and best regards,

José L. Oseguera California Transportation Commission 1120 N Street, MS-52 Sacramento, CA 95814 Office: (916) 653-2094 | Fax: (916) 653-2134 Jose.Oseguera@catc.ca.gov

Comment 44

From:	koshostagg@yahoo.com
Sent:	Thursday, March 07, 2019 11:26 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by koshostagg@yahoo.com on March 7th, 2019 at 11:25PM (PST).

name: musia stagg email: koshostagg@yahoo.com telephone: 510 478 5844 comment: West Grand between Mandela and Market must be repaved (not just patched) before Caltrans dumps more traffic here. Potholes big enough to eat a truck wheel appear in no time as it stands. 35th and 36th streets will need help too. and this is just in the immediate area South of the project.

From:	joangarb2@gmail.com
Sent:	Friday, March 08, 2019 12:29 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by joangarb2@gmail.com on March 8th, 2019 at 12:29PM (PST).

name: Joan Garbarino email: joangarb2@gmail.com telephone: 5105282098

comment: I think the public is less concerned with environmental impacts than with the traffic disruption involved in this project (although the first proposal of lowering the roadway would perhaps be not advisable because of rising sea levels). But the main issue is that the maze is central to transportation throughout the region. The smallest disruption there is catastrophic. The rationale that the clearance, which has been the same for a very long time, needs to be raised because trucks are now taller seems ludicrous. This is true also for the University Avenue project closer to my house. If more truck clearance is absolutely needed it might be better to construct some kind of truck bypass for the maze. This might also reduce the number of accidents and spills involving big rigs that sometimes tie up this highway. This whole project seems absolutely ridiculous. Please get a clue and spend our Caltrans funds on something useful.

Comment 46

From:	jerryepower@gmail.com
Sent:	Friday, March 08, 2019 5:00 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jerryepower@gmail.com on March 8th, 2019 at 05:00PM (PST).

name: Jerry E Power email: jerryepower@gmail.com telephone: 5105253196 comment: I travel 80 west to 580 east frequently. I observe traffic backed up to Gilman almost every time I travel. The cause is always an insufficient number of lanes allotted to serve within the East Bay at the maze. While you're doing this can you PLEASE add an extra lane for 580 880 split from 80? Not to do so will keep traffic as bad it is or actually worse as traffic within the East Bay continues to increase. Please plan a little for the future while you're at it.

From:	nathanielburge@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 12, 2019 10:53 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by nathanielburge@gmail.com on March 12th, 2019 at 10:52AM (PDT).

name: Nathaniel Burge email: nathanielburge@gmail.com telephone: 4155725401 comment: Alternative D appears to be the best solution.



DALZIEL BUILDING • 250 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA • SUITE 4344 • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612-2033

Oakland Department of Transportation

(510) 238-3466 FAX (510) 238-7415 TDD (510) 238-3254

March 8, 2019

Tony Tavares Director, Caltrans District 4 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612

RE: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Dear Director Tavares,

On behalf of the City of Oakland, I write to express our grave concern regarding the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project. While we understand the importance of the project for goods movement, we are dismayed that we weren't engaged in meaningful conversations about this project and its impact much earlier. The City of Oakland formally requests an extension of the comment period through May 31, 2019 to allow for more analysis and enhanced communication about the project and its impacts.

The project proposes four alternatives, all of which would require intermittent rerouting of freeway traffic through the maze onto Oakland's local streets for numerous years. This major impact on Oakland's streets should have been elevated to me directly to discuss rerouting plans and mitigations to ensure that Oakland's communities in and around this area (identified as Communities of Concern) are not further impacted. We are dismayed that we were engaged at one general meeting where no information about traffic routing plans and details were available. Please consider our request to delay this project until we have had the opportunity to have meaningful engagement with substantial information and planning to ensure that Oaklanders are provided with a safe transportation system during this prolonged construction project.

Sincerely

Ryan Russo Director, Department of Transportation

cc: Michael Hursh, General Manager, AC Transit Christine Daniel, City Manager, City of Emeryville Mayor Libby Schaaf Lynette Gibson-McElhaney, City Councilmember, District 3 Sabrina Landreth, Oakland City Administrator William Gilchrist, Director of Planning and Building Department, City of Oakland



March 12, 2019

Department of Transportation, District 4 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612 Attn: Rebecca De Pont, Office of Environmental Analysis, MS-88

Subject: MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project

Dear Ms. De Pont,

The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the subject project on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Emeryville Transportation Management Association (ETMA).

The ETMA is a non-profit organization which provides the Emery-Go-Round Shuttle program, in partnership with the City of Emeryville. The Emery Go-Round is a first/last-mile shuttle service which connects employees, residents and visitors of Emeryville from the MacArthur BART Station to various locations throughout the City. The service is fare-free and open to the public.

The ETMA is in need of a long term operations and parking facility to store its fleet of shuttle buses and house its operations staff. Over the past year, the ETMA has been working with the Caltrans Airspace Lease department on a long term lease for site ALA 580-34. In December 2018, the California Transportation Commission provided authorization for District 4 to negotiate the terms of the lease with our organization. We are currently in the process of conducting environmental technical studies and preparing our design submittal. Our target date for site occupancy is April 2020.

We have also worked closely with staff from the City of Oakland, who initially reached out to us to see if we were interested in utilizing some under freeway space in Oakland for fleet parking. We understand both Caltrans and Oakland have had challenges with keeping the under freeway sites free from crime, homeless encampments, trash and graffiti. We all agreed our proposed use and improvements of the site would be considered a win/win solution for all.

In the fall 2018, we were informed by the District 4 Airspace Lease Department of the MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project and the potential impacts to our proposed site. Since then, we have met with the project team to discuss the project. It is our understanding that there are four alternatives being considered. The one alternative that would negatively impact our proposed use of site ALA 580-34, is Alternative C. Should this alternative be selected, the Emery Go-Round operations and parking facility project would no longer be viable, since Alternative C would require the use of the site for the relocation of the structures above. This would put the ETMA in a very challenging position as we would have to quickly locate another suitable site for our public transportation program, which would likely be located outside of the area and would have a significant impact to the efficiency of our shuttle operation. Additionally, we have already expended a great deal of our limited site development budget on the environmental and design work for the proposed site.

1601-D 63rd Street, Emeryville, CA 94608 ♦ Tel 925-937-0980, ext. 212 ♦ www.emerygoround.com

Comment 49 (Continued)

EMERYVILLE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

In addition to the significant impacts to our project, we are also concerned about the local traffic impacts, should Alternative C be selected. Emeryville is already infused with traffic congestion, particularly during the commute period. We fear Alternative C will significantly worsen the situation, in comparison with the other viable alternatives. This will result in significant impacts to the Emery-Go-Round service, which is so vital to the Emeryville community.

We kindly request that you consider our concerns when making your selection of the build alternatives and request that Alternative C <u>not</u> be selected as the preferred build alternative.

Sincerely,

Veronica 'Roni' Hattrup Executive Director

Cc: ETMA Board of Directors Diana Keena, City of Emeryville

Comment 50

From:	123giovanni@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 12, 2019 4:13 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten.
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by 123giovanni@gmail.com on March 12th, 2019 at 04:12PM (PDT).

name: Carlo DiFabio email: 123giovanni@gmail.com

telephone: 6504250662

comment: Please include bottleneck remediation from 80 westbound. 2 lanes to 580 east, 2 lanes to 880 south and 3 lanes continuing to 80 west. There is space and this is sorely needed and can easily be incorporated into this project.

From: Sent: To:	Goingonce@gmail.com Tuesday, March 12, 2019 9:49 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Goingonce@gmail.com on March 12th, 2019 at 09:48PM (PDT).

name: Kristin email: Goingonce@gmail.com comment: Strongly opposed to this project for the following reasons:

1) Penalizes east bay residents by causing undue burden of commute

2) Cargo trucks are not the future of transportation; prioritizing this short term "gain" over liability is short sighted and dangerous

3) We do not need to add to the air pollution in West Oakland

Pat Charley 5837 Fremont Strut Oahlound, CA 94608 510-654-7816

CalTrans District & Office 111 Grand avenue Cahland California 94612-3717 att." Rebecca De Pont Dear CalTrans Review Committee: I wish to respond to the notice of Subert to Adopt a negative Declaration re 1/80, 1/580 + 1-880 corroidon project. The project should be skuttled for the following The impact on the commutes of 150,000 people minimum perday would be disasterous for (2) The efficiencies of commercial traffic would be compromised for months 3 the Baut is operating at beyond capacity during commute hours at saterandland health + safety considurations I the plan does not addhess the most pressing mobles of colling trucks at the port of Dahland, a major Louice & aix pollution. The most pressing issue here is low infrient leans or grants to independant truchers who cannot offord to upgrade to electric or by bud Semi Fruchs. (over

Comment 52 (Continued)

(5) adding more freeway does not get these containers on Rail. That infrastructeurs already in place and under utalized. Our quality of life is deminished with # of trucks The responsible moblem solutions for the future must examine hig picture issues. It is not in the best interest short or long term to develop more capacity on the frieway. It is to divient freeway traffic to rail and where impossible; to upgrade Semi truch so they do not pollete while waiting for loads at the part or litilizing preeways to move preight.

most Respectfully,

PatCharley

From: Wald, Zachary <<u>ZWald@oaklandca.gov</u>> Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 12:25 PM To: Mccauley, Myeast@DOT <<u>myeast.mccauley@dot.ca.gov</u>> Cc: Cook, Brigitte <<u>BCook@oaklandca.gov</u>>; Weaver, Mark@DOT <<u>mark.weaver@dot.ca.gov</u>>; Ms.Margaret Gordon <<u>margaret.woeip@gmail.com</u>>; Brian Beveridge <<u>brian.woeip@gmail.com</u>>; Ferrara, Nicole <<u>NFerrara@oaklandca.gov</u>> Subject: Re: Maze Rebuild

Myeast -

Thank you for your help.

Our office would like to officially request that Caltrans delay approval of the environmental review of the maze project until the West Oakland community has had a chance to learn more about the project and to give input.

To that end, I am connecting you here with Ms. Margaret and Brian of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project.

Thank you,

Zac Wald

Zachary Wald Chief of Staff Oakland City Council, District 3 Councilmember Lynette Gibson McElhaney

Comment 54

From:	chcondon@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 13, 2019 12:28 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by chcondon@gmail.com on March 13th, 2019 at 12:28PM (PDT).

name: Courtney Condon email: chcondon@gmail.com telephone: 4156014951 comment: I would prefer for alternative C to take place to improve overall road conditions

From:	roni@graybowenscott.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 13, 2019 3:41 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by roni@graybowenscott.com on March 13th, 2019 at 03:40PM (PDT).

name: Veronica 'Roni' Hattrup email: roni@graybowenscott.com telephone: 925-937-0980, ext. 212 comment: Subject: MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project

Dear Ms. De Pont,

The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the subject project on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Emeryville Transportation Management Association (ETMA).

The ETMA is a non-profit organization which provides the Emery-Go-Round Shuttle program, in partnership with the City of Emeryville. The Emery Go-Round is a first/last-mile shuttle service which connects employees, residents and visitors of Emeryville from the MacArthur BART Station to various locations throughout the City. The service is fare-free and open to the public.

The ETMA is in need of a long term operations and parking facility to store its fleet of shuttle buses and house its operations staff. Over the past year, the ETMA has been working with the Caltrans Airspace Lease department on a long term lease for site ALA 580-34. In December 2018, the California Transportation Commission provided authorization for District 4 to negotiate the terms of the lease with our organization. We are currently in the process of conducting environmental technical studies and preparing our design submittal. Our target date for site occupancy is April 2020.

We have also worked closely with staff from the City of Oakland, who initially reached out to us to see if we were interested in utilizing some under freeway space in Oakland for fleet parking. We understand both Caltrans and Oakland have had challenges with keeping the under freeway sites free from crime, homeless encampments, trash and graffiti. We all agreed our proposed use and improvements of the site would be considered a win/win solution for all.

In the fall 2018, we were informed by the District 4 Airspace Lease Department of the MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project and the potential impacts to our proposed site. Since then, we have met with the project team to discuss the project. It is our understanding that there are four alternatives being considered. The one alternative that would negatively impact our proposed use of site ALA 580-34, is Alternative C. Should this alternative be selected, the Emery Go-Round operations and parking facility project would no longer be viable, since Alternative C would require the use of the site for the relocation of the structures above. This would put the ETMA in a very challenging position as we would have to quickly locate another suitable site for our public transportation program, which would likely be located outside of the area and would have a significant impact to the efficiency of our shuttle operation. Additionally, we have already expended a great deal !

of our limited site development budget on the environmental and design work for the proposed site.

Comment 55 (Continued)

In addition to the significant impacts to our project, we are also concerned about the local traffic impacts, should Alternative C be selected. Emeryville is already infused with traffic congestion, particularly during the commute period. We fear Alternative C will significantly worsen the situation, in comparison with the other viable alternatives. This will result in significant impacts to the Emery-Go-Round service, which is so vital to the Emeryville community.

We kindly request that you consider our concerns when making your selection of the build alternatives and request that Alternative C not be selected as the preferred build alternative.

Comment 56

TO: CALTRANS

FR: Douglas Flock, Emeryville CA

RE: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

DATE: March 5th, 2019

Greetings.

I have watched your video presentations regarding the road areas of concern and cannot tell, from an engineering perspective, what would be the best alternative. But due to our local earthquake issues, it would seem lower is better. But we are only talking a foot or so here. It looks like Alternative D makes sense as it is effective with lower costs and interruptions; as long as the other parts of the roadways are not in need of attention.

Which brings me to the point I can make with certainty. The design of the high flyover (NB-880 to EB-80) has caused added extreme noise pollution affecting residential units at the Watergate condominiums on Powell Street in Emeryville; located between Captain and Anchor Drives. And likely affecting residents in West Oakland as well. The main cause is large trucks using their Jake-Brakes to slow them down on the monstrous decline descending to EB80. Please do not repeat this situation as you refit the Maze. Indeed, if it were possible to reroute the flyover traffic underground to merge with EB80, that would be great; and safer for the truckers. An arrangement like the sunken intersection at 7th Street, by the Post Office, comes to mind, but with a cover of roadways on top. You probably made the high roadway because of the roadway connections needed below it; but the underground roadway may be an alternative for some of these connections. Then the high one could be lowered.

One other point. The intersection in the sky, where the high fly-over originates from, seems kind of shaky to me. When I'm stopped at the traffic light there, the whole thing moves and bounces under the weight of all the large trucks. It seems this would accelerate the fatigue of the structural components resulting in premature failure. Guess it depends on the underlying design though.

Cheers, Doug

D_flock@hotmail.com



West Oakland Commerce Association P.O. Box 23612 Oakland, California 94623 (510) 839-6999 Fax (925) 283-9924 Visit www.woca.biz

OFFICERS Norman Hooks President

George Burtt VP Internal Affairs Public Affairs

Steve Lowe VP Economic Development

Karen Cusolito VP Communications

Jon Sarriugarte VP Membership Development

Bob Tuck Secretary / Treasurer

BOARD OF DIRECTORS Bill Aboudi AB Trucking

Kurt Brinkman Intrepid Electronic Systems

George Burtt Cameron Enterprises

Karen Cusolito American Steel Studios

Les Hausrath Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean

Michael Herling Consolidated Cleaning Service

Norman Hooks Norman Hooks Architect

Joseph Hurwich Hurwich Properties

Edward Kangeter Custom Alloy

Steve Lowe Urbanspace Development

Alan Lucchesi Soundwave Studios

Tom McCoy BBI Construction

Tim Morse Bay Alarm

Markus Niebanck Amicus

Bill Purcell Cornish & Carey Commercial Real Estate

Christine Saed City of Oakland Main Library

Jon Sarriugarte Form and Reform

Rusty Snow Snow Property Company

Bob Tuck Atlas Heating

Richard Wang National Recycling

Lauren Westreich Every Dog has its Day Care BY US MAIL AND ELECTRONIC MAIL

March 14, 2019

Department of Transportation, District 4 Office of Environmental Analysis, MS-8B 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612 Attn: Rebecca De Pont, Associate Environmental Planner Email: MacArthurMaze@dot.ca.gov

Re: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Initial Study/Environmental Assessment with Proposed Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. De Pont.

The West Oakland Commerce Association (WOCA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and the recommendation for a Negative Declaration prepared in an effort to satisfy statutory requirements under the California Environmental Quality Control Act (CEQA).

This letter transmits a general comment and a number of specific comments. The specific comments include excerpts from the IS/EA for your convenient reference.

General Comment

Founded and incorporated in 1990, the West Oakland Commerce Association (WOCA) is the oldest business development and advocacy organization in West Oakland. WOCA works to promote the health and vitality of West Oakland and the surrounding area through promotion of business and the free enterprise system.

The West Oakland business and residential community are inextricably linked and WOCA recognizes that a healthy and thriving business climate requires a similar residential circumstance – business does not exist and succeed at the expense of the community – business succeeds BECAUSE of the community.

The MacArthur Maze IS/EA project description either by default or design fails to describe or quantify the impact the proposed alternatives will have on the West Oakland (and Emeryville) communities <u>during construction</u>. For reasons that are not clear, the report author chooses instead to focus largely on post-construction impact, and it is the finding that the project when complete may have no significant additional human health/environmental impact compared to existing configurations that makes the basis for the proposed Negative Declaration.

Caltrans Maze Project Initial Study

Serving the Business Community Since 1990

11Page

Comment 57 (Continued)

WOCA generally supports projects that benefit local businesses, and improvements to freeway infrastructure to improve the transport of goods appears to be intended to do just that. WOCA cannot, however, support a project that does not responsibly account for impacts to the business and residential community, nor can we support a project of the scale here that does not include robust and meaningful community outreach.

Specific Questions/Comments

Copied and pasted below are sections of the Initial Study that we believe are in need of attention/revision. Specific noteworthy aspects are <u>underlined</u>. Questions/comments are beneath each section in **BOLD CAPITALIZED** font.

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (unnumbered page preceding Table of Contents)

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

Project Description

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to increase vertical clearance for freight vehicles to the current Caltrans standard of 16 feet and 6 inches at three locations in the Oakland MacArthur Maze in Alameda County.

Determination

This proposed Negative Declaration (ND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is Caltrans' intent to adopt an ND for this project. This does not mean that Caltrans' decision regarding the project is final. This ND is subject to change based on comments received by interested agencies and the public.

Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study for this project, and pending public review, expects to determine from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

<u>The proposed project would have no effect on</u> Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, <u>Transportation/Traffic</u>, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Mandatory Findings of Significance.

In addition, the proposed project would have less than significant effects to Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Noise.

Caltrans Maze Project Initial Study

Comment 57 (Continued)

COMMENT 1 - AS NOTED BELOW, IT DOES NOT APPEAR AS IF CALTRANS CONDUCTED ANY SUBSTANTIAL EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF THIS PROPOSED PROJECT ON COMMUNITY TRAFFIC AND RELATED AIR QUALITY <u>DURING</u> CONSTRUCTION. THE AUTHOR NOTES ONLY THAT THE PROJECT WHEN <u>COMPLETED</u> WILL HAVE NO SUBSTANTIAL INCREMENTAL CONSEQUENCES. AN EIR SEEMS THE MORE APPROPRIATE CEQA DOCUMENT FOR AN UNDERTAKING OF THIS MAGNITUDE GIVEN THE INITIAL STUDY DEFICIENCIES AND THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS HIGHLIGHTED HERE.

1.2 Purpose and Need (p 5)

1.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the project is to remedy vertical clearance deficiencies at three locations within the MacArthur Maze that impede the safe and efficient movement of freight vehicles through the interchange.

1.2.2 Need Roadway Deficiencies

The proposed project is needed to remedy the vertical clearance deficiencies found at three locations within the MacArthur Maze to allow for freight and oversized vehicles to travel through these major connectors to and from areas such as the Port of Oakland. The current Caltrans vertical clearance standard is 16 feet 6 inches. Within the Maze, there are currently three locations that do not meet this standard, depicted in Figure 1-2. At present, the connector from WB 1-80 to EB 1-580 has 14 feet 9 inches of vertical clearance as it passes under the WB 1-580 to WB 1-80 connector. The connector from WB 1-80 to SB 1-880 has a vertical clearance of 15 feet 3 inches as it passes under the WB 1-580 to EB 1-580 connector, as depicted in Figure 1-2 which shows the current clearance. The vertical clearance must be increased to the current Caltrans standard in order to correct these deficiencies.

Q1. WOCA REQUESTS THAT CALTRANS PROVIDE INFORMATION DESCRIBING THE NATURE/NUMBER OF HIGH LOADS THAT PRESENTLY REQUIRE REROUTING DUE TO THE BRIDGE CLEARANCES, INCLUSIVE OF A DESCRIPTION OF THE ROUTES THAT THESE LOADS MUST PRESENTLY TRAVEL.

Q2. WOCA REQUESTS THAT CALTRANS PROVIDE INFORMATION PERTAINING TO ANY SPECIFIC KNOWN HIGH-LOAD CARRIER OR BUSINESS THAT HAS CONTACTED THE AGENCY WITH OVERPASS CLEARANCE CONCERNS. THIS WILL ENABLE AN UNDERSTANDING OF COMMERCIAL NEEDS THAT INFLUENCE CLEARANCE PROJECT PLANNING.

Caltrans Maze Project Initial Study

31 Page
Q3. WOCA REQUESTS THAT CALTRANS ALSO DESCRIBE THE CURRENT/PROJECTED ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF REMAINING WITH THE STATUS QUO. AS WRITTEN THE PROJECT BASIS IS VAGUE, AND TURNS MORE ON THE NOTION THAT THE BRIDGE CLEARANCES SIMPLY DON'T MEET CURRENT AGENCY STANDARDS. GIVEN THE SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED UNDERTAKING, INCONSISTENCY W AN AGENCY STANDARD ALONE DOESN'T SEEM AN ADEQUATE BASIS FOR THE PROJECT AS DESCRIBED.

2.5.4 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Affected Environment $(p\ 49)$

The MacArthur Maze interchange is the major traffic distribution center that enables the public to access San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, the Port of Oakland et cetera. The interchange connectors distribute traffic to and from the Bay Bridge.

The Bay Bridge Trail, which is a segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail system, extends from a trailhead on Shellmound Street in Emeryville to the East Span of the Bay Bridge. The trail is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Environmental Consequences

Traffic in the project area could potentially be impacted by lane or connector closures required by construction activities.

The Bay Bridge Trail extends through the MacArthur Maze project area and could be potentially disturbed during construction activities. The proposed project would likely require a temporary detour of the trail during construction activities. The Bay Bridge Trail would be restored to existing conditions following construction of the project for Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D. For Alternative C, the Bay Bridge Trail would be realigned within the project area and would be repaved and landscaped to match existing conditions following construction of the project.

Project Features

• <u>A TMP would be developed prior to project construction. The TMP would identify</u> ways to reduce traffic congestion that would result from project construction and could include detours.

• The trail would either be protected by a structure built over it during construction activities or rerouted out of the construction zone. The project would only impact the

Caltrans Maze Project Initial Study

Bay Bridge Trail during construction. After the construction of the project, the Bay Bridge Trail and its adjacent landscaping would be restored to its previous condition.

COMMENT 2 - IF THE PROPOSED PROJECT INVOLVES <u>ANY</u> ROUTING OF HIGHWAY TRAFFIC THROUGH NEIGHBORHOODS, OR IF IT CAN BE REASONABLY FORESEEN THAT DRIVERS WILL CHOOSE CITY STREETS OVER CONGESTED HIGHWAYS DURING THE PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION, A TMP IS AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT OF THE CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND MUST BE COMPLETED <u>NOW</u>. A PROMISE TO MAKE ONE LATER DOES NOT MITIGATE THIS POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.

Q4. WOCA REQUESTS THAT CALTRANS CLARIFY PLANS/EXPECTATIONS RELATIVE TO THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC ANTICIPATED FOR WEST OAKLAND CITY STREETS. IF THIS ANALYSIS HAS NOT BEEN CONDUCTED, WOCA REQUESTS THAT IT BE CONDUCTED AND THE TMP COMMENT ABOVE BE ADDRESSED ACCORDINGLY.

3.2 CEQA Environmental Checklist

AIR QUALITY (P 55)

<u>No Impact</u> A-E

This project is exempt under the Clean Air Act conformity rule under 40 CFR 93.126, Table 2- widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes) and an air quality study is not required. This project would be required to comply with Caltrans Standard Specification 14-9, Air Quality, which requires compliance with air pollution control rules, regulations, ordinances, and statues that apply within the project area. This project has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special mobile source air toxic (MSAT) concerns. As such, this project will not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause a meaningful increase in MSAT impacts of the project from that of the no-build alternative.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC (p 71)

CEQA Significance Determinations for Transportation/Traffic

<u>No Impact</u> A-F

Caltrans Maze Project Initial Study

51 Page

<u>All traffic impacts would be temporary during construction</u>. The Bay Bridge Trail construction impacts would be temporary and would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or pedestrian facilities. <u>Due to anticipated closures that would result</u> in detours, a TMP would be implemented during construction. Further discussion can be found in Section 2.5.4 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.

COMMENT - FOR THE REASONS DESCRIBED ABOVE, THE ANALYSIS FOR AIR QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC IS DELIBERATELY AND UNACCEPTABLY SUPERFICIAL.

Q5. WOCA REQUESTS THAT THE INITIAL STUDY EVALUATE THE AFFECT OF THE PROJECT ON WEST OAKLAND COMMUNITY AIR QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC <u>DURING</u> CONSTRUCTION.

4.1 Comments and Coordination (p 88)

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. It helps planners determine the necessary scope of environmental documentation and the level of analysis required, and to identify potential impacts and avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures and related environmental requirements. Agency and tribal consultation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including interagency coordination meetings, public meetings, public notices, Project Development Team (PDT) meetings, and Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) meetings. This chapter summarizes the results of Caltrans' efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

Chapter 6 - Distribution List

Community Organizations (P 97)

Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter; Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter Northern Alameda County Group; Save the Bay; Bike East Bay; California Walks; TransForm

Individuals

Kevin Johnston 2288 Buena Vista Avenue Livermore, CA 94550

COMMENT – THE IS/EA CORRECTLY OBSERVES THAT EARLY AND CONTINUING COORDINATION WITH THE GENERAL PUBLIC IS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS – YET <u>NO</u> OUTREACH OR COORDINATION WITH LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS OR

Caltrans Maze Project Initial Study

INDIVIDUALS BEYOND THOSE ASSOCIATED WITH THE BAY BRIDGE TRAIL WAS CONDUCTED PRIOR TO THE PUBLICATION OF THE DRAFT DOCUMENT.

NAMES OF ALL "COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS" AND "INDIVIDUALS" ARE COPIED FROM THE IS/EA AND SHOWN ABOVE. <u>NO</u> WEST OAKLAND ORGANIZATIONS ARE LISTED. THE SINGLE INDIVIDUAL LISTED IN THE DOCUMENT IS ACTUALLY A REPRESENTATIVE OF AN ALAMEDA COUNTY SMALL EMERGING LOCAL BUSINESS (SLEB) THAT PROVIDES ENGINEERING AND SEPTIC SERVICES LOCATED IN LIVERMORE, CALIFORNIA, OVER 30 MILES DISTANT FROM THE WEST OAKLAND PROJECT LOCATION.

THE WEST OAKLAND COMMUNITY IS VERY INTERESTED IN PROJECTS SUCH AS THE ONE PROPOSED, AND HAD THE DEPARTMENT TELEGRAPHED ITS INTENTION TO COMMENCE WITH AN INITIAL STUDY THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT DOZENS OF INDIVIDUALS AND NUMEROUS ORGANIZATIONS WOULD HAVE INDICATED THEIR DESIRE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PRE-PROJECT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS.

IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE OUTREACH DESCRIBED IN THE INITIAL STUDY WAS DESIGNED TO ENSURE THAT THIS PROJECT REMAINS OFF THE RADAR FOR AS LONG AS POSSIBLE.

Q6. WOCA REQUESTS THAT CALTRANS EXPLAIN THEIR ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY TO DATE AND TAKE IMMEDIATE STEPS TO ENSURE MEANINGFUL COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH FROM THIS POINT ON.

This concludes our Initial Study questions and comments. To reiterate – WOCA is supportive of projects that benefit business and the West Oakland community. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposed project and look forward to more detailed outreach.

Most sincerely

George Burtt Vice President Internal Affairs WOCA For the West Oakland Commerce Association Board of Directors

Caltrans Maze Project Initial Study

71 Page

COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print) Bill Abad:
Address (Home) city state zip code
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency)
Address (Business) 10 Brens Ro city Orkins state CA zip code 94607
Comments: Support FOR AUTERNATIVE "C"
THIS PROJECT DREA IS CRETICAL TO BAY ANEA
REPLACING AN OLD STRUCTURE WILL BE
CHENPER LONG TERM & ALLOW FOR
LONE REALINEMENTS
For additional comments use reverse side.

IK Udekwu <ikudekwu@mykolab.com></ikudekwu@mykolab.com>
Friday, March 15, 2019 4:53 PM
MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Comment on Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Hello,

I received a "Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration" in my postal mailbox today, March 15, and I would like to lodge a complaint against any upcoming design or project — if only because this mailer has arrived on the last day of the comment period, giving me (and I presume other residents) no reasonable amount of time to review the technical studies mentioned or understand what may or may not be happening with respect to this project.

I left a message with Rebecca De Post to this effect 510-622-0803. I would like more information on the results of the study and, in particular, when the mailers were sent.

Best, Osita Udekwu

438 W Grand Ave Oakland, CA 94612

Comment 60

From:		Moppedahl@yahoo.com
Sent:		Sunday, March 17, 2019 12:39 PM
To:	¥.	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT: Weingarten
		Carl@DOT
Subject:		MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Moppedahl@yahoo.com on March 17th, 2019 at 12:38PM (PDT).

name: Mary Oppedahl email: Moppedahl@yahoo.com

telephone: 5109958155

comment: I can't believe you are going to spend this amount of money and inconvenience hard-working commuters in cars on millions if not hundreds of millions of daily trips through the maze over the course of this project to accommodate the trucking industry. They can use the smaller trucks that have successfully negotiated this area for years. Again, our tax dollars to benefit industry. It's ridiculous. Use the money to fix the Nimitz which the trucks tear up. They resurfaces it in 2012 and now it is filled w/ potholes. If you must do the maze revamp to accommodate trucks so they can carry a 10 or 20% larger load, the trucking industry should pay for all of it. You should make them pay to resurface the Nimitz while you are at it.



March 18, 2019

Tony Tavares, Director Caltrans District 4 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612

Re: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Dear Director Tavares:

While it is great to see SB1 projects happening after much effort to pass the legislation and defend it at the ballot box, Bike East Bay has concerns about the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project and its impacts on safe bicycling. Could we please meet to discuss how this important freight movement project can be made safe for people walking and bicycling local streets in the area? We request that the cities of Emeryville and Oakland, as well as a representative of the Alameda CTC, join the meeting. Please let me know how soon we can have such a meeting to discuss the issues summarized here.

First, walking and bicycling access along the bike connector path from Shellmound/IKEA to the Bay Bridge needs to remain open at all hours, and of course needs to be safe and inviting for this purpose. It sounds like you are aware of this concern and can coordinate construction activities accordingly, but please keep us advised so that we can inform our members.

More challenging, the options your website outlines for the ramp replacements (<u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/d4/macarthurmazeproject/</u>), will result in ramp closures that most certainly will add thousands of car trips on to local streets that people walk and bike everyday, and do so for many months or more than a year perhaps. These local streets will need added bike lanes as safety mitigations, or upgraded bike lanes and intersections, as well as transit improvements. BART should also be consulted.

The streets we see as being most impacted with additional traffic are Powell Street/Shellmound/40th in Emeryville, San Pablo Avenue in Emeryville and Oakland, W. Grand Avenue in Oakland, Market St., West St., 7th St. and Adeline St. in Oakland, and Mandela

> PO Box 1736, Oakland, CA 94604 510 845 RIDE (7433) • info@bikeeastbay.org

Parkway. There may be more and we will look to traffic experts to advise on which streets will be signed and operated as detours. Both Oakland and Emeryville have current plans to add and upgrade bike lanes on many of these streets. So, the good news is that a coordinated effort is all that is needed to accelerate these community-supported safety improvements as part of the Maze Project. We want your projects to be multimodal and to contribute to Caltrans' adopted goals to double walking and triple bicycling by 2020.

Bike East Bay is ready as a resource to help with these coordination efforts. In addition to plans for safety mitigations, local streets will need to be monitored during construction to ensure safety of people walking and bicycling, with adjustments made promptly where and when needed.

Please let me know that you have received this request and how soon we can sit down and roll up our sleeves to ensure safety for everyone.

Thank you for your attention and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Dot Coplar

Dave Campbell Advocacy Director Bike East Bay (510) 701-5971 <u>dave@bikeeastbay.org</u>

Cc: Ally Medina, Emeryville Mayor John Bauters, Emeryville City Council Lynette McElhaney, Oakland City Council District 3 Ryan Russo, OakDOT Director Art Dao, Alameda CTC Executive Director Carolyn Clevenger, Alameda CTC Planning Greg Currey, Caltrans D4 Planner

PO Box 1736, Oakland, CA 94604 510 845 RIDE (7433) • info@bikeeastbay.org

given to

Comment 62

From:	dscarritt@springmail.com
Sent:	Monday, March 18, 2019 7:21 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	alteration to MacArthur Maze
I am not in favor of alt residents like myself w	erations to the MacArthur Maze to accommodate trucks. Too little consideration is being given ho suffer from asthma as a result of living close to Oakland freeways. Diesel fuel is the main
irritant for me.	
Sincerely,	
Diane Scarritt	
Comment 63	
From:	patrickmccully@mac.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:09 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments
Below is the result of 04:09PM (PDT). name: Patrick McCully	your feedback form. It was submitted by patrickmccully@mac.com on March 19th, 2019 at
email: patrickmccully	@mac.com

telephone: 5102131441 comment: This project will result in substantial additional traffic on surface streets in N. and W. Oakland and Emeryville. My commute from Berkeley to West Oakland BART involves biking through this streets every day. Please ensure protected bike lanes on the worst impacted streets to ensure that they are safe for cyclists.

Thank you, Patrick McCully, Berkeley CA

From:	katwong1@yahoo.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:20 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by katwong1@yahoo.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:19PM (PDT).

name: Kathleen Wong email: katwong1@yahoo.com telephone: 6502917352

comment: I wish to remind Caltrans that the reconstruction of the MacArthur Maze freeway sections are funded by SB1, which requires that potential impacts to bicycle travel must be minimal. The Maze project will generate a dramatic increase in traffic along West Oakland streets such as Shellmound, Powell, West Grand, For this reason, Caltrans should fund the establishment of protected bikeways along streets that will see more congestion and car trips due to this project.

Comment 65

From:	joe@xenotropic.net
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:25 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by joe@xenotropic.net on March 19th, 2019 at 04:24PM (PDT).

name: Joseph Morris

email: joe@xenotropic.net

comment: Please ensure there are protected bike lanes on San Pablo, W. Grand, Powell, Shellmound, Mandela Parkway, and Adeline to protect bikes from the extra cars that will be on city streets as a result of the maze work.

From:	lobsang.wangdu@ucop.edu
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:27 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by lobsang.wangdu@ucop.edu on March 19th, 2019 at 04:26PM (PDT).

name: Lobsang Wangdu

email: lobsang.wangdu@ucop.edu

comment: I wish to remind Caltrans that the reconstruction of the MacArthur Maze freeway sections are funded by SB1, which requires that potential impacts to bicycle travel must be minimal. The Maze project will generate a dramatic increase in traffic along West Oakland streets such as Shellmound, Powell, and West Grand. For this reason, Caltrans should fund the establishment of protected bikeways along streets that will see more congestion and car trips due to this project.

Comment 67

From:	dan@dannew.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:28 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by dan@dannew.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:27PM (PDT).

name: Daniel Newman email: dan@dannew.com telephone: 5106449723 comment: Please immediately add protected bike lanes to all streets surrounding this construction project. It protects bikes.

From:	Jmdrew2001@yahoo.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:33 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jmdrew2001@yahoo.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:32PM (PDT).

name: JM Drew email: Jmdrew2001@yahoo.com telephone: 510-331-9914 comment: Bikers are going to need clearly marked bike lanes and a way to cross from Treasure Island to SF and back would also be helpful.

Comment 69

From:	Ksbrune@yahoo.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:19 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ksbrune@yahoo.com on March 19th, 2019 at 05:19PM (PDT).

name: Kyle Brunelle email: Ksbrune@yahoo.com telephone: 5105581258

comment: This letter is regarding the MacArthur Maze rebuild and the resultant automobile traffic effects for cyclists: While I'm pleased to hear of the upcoming rebuilding of the connector ramps in the MacArthur Maze freeway interchange, I'm very concerned about the effect of the increased street level traffic on the safety of cyclists. As a cyclist who current uses roads in the area, I see that it's already overrun with excess cars that make it dangerous and especially unwelcoming for cyclists- such roads as West Grand avenue, Shellmound, and especially Powell, with fast moving cars and no protection for bike riders from these speeding cars. The freeway undercrossing a Powell on the way to the Bay Trail is especially dangerous! The freeway ramp closures will add thousands of cars to already overcrowded streets.

Before any construction effects the traffic, please provide/install protected bike lanes. Thank you.

Kyle

From:	kathy_jarrett@yahoo.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:28 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by kathy_jarrett@yahoo.com on March 19th, 2019 at 05:28PM (PDT).

name: Katherine w Jarrett email: kathy_jarrett@yahoo.com telephone: 5105471233 comment: Caltrans is set to rebuild connector ramps in the MacArthur Maze freeway interchange. Ramp closures will add thousands of cars to already busy local streets like West Grand Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, Mandela Parkway and more.

There is a need for immediate protected bike lanes on these streets.

Comment 71

From:	tallulahterryll@yahoo.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:33 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by tallulahterryll@yahoo.com on March 19th, 2019 at 05:32PM (PDT).

name: tallulah terryll email: tallulahterryll@yahoo.com telephone: 5103166003 comment: Hello!

I commute to work in West Oakland daily. I'm concerned that this construction will push many cars onto surface streets. I'm hoping that West Grand, San Pablo and Adeline's bike lanes will be extended so there won't be gaps and protected so cars don't pull into them. So many people in the community ride bikes. Please help keep us safe!

From:	morgan@hahaha.org
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 7:40 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by morgan@hahaha.org on March 19th, 2019 at 07:39PM (PDT).

name: Morgan Fletcher email: morgan@hahaha.org telephone: 5108471696 comment: Please accelerate bike lane improvements. I ride to work this way, every day, and more cars choking West Grand will mean someone on a bike will be at much greater risk of being hit by a car.

Morgan

Comment 73

From:	rhallsten@yahoo.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:54 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by rhallsten@yahoo.com on March 19th, 2019 at 11:53PM (PDT).

name: roger hallsten

email: rhallsten@yahoo.com

telephone: 5108488749

comment: Caltrans is set to rebuild connector ramps in the MacArthur Maze freeway interchange. Ramp closures will add thousands of cars to already busy local streets like West Grand Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, Mandela Parkway and more.

I call for immediate protected bike lanes on these streets.

From:	Claire@bikeconcord.org
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 8:02 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Claire@bikeconcord.org on March 20th, 2019 at 08:01AM (PDT).

name: Claire email: Claire@bikeconcord.org telephone: 925.272.8056 comment: What are the high quality bicycle and pedestrian facilities in this projecr that will fit her Caltran's goal of tripling biking and walking?

Comment 75

From:	arianahirsh@berkeley.edu
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:03 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by arianahirsh@berkeley.edu on March 19th, 2019 at 04:03PM (PDT).

name: Ariana Hirsh email: arianahirsh@berkeley.edu

telephone: 4152467824

comment: Please add protected bike lanes to the streets around the Macarthur Maze freeway redesign- displaced cars will make biking those streets more dangerous. The SB1 gas taxes call for complete streets, which means bike infrastructure!

From:	nathaniel.kane@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:06 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by nathaniel.kane@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:06PM (PDT).

name: Nathaniel Kane email: nathaniel.kane@gmail.com telephone: 9785050090 comment: Please ensure that there are protected bike lanes on streets impacted by MacArthur Maze construction.

Comment 77

From:	jsever117@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:16 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jsever117@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:16PM (PDT).

name: Jean Severinghaus email: jsever117@gmail.com telephone: 415 925 1809 comment: I support the immediate provision of pop-up protected bikeways on the surface streets impacted by the Macarthur Maze construction.

From:	jccirelli@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:23 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Callebol
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jccirelli@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:22PM (PDT).

name: James Cirelli email: jccirelli@gmail.com telephone: 9174347138

comment: Please ensure that there are protected bike lanes on the streets that are expecting the freeway spillover. Frustrated drivers sharing roads with cyclists is a recipe for disaster, and without protected bike lanes, I fear another cyclist death by a driver will happen. Deaths like this are not infrequent, and are easily solved by physical barriers from drivers. Thank you.

Comment 79

From:	jameane@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:23 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jameane@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:22PM (PDT).

name: Jame Ervin email: jameane@gmail.com telephone: 510-269-4420 comment: I am worried about safety for pedestrians and bicyclists during the construction period. I bike and occasionally walk around this area, at least 1x per week.

The streets (San Pablo Avenue, W. Grand Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, Mandela Parkway, Adeline Street) in this area are already a little precarious feeling when you are not in a car. The traffic is traveling quickly and the streets are poorly maintained and not well lit. These are also key corridors for traveling north/south or to the Bay Trail and other western locations.

I imagine with the increased car traffic, there will be more potential for conflicts with drivers and non-car traffic. Additionally these cars will be traveling at higher speeds. The streets are currently pretty wide with high speed limits, which encourages cars to go fast.

In order to improve saftey during the construction, there should be protected bike lanes and crosswalks through out the construction period. Without these provisions, it is only a matter of time before we see more injuries and fatalities on those corridors.

From:	polyphone@hotmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:27 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by polyphone@hotmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:26PM (PDT).

name: erin sanders email: polyphone@hotmail.com

telephone: 3124204241

comment: I'm very concerned about overflow of car traffic in Emeryville and Oakland during this project. San Pablo Ave, Mandela Pkwy, Shellmound/Christie will all see vastly increased numbers of cars; drivers who are frustrated and in a hurry due to construction. What will Caltrans do to mitigate this impact, and secure the safety of those of us using local bike infrastructure?

We need protected bike lanes NOW. We need an offroad feeder trail from Mandela Pkwy to the Bay Trail NOW. We need better crossings on San Pablo NOW.

Comment 81

From:	will.leben@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:30 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by will.leben@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:30PM (PDT).

name: Will Leben email: will.leben@gmail.com telephone: 5108421134 comment: I get around Oakland by bike and transit. With the changes coming to the MacArthur maze, street traffic is going to get worse--potentially deadly news for those of us who bike and walk.

As a cyclist, I'm grateful for the bike lanes that have been added in recent years yet very concerned that unprotected bike lanes are not safe enough for current conditions. Car traffic has gotten worse in two respects: there's ore of it and it's not well regulated. Car speeds are higher, drivers run red lights more often, turn signals are used less often.

Please call for stepped-up enforcement of existing laws and do whatever it takes to improve bike and pedestrian safety in the area affected by the MacArthur Maze project.

From:	laurelye@svctwww1.dot.ca.gov
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:43 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by laurelye on March 19th, 2019 at 04:42PM (PDT).

name: Laura Shifley email: laurelye telephone: 646-303-1007 comment: Please design protected bicycle lanes and safe pedestrian crossings and infrastructure as part of this reconfiguration project!

Comment 83

From:	heyoverhere@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:46 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by heyoverhere@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:46PM (PDT).

name: Paul Langlois

email: heyoverhere@gmail.com

comment: This rebuild will add thousands of cars to already busy local streets like West Grand Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, Mandela Parkway and more. I'm calling for immediate protected bike lanes on these streets.

From:	flxthomson@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:51 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by flxthomson@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 04:50PM (PDT).

name: F Thomson email: flxthomson@gmail.com telephone: 5103332339 comment: Please ensure there is truly safe, evidence based bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure on impacted city streets before beginning this project. Physically protected bike lanes are the safety standard and equity demands we provide that standard on Oakland streets.

Comment 85

From:	geoffrey.sylvester@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:01 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by geoffrey.sylvester@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 05:00PM (PDT).

name: geoffrey Sylvester email: geoffrey.sylvester@gmail.com

telephone: 651-428-5214

comment: I regularly bike from Alameda to Emeryville and 3-4 times per year to Yerba Buena on the bridge. I sincerely hope and expect that any rebuilding and design of an improved Maze interchange will include improvements to bike transit. and include consideration of any expected increased car/truck traffic will have on the safety of bike traffic in the area.

Sincerely,

Geoff Sylvester

From:	deborahmdodge@comcast.net
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:15 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by deborahmdodge@comcast.net on March 19th, 2019 at 05:14PM (PDT).

name: Deborah M Dodge email: deborahmdodge@comcast.net telephone: 5105282933 comment: This project will necessitate ramp closures which will add thousands of cars to the already busy local streets West Grand Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, Mandela Parkway and more. Please work with the city of Oakland and make it a priority of the project to immediately add protected bike lanes on these streets. Warm regards, Deborah Dodge

Comment 87

From:	benjamin.eversole@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:33 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by benjamin.eversole@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 05:32PM (PDT).

name: Ben Eversole email: benjamin.eversole@gmail.com telephone: 5105666930

comment: The closure of the maze will cause more cars onto neighboring streets. As a cyclist, I worry this change will increase the chance of me being hit by a car. Please put in protected bike lanes on all the streets in the area that have increased car traffic.

From:	waddysmith@sbcglobal.net
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:53 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by waddysmith@sbcglobal.net on March 19th, 2019 at 05:52PM (PDT).

name: Paul Smith email: waddysmith@sbcglobal.net telephone: 5104597368 comment: Hello Protected bike lanes are very important to me and my community. Please create protected bike lanes in the MacArthur Maze project.

Comment 89

From:	twillgin@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 6:18 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by twillgin@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 06:17PM (PDT).

name: Tom Willging email: twillgin@gmail.com telephone: 2024914747 comment: Dear Caltrans:

This projected construction work will dump motor vehicle onto major arteries like San Pablo and Grand Avenues. These are high injury corridors. Build protective bikeways now--before the construction and before someone is killed. Since the work will have to be done at some point, why not now?

Tom Willging 177 19th St. Oakland, CA 94612

From:	Davidjmckay@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 6:55 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Davidjmckay@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 06:55PM (PDT).

name: David McKay email: Davidjmckay@gmail.com

telephone: 5104693738

comment: Hello, as a regular bicycle commuter in Oakland I am always supportive of infrastructure updates that will ease traffic for everyone. Please ensure that when you are redoing these ramps at the MacArthur Maze that you are protecting the bike paths and routes of the surface streets that will be heavily affected, such as West Grand and San Pablo Avenues. I often find that road construction does not take the needs of bicycle commuters into account, and severely hinders and ultimately discourages bicycle commuting. If we want to improve air quality, traffic flow and quality of life in the Bay Area for all, it is important that these projects prioritize pedestrian and bike throughways during their completion.

Comment 91

From:	ksueduncan@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 7:00 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ksueduncan@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 07:00PM (PDT).

name: K.Sue Duncan email: ksueduncan@gmail.com telephone: 510-548-4407 comment: SB1 has a "complete streets" requirement, meaning potential impacts to bicycle travel must be minimal. You can see in the map shown here, more freeway traffic will use Powell Street and Grand Avenue to get to and from San Francisco. As a result, more car traffic will be on San Pablo Avenue, W. Grand Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, Mandela Parkway, Adeline Street and more. We want protected bike lanes while the MacArthur Maze project is happening.

From:	tboggia@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 7:27 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by tboggia@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 07:26PM (PDT).

name: Tommaso Nicholas Boggia email: tboggia@gmail.com telephone: 8312344507

comment: Do you have a plan to mitigate the impact this project construction will have on bicycle communing routes? Are protected bike lanes along alternative routes that car traffic will take because of this project part of the plan? If not, why not and how do you rationalize that increased car traffic on surface street won't make the roads less safe for people commuting by bicycle?

Comment 93

From:	Omar.masry@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 7:45 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Omar.masry@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 07:45PM (PDT).

name: Omar Masry email: Omar.masry@gmail.com telephone: (805) 300-7219 comment: Please support Complete Streets including well designed protected bike lanes as part of the Oakland Maze Project.

From:	abbeymyszka@hotmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 7:56 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by abbeymyszka@hotmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 07:55PM (PDT).

name: Abbey Myszka

email: abbeymyszka@hotmail.com

comment: Hello

I'm writing to comment on the MacArthur Maze vertical clearance project. There are many service streets that will be affected by the highway ramp closures. Because this project is funded by SB1 gas taxes, I would like to request that protected bike lanes be installed on these streets. SB1 has a "complete streets" requirement, meaning potential impacts to bicycle travel must be minimal. More freeway traffic will use Powell Street and Grand Avenue to get to and from San Francisco. As a result, more car traffic will be on San Pablo Avenue, W. Grand Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, Mandela Parkway, Adeline Street and more. Please add bike lanes!

Comment 95

From:	Albert.reinhardt@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 8:01 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Albert.reinhardt@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 08:00PM (PDT).

name: Albert reinhardt email: Albert.reinhardt@gmail.com telephone: 510-559-3969 comment: Hello I'm writing in regards to Vertical Maze project. I live several miles north of this area and like many other people in the region go near the effected area daily. I sometimes drive through on surface streets or the freeway but more often than not I'm commuting through on my bicycle. I also ride with my children to and from their after school and weekend activities near San Pablo and Powell. I want to make sure traffic planning takes into account the extra car traffic on city streets created by this project. It's important for those driving to have smooth flow of traffic. It will be crucial for the safety of cyclists that there are protected bike lanes and other accommodations. This area in Emeryville is a busy corridor for people traveling by bicycle and I want to make sure our needs and safety are also considered. Thank you,

Albert

From:	rjmaller@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 8:03 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by rjmaller@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 08:02PM (PDT).

name: Jeremiah Maller email: rjmaller@gmail.com telephone: 4158714323

comment: Please add protected bike lanes to these streets in the east bay: San Pablo, Powell St/Shellmound, and West Grand Avenue. I live in West Oakland and bicycle to commute and as my only form of transportation. Please create more protected bike lanes so I can safely travel once the MacArthur Maze ramps are closed, adding traffic to local streets.

Caltrans is rebuilding connector ramps in the MacArthur Maze to create more vertical clearance for truck traffic. Ramp closures will add thousands of cars to local streets, including San Pablo Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, W. Grand Avenue and more. The cities of Emeryville and Oakland are supportive of mitigating this heavy traffic impact and Bike East Bay is calling for immediate protected bike lanes on these already busy streets.

Comment 97

From:	carter.lavin@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 8:32 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by carter.lavin@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 08:32PM (PDT).

name: Carter Lavin email: carter.lavin@gmail.com telephone: 6107726591 comment: There should be bike and bus improvements included in the overall project scope particularly to help mitigate the additional local traffic the construction will cause.

From:	bruceoleohlson@hotmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 8:38 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Subject:	Carl@DOT MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by bruceoleohlson@hotmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 08:38PM (PDT).

name: Bruce "Ole" Ohlson email: bruceoleohlson@hotmail.com telephone: 9254395848 comment: During the rebuilding of the MacArthur maze, please provide safe passage for people who bicycles on the local streets such as West Grand Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, Mandela Parkway. Please remember that streets are for all people, not just people in cars. Thank you for your concern. ~Ole

Comment 99

From:	noah.e.miller@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 8:49 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by noah.e.miller@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 08:49PM (PDT).

name: Noah Miller email: noah.e.miller@gmail.com telephone: 510-684-2798 comment: Please mitigate the heavy traffic impact that will be caused by the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project: immediately install protected bike lanes on San Pablo Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, W. Grand Avenue and other local streets impacted by the project.

From:	scottjasonyoung@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 8:52 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by scottjasonyoung@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 08:52PM (PDT).

name: Scott Young email: scottjasonyoung@gmail.com telephone: 2132587003 comment: Need protected bike lanes on streets in area to protect bicycles from traffic.

Comment 101

From:	britharvey1@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:02 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by britharvey1@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 09:01PM (PDT).

name: Brit Harvey email: britharvey1@gmail.com telephone: 5108459122

comment: First, it is disturbing that so much money is being spent to accommodate unnecessary changes to the size of trucks. Second, this is going to greatly increase the risk to pedestrians and bicyclists using streets in the vicinity for many years. If there is enough money to take care of the trucking industry, I hope there is also enough money to provide improved pedestrian and bike facilities in the impacted area. These facilities, such as protected bike lanes, cost a fraction of the total project cost and should be completed prior to any diversion of traffic onto city streets. Thank you for your consideration to this matter.

From:	ginarschu@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:37 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ginarschu@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 09:37PM (PDT).

name: Gina Schumacher email: ginarschu@gmail.com telephone: 6196060477

comment: PLEASE make sure that you are adding protected bike lanes to all the major roads impacted by this project. If we as a neighborhood, city, and state want to help move more people through our city, there needs to be a safe option for people walking and biking. Protected bile lanes create safety for all road users. Lets make sure we are improving access to streets for all people, not just people who have cars. Thank you for your consideration to ensure our roadways promote healthy sustainable transportaion options.

Sincerely, Automobile owner, bicycle owner, tax payer, and voter

Comment 103

From:	jonbparry@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 10:14 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jonbparry@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 10:14PM (PDT).

name: Jonathan Parry email: jonbparry@gmail.com telephone: 9493949514 comment: Please implement separate bike and bus lanes for West MacArthur and West Grand during this project. This will allow for better traffic flow and safety for all road users if properly publicized.

From:	abracadabera@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:31 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by abracadabera@gmail.com on March 19th, 2019 at 11:30PM (PDT).

name: Sarah Shelley email: abracadabera@gmail.com telephone: 9252950748 comment: Please make bike infrastructure part of your plans. Thank you.

Comment 105

From:	mheberger@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 6:30 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by mheberger@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 06:29AM (PDT).

name: Matthew Heberger email: mheberger@gmail.com telephone: 5107467391 comment: Because this project

comment: Because this project will push many more cars onto surface streets, Caltrans should provide funding and technical assistance to local authorities to install protected bikeways on local roads San Pablo Avenue, W. Grand Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, Mandela Parkway, and Adeline Street.

These bikeways should not just be created with paint or signs, but should be physically separated from vehicular traffic.

From:	ltrhine@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 7:34 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ltrhine@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 07:33AM (PDT).

name: Linda Rhine email: ltrhine@gmail.com telephone: 650 270 9133 comment: It is imperative that the Complete Streets concepts in the MacArthur Maze project to avoid dumping more traffic on Grand Ave and increase vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle accidents. Safety must be a prime factor as well as all of the users of Grand Ave. The project must consider bike and pedestrian infrastructure in this project.

Comment 107

jonathan_walden@hotmail.com
Wednesday, March 20, 2019 8:14 AM
MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Carl@DOT
MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jonathan_walden@hotmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 08:14AM (PDT).

name: jonathan walden email: jonathan_walden@hotmail.com comment: Please provide additional protected bike lanes to help cyclists survive the increased street traffic that the construction will cause.

In Berkeley, we can anticipate additional traffic on MLK and San Pablo and Ashby and Telegraph. All of these streets are dangerous to cross on foot or by bicycle.

Please provide some mitigations to help prevent deaths and injuries from the increased traffic load.

From:	jonathanjmacmillan@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:00 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jonathanjmacmillan@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 08:59AM (PDT).

name: Jonathan MacMillan

email: jonathanjmacmillan@gmail.com

comment: Please make it safer for bicyclists before the freeways are closed and many more cars get on the road. This is an important area for getting to Emeryville and using the Bay Bridge bike path. Protected bike lanes are the only thing that works. I fear that someone will die otherwise.

Comment 109

From: Sent:	Kerbyolsen@gmail.com Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:40 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kerbyolsen@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 09:40AM (PDT).

name: Kerby Olsen email: Kerbyolsen@gmail.com telephone: 925-876-4203

comment: Per the "Complete Streets" requirement for SB1 projects, Caltrans should implement protected bike lanes and a "Bus Only" red lane on West Grand Avenue during the MacArthur Maze closure. This can be accomplished without a major impact on traffic flow by temporarily removing all on-street parking. Street parking on West Grand is highly underutilized (I know since I live one black away).

From:	andy.kleiber@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:45 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by andy.kleiber@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 09:45AM (PDT).

name: Andy Kleiber email: andy.kleiber@gmail.com telephone: 5103380238 comment: During the ramp closures required by this project, many vehicles will be diverted to local streets. This will impact bikes, pedestrians, etc. on these streets.

Enhanced protected bike lanes, early walk signals at intersections and other traffic calming measures should be included in this project to alleviate the impacts of this added traffic.

Comment 111

From:	mjhyatt@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:45 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by mjhyatt@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 09:45AM (PDT).

name: Michael Hyatt email: mjhyatt@gmail.com telephone: 510-470-0335 comment: I regularly commute by bi

comment: I regularly commute by bicycle through this area and I'm very concerned about the impacts of diverting all this traffic onto local bikeways. The only adequate mitigation (other than not doing the project) would be to provide true protected bike lanes on all affected bike corridors. Otherwise this project will most likely force me to drive rather than bike due to the added danger.

From:	bryan.culbertson@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:52 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Callebol
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by bryan.culbertson@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 09:51AM (PDT).

name: Bryan Culbertson email: bryan.culbertson@gmail.com telephone: 415-413-7115 comment: Hi Caltrans,

I live in West Oakland and bike this route every day. Changes that move car and truck traffic to local streets will make biking more dangerous. SB1 has a "complete streets" requirement, meaning potential impacts to bicycle travel must be mitigated. Before this project starts we need protected bike lanes on the already busy streets of San Pablo, Powell, Shellmound, West Grand, 7th, and Mandela.

Thank you, Bryan Culberson

From:	kuanbutts@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:59 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by kuanbutts@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 09:58AM (PDT).

name: Kuan Butts email: kuanbutts@gmail.com telephone: 8588694735 comment: This is re the rerouting of significant traffic onto city streets in Oakland. As someone who bike commutes to and from work - these traffic increases will put freeway drivers into high stress urban corridors. This puts commuters who choose to cycle to work at risk.

Recent car crashes that resulted in the driver of the vehicle killing a cyclist in the SOMA neighborhood of SF and around Oakland highlight the severe risks insufficient bike infrastructure poses to those commuting by non-auto means.

If Caltrans is going to make the decision to route significant traffic onto city streets and put the bike commuters there at significantly greater risk of severe injury, they need to both:

a.) Acknowledge that

b.) Do their utmost to protect these commuters.

Namely, significant investment should be made in complete overhauls of bike infrastructure, with the installation of bike boxes, and completely grade separated and protected bike lanes along these roads where traffic is increased. Bike safety improvements should also be made on streets not experiencing the rerouting directly, but who are in the "blast radius" and getting effected by the increased traffic on side and support streets to these arterials, as well.

Comment 114

From:	sousa.plm@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:18 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by sousa.plm@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 10:17AM (PDT).

name: Paul Sousa email: sousa.plm@gmail.com telephone: 4157354186 comment: Please add protected bike lanes in West Oakland, including on Frontage Road, 7th Street, Mandela Parkway, Peralta Street, and West Grand Avenue. I feel unsafe riding my bike on these roads and increasing traffic will only make that worse.

From: Sent: To:		chris.t.tracy@gmail.com Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:25 AM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	x	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by chris.t.tracy@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 10:25AM (PDT).

name: Chris Tracy email: chris.t.tracy@gmail.com telephone: 510-452-7978

comment: I commute to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory by bicycle. I have worked for the laboratory for almost 10 years. The city *must* do implement protected bike lanes on these already busy local streets which will be further impacted during the upcoming year-long ramp closures that is expected to add tens of thousands of cars to local streets. I will be impacted by this on my commute.

Comment 116

From:	Izavod@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:25 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Izavod@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 10:25AM (PDT).

name: Liat Zavodivker email: lzavod@gmail.com telephone: 408-644-4651

comment: This project was funded by SB1 funds which my organization fought for with the No on Prop 6. I request that Caltrans immediately create a network of protected bike lanes and honor the "complete streets requirement" as designated by SB1.

The increased car traffic from ramp closures will affect: San Pablo Avenue, W. Grand Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, Mandela Parkway, Adeline Street. For all roads that the car traffic will affect, the ask is a network of protected bike lanes. Bus priority would also mitigate some of the traffic impacts. Please strongly consider these improvements before you begin this project. The traffic situation in the Bay Area depends on getting cars off the road.
From:	miles.lincoln@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 11:23 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by miles.lincoln@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 11:23AM (PDT).

name: Miles Lincoln email: miles.lincoln@gmail.com telephone: 6304790199 comment: I live very close to the macarthur maze, and I have two requests:

1. My windowsills, the plants on my street, and probably the inside of my lungs are all blanketed in a layer of black dust from car exhaust. I can wipe it up, but it will return in a few days. I am strongly opposed to any efforts being made to increase the amount of auto/truck traffic through this area where I and many others live. It should not be necessary for me to hose particulate off of my outdoor plants so that they can get sunlight.

2. I bike to get around. This area is already dangerous due to high traffic of cars using surface streets to avoid the maze, and incredibly dangerous potholes, particularly on Hollis under 580 (but particularly everywhere). These streets need to be made safe for pedestrians and bicycles. Regardless of whether the maze project moves forward, we need these streets to be made safe with protected bike lanes.

Continued efforts to prioritize auto traffic are efforts to kill bicyclists and pedestrians, and lower the air quality of West Oakland.

This tweet says it best:

 $https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Ftwitter.com%2Fladyfleur%2Fstatus%2F11044623\\56850069510&data=02%7C01%7CMacArthurMaze%40dot.ca.gov%7C0251fe2ee7fd4c58669108d6ad611e61%7C62\\1b0a64174043cc8d884540d3487556%7C0%7C0%7C636887029978254504&sdata=p0o0XqyHPZbXsK3G9DKQfZl1b\\m4LKKZke%2FgiGRS53Rc%3D&reserved=0$

"people who loudly fight any changes that slow down or limit cars" are to blame for bicycle and pedestrian deaths. I am writing this to make it clear that I wish to slow down and limit cars (and trucks) in order to protect pedestrians and bicyclists.

From:	caltrans@renderfast.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 12:35 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by caltrans@renderfast.com on March 20th, 2019 at 12:34PM (PDT).

name: Doug Letterman email: caltrans@renderfast.com telephone: 917-825-1448 comment: Why is the Caltrans vehicle clearance standard 16' when the California vehicle code (Section 35250) limits truck height to 14'? Why is raising clearances in the MacArthur Maze necessary at all when the existing minimum vertical clearance of 14'9" seems more than sufficient to accommodate the tallest trucks that the vehicle code currently allows?

What is the number of oversize trucks that currently have to divert around the maze and at what additional cost? If the height clearances are raised what is the projected number of trucks that will not have to divert around the maze and how much money will it save shippers and the general public?

Comment 119

From:	ebhruby@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 1:07 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ebhruby@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 01:06PM (PDT).

name: Erica Hruby email: ebhruby@gmail.com telephone: 6178173041 comment: Please consider the effect of rerouted car traffic on cyclists in West Oakland and include protected bike lanes in these streets!

From:	marty_evans@sbcglobal.net
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 4:16 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by marty_evans@sbcglobal.net on March 20th, 2019 at 04:15PM (PDT).

name: Martin Evans email: marty_evans@sbcglobal.net telephone: 5109640903 comment: I realize that the MacArthur Maze is in need of upgrades and improvements, but please consider accounting for cyclists during the construction phase so that cycling commuters and recreational cyclists have a path through or around the mess that construction will entail. some protected bike lanes before construction starts would be a help. thank you.

Comment 121

From:	Tbobx@aol.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 6:53 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Tbobx@aol.com on March 20th, 2019 at 06:53PM (PDT).

name: Bob Trencheny email: Tbobx@aol.com

telephone: 19254133432

comment: With literally thousands of people walking, biking and scootering in this neighborhood every day it would be absolutely dereliction of duty for Caltrans to not provide strong effective and safe routes of travel for vulnerable road users. It's hard to believe that California has to discuss and debate this. Make the streets safe for everyone. Do it!

Robert Trencheny

From: Sent:	dianadorinson@yahoo.com Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:03 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by dianadorinson@yahoo.com on March 20th, 2019 at 10:03PM (PDT).

name: Diana Dorinson email: dianadorinson@yahoo.com telephone: 555-555-5555

comment: This project *must* improve the pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure on the surface streets that will see increased vehicle volumes during the ramp closures. This should include protected bike lanes, plus bulb-outs at key intersections. At the largest volume intersections, re-timed signals that include a pedestrian-only phase might be the best way to protect vulnerable road-users. And these improvements should be implemented before the construction begins, so that travelers can get used to the new configurations before the added traffic is felt.

Comment 123

From:	gavin.lohry@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 6:00 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by gavin.lohry@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 05:59PM (PDT).

name: Gavin F Lohry email: gavin.lohry@gmail.com telephone: 5103308295 comment: Please include projected bike lanes on the routes that will be effected by the maze before construction begins. Also can we add bus only lanes to the updated access routes to prioritize efficiency of moving people over steel.

From:	sunstreamgrafix@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 8:13 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by sunstreamgrafix@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 08:12PM (PDT).

name: Joshua Davis email: sunstreamgrafix@gmail.com telephone: 5712968503 comment: I do not own a car, and bike daily for work, groceries, errands and sometimes fun. However our local streets are already dangerous, I'm lucky if on any day I don't have a close call with a negligent or aggressive driver.

My close calls happen frequently when I'm near a highway interchange as drivers have likely already entered in to "highway mode" and aren't on the lookout for bikes and pedestrians.

If Calrrans plans to route highway traffic on to local streets it must be accompanied with a seperated bike lane along all impacted routes. Anything less than that will create a hazardous condition that could lead to an injury or death.

Please ensure bike lanes are added to all streets that will see increased traffic.

Thanks, Joshua Davis, Oakland, CA

Comment 125

From: Sent: To:	ben.gerhardstein@gmail.com Wednesday, March 20, 2019 8:31 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ben.gerhardstein@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 08:31PM (PDT).

name: Ben Gerhardstein email: ben.gerhardstein@gmail.com telephone: 5133130069 comment: Please provide protected bike lanes to commute routes to mitigate the added surface street traffic this project will cause.

From: Sent: To:	gavin.m.platt@gmail.com Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:22 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by gavin.m.platt@gmail.com on March 20th, 2019 at 09:22PM (PDT).

name: Gavin Platt email: gavin.m.platt@gmail.com telephone: 7248251508

comment: I'm a West Oakland resident and home owner, and I'm very concerned about truck and car traffic as a result of the upcoming MacArthur Maze project. Our family primarily bicycles to work. We want to know that Caltrans and other authorities support the addition of substantial, physically-protected bike lanes before this project begins to divert traffic onto our neighborhood streets, including Grand Ave., 7th St. to 3rd St., and Mandela Parkway. This can easily become a life-and-death situation if not handled properly and in a timely fashion. Thank you.

Comment 127

From:	michesinnott@gmail.com
Sent:	Thursday, March 21, 2019 10:00 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by michesinnott@gmail.com on March 21st, 2019 at 09:59AM (PDT).

name: Michelle Sinnott Petersen email: michesinnott@gmail.com telephone: 9257883042

comment: With the Caltrans rebuilding of connector ramps in the MacArthur Maze to create more vertical clearance for freight truck traffic, upcoming year-long ramp closures will add tens of thousands of cars to local streets, including San Pablo Avenue, Powell Street/Shellmound, W. Grand Avenue, 7th Street and more. The cities of Emeryville and Oakland are supportive of mitigating this heavy traffic impact and Bike East Bay is calling for immediate protected bike lanes on these already busy streets. Please protect cyclists during this transition time and add protected bike lanes!!!!

From: Sent: To: Subject:	ronald@kappesser.net Thursday, March 21, 2019 10:57 AM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments
Below is the result of yo (PDT).	our feedback form. It was submitted by ronald@kappesser.net on March 21st, 2019 at 10:57AM
name: Ronald Kappesse email: ronald@kappess telephone: (831)905-30 comment: This project clearance that the new and the project would o project on something th	er.net er.net 45 seems like it is an unnecessary expense. The number of vehicles requiring the additional bridges would provide seems to be tiny compared to the expense of providing the improvement delay numerous travelers during construction. It would be better to spend the money for this hat will significantly improve mobility for people and freight in the region.
Sincerely,	
Ronald Kappesser	
Comment 129	ci@vourpalclaudia.com
Sent:	Thursday, March 21, 2019 2:21 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments
Below is the result of yo (PDT).	ur feedback form. It was submitted by cj@yourpalclaudia.com on March 21st, 2019 at 02:20PM
name: Claudia van Dijk email: cj@yourpalclaud telephone: 5105205680 comment: I am concern injured as a result of be environment. But the st the roads with a curb or greatly reduced by such Thank you.	ia.com ed about bicycle safety and upset that anyone using a bike for transport would be killed or ing struck by a car. California is a state known for residents who look after their health and the creets are not designed to support that. Please commit to protected bicycle lanes, separated from barrier, making it nearly impossible for an accidental collision with a car. Traffic problems can be provisions.

From:	cj@yourpalclaudia.com
Sent:	Thursday, March 21, 2019 2:21 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by cj@yourpalclaudia.com on March 21st, 2019 at 02:20PM (PDT).

name: Claudia van Dijk email: cj@yourpalclaudia.com telephone: 5105205680

comment: I am concerned about bicycle safety and upset that anyone using a bike for transport would be killed or injured as a result of being struck by a car. California is a state known for residents who look after their health and the environment. But the streets are not designed to support that. Please commit to protected bicycle lanes, separated from the roads with a curb or barrier, making it nearly impossible for an accidental collision with a car. Traffic problems can be greatly reduced by such provisions. Thank you.

Comment 131

From:	Monkey.mini@gmail.com
Sent:	Saturday, March 23, 2019 10:11 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Monkey.mini@gmail.com on March 23rd, 2019 at 10:11AM (PDT).

name: Irene Nexica email: Monkey.mini@gmail.com telephone: 5106545080 comment: I support protected bike lanes in this project !

From:	rndyl@sbcglobal.net
Sent:	Saturday, March 23, 2019 9:12 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by rndyl@sbcglobal.net on March 23rd, 2019 at 09:12PM (PDT).

name: Randall Baxter email: rndyl@sbcglobal.net telephone: 5102895145

comment: I've lived in Berkeley for 25 years and want to voice my support behind dedicated bicycle lanes in the upcoming project to expand how traffic accesses the Maze going to and from the bay bridge. Allowing for the presence of bikeways can only be a good thing. If dedicated space is made, bicyclists will definitely use the lanes. Thank you for your consideration, sincerely, Randall Baxter

Comment 133

From:	bj@bethanyjane.com
Sent:	Saturday, March 23, 2019 10:46 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by bj@bethanyjane.com on March 23rd, 2019 at 10:45AM (PDT).

name: Bethany J Hanson email: bj@bethanyjane.com telephone: 510-835-1034 comment: I think it is a bad idea to re-work the MacArthur maze in order to make the clearances taller. You will be spending tons and tons of money and causing years of traffic jams to benefit a few trucks. I don't want our tax dollars to go to such an effort.

I would like to suggest that Caltrans widen its perspective from just California freeways to how all transportation (freight and people) in California happens. What if that money was used in another way?

At the very least Caltrans has a serious unaddressed (at least last I knew) problem with garbage from the roadway not being picked up and trashing our creeks and bay.

From: Sent: To:	thteach@sonic.net Saturday, March 23, 2019 4:52 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; V Carl@DOT	Veingarten,
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments	

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by thteach@sonic.net on March 23rd, 2019 at 04:52PM (PDT).

name: Todd Teachout email: thteach@sonic.net telephone: 5107996051

comment: Caltrans Vertical Clearance Standards Exceed Federal Standards by 6 inches. The Environmental Document fails to provide sufficient background about the last projects. It appears that standards exceptions were utilized to enable the newer structures to be constructed over the older existing structures with Clearance deficient of Federal Standards. The Environmental Document should reference or summarize those old exceptions. It would be useful to understand the primary advocates for this project.

The Environmental Document does not appear to document the age of the various components of the project, what the service life is and if, due to age, there are structural deficiencies in need of being addressed.

The Environmental Document does not appear to reference cost/benefit analysis.

I am upset by this project. The unmet needs on the Interstate and State Highways in the region are great. I believe that resources would be best used to address other more basic needs like pavement condition, vegetation management, safety deficiencies. I assume the advocates for the project include the Port of Oakland and Trucking interests. If these interests are willing to fully fund these improvements via bonding or direct contributions so as to not impact existing and projected State, Federal Highway, County or other funds then I can support the project. My experience says that all motorists will provide funding assistance. Of the alternatives Alternative D seems to have the lowest cost and fastest delivery time so that seems most appealing of the Alternatives. That said if the project will cause redirection of funds away from more basic and therefore more urgent needs the no build alternative seems the best.

At the get go the overview says that the project is proposed to accommodate OVERSIZED containers and vehicles. To make such accommodations is a luxury and privilege. I object to giving this project any consideration of priority.

From:	bkeller@hmc.edu
Sent:	Saturday, March 23, 2019 6:19 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by bkeller@hmc.edu on March 23rd, 2019 at 06:19PM (PDT).

name: Ben Keller email: bkeller@hmc.edu telephone: 4013787523

comment: The proposed ramp closures will force tens of thousands of cars onto surface streets every day. Please prioritize immediate protected bike lanes on Powell Street, San Pablo Avenue, West Grand Avenue, and other affected streets, per the "complete streets" requirement associated with SB1 project funding.

I spent many hours fighting Proposition 6 at the ballot box last November for the sake of better bike infrastructure. It would be a cruel joke to fail to prioritize it with this SB1-funded project.

Comment 136

From: Sent: To:	janetlesliebyron@gmail.com Monday, March 25, 2019 11:45 AM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by janetlesliebyron@gmail.com on March 25th, 2019 at 11:44AM (PDT).

name: JANET BYRON email: janetlesliebyron@gmail.com telephone: 510-495-4999 comment: Please add protected bike lanes to streets around the maze. I commute from Berkeley to Oakland daily for work and the streets around the highways are absolutely the most scary for me from a safety perspective. The underpasses are dark, the lights and beg buttons are not timed well, and cars race through the intersections and lights on their way on and off ramps. Cyclists and pedestrians need additional protections as an integral part of this project. Sincerely,

Janet Byron

From:	dentelpost@gmail.com
Sent:	Monday, March 25, 2019 8:09 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by dentelpost@gmail.com on March 25th, 2019 at 08:09PM (PDT).

name: Colin Dentel-Post email: dentelpost@gmail.com telephone: 3025288156 comment: Dear Caltrans,

I am concerned that the proposed ramp closures due to the MacArthur Maze ramp rebuild project will add large volumes of through traffic to local streets in Oakland and Emeryville, putting these vehicles on the same streets as vulnerable pedestrians and bicyclists. As a result the project will result in significant safety risks for people walking and biking. Although the traffic diversions are temporary, additional injuries or deaths during the construction period due to the project are not acceptable. In order to appropriately mitigate these impacts, Caltrans must:

1) Fully analyze and identify the streets that will have increased traffic volumes due to diverted freeway traffic during construction;

2) Identify which streets already have disproportionately high rates of fatal and injury collisions, which have lower injury/fatality rates but might have higher rates with the expected traffic increase; and whether these streets are concentrated in environmental justice communities; and

3) Include an avoidance/mitigation measure to install safety treatments including protected bike lanes, pedestrian bulbs, and appropriate traffic calming treatments along the affected streets.

Thank you for including safety treatments to make sure the project does not have a negative impact on safety in Oakland.

Sincerely, Colin Dentel-Post

From:	Omar Masry <omar.masry@gmail.com></omar.masry@gmail.com>
Sent:	Monday, March 25, 2019 10:48 PM
To:	Mu, Lily@DOT; MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Cc:	Libby Schaaf; rrusso@oaklandca.gov; AMargusee@oaklandnet.com
Subject:	Re: Encore Public Meetings for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Thank you for this outreach on the Caltrans Vertical Clearance Project.

I'll keep this short and offer a suggestion and area of concern.

1. Please consider funding murals and artwork by local Oakland artists on a number of new or modified roadway support structures. Murals with local artists TEND to be less attractive spots for taggers. Plus West Oakland definitely deserves it.

2.Please use this project as an opportunity to remove cluttered signage along these roadways through removal of unnecessary signs; and in some cases increasing the separation between essential signage so as to reduce driver confusion. Example: "Safety Corridor Drive Safely Sign" near the apex of a road curve.

Thank You,

Omar Masry, AICP 4479 Oak Hill Road Oakland, CA 94605 (805) 300-7219 | <u>omar.masry@gmail.com</u>

Comment 139

From:	laura stevens <laura_lana@yahoo.com></laura_lana@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, March 27, 2019 1:38 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Vertical clearance project

I like the fact that there are few trucks on 580 Please dont go forward with this project. Spend the money elsewhere. I like 580 the way it is. Laura

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From: Sent: To:	Wdhoke@yahoo.com Wednesday, March 27, 2019 8:01 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Wdhoke@yahoo.com on March 27th, 2019 at 08:00PM (PDT).

name: William Hoke

email: Wdhoke@yahoo.com

telephone: 2069401645

comment: Please ensure the safety of bicycle commuters like myself on West Grand and Mandela during the project. West Grand often includes close passes for me by cars, especially near the auto body shop. Mandela often requires avoiding cars parked in the bike lane and occasionally trash in the bike lane. As traffic increases with the ramp construction project, these issues will be more significant due to increased traffic preventing bicycles from safely diverting into lanes of car traffic. Thanks!

Comment 141

From:	hosomosos@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, March 27, 2019 11:21 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by hosomosos@gmail.com on March 27th, 2019 at 11:21PM (PDT).

name: Jennifer Formoso email: hosomosos@gmail.com telephone: 510-536-3473

comment: Are you kidding me? You are going to redo the overpasses because a few trucks have too high of beds? Were you living in Oakland when the gas truck blew up and closed down the on ramp to 580? Well I was, we just avoided downtown, going to SF, going to Berkeley, going to Emeryville till it was done. It was stop and go traffic through out Oakland from it. Traffic in Oakland has gotten much worse since then. I could avoid those areas, many people cannot. Figure out something else, closing down the maze for months is going to create a horrible mess in Oakland that will effect the surrounding areas. You are talking about closing down the bay from Santa. Rosa down to Santa Cruz for months, that is insane! If the trucking companies cared about this they would not buy trucks too tall for the bridges! Do not do this! You better plan on upping the bus services throughout Oakland and the entire bay area! Put all the buses back in AC Transit till we are at late 80s early 90s amo!

unts, double BART, up Muni, raise Contra Costa Services if you want this to work at all.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Formoso

From: Sent: To:	zoe_abroad@yahoo.com Thursday, March 28, 2019 12:06 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by zoe_abroad@yahoo.com on March 28th, 2019 at 12:05PM (PDT).

name: Zoe Chafe, PhD, MPH email: zoe_abroad@yahoo.com telephone: 2023788267 comment: I am writing to request that Caltrans choose the Macarthur Maze construction option that will divert the LEAST traffic onto surface streets in Emeryville and Oakland.

I am an Emeryville resident who frequently bicycles and walks to work, to take my children to school and daycare, to do errands and shopping, and for recreation.

Emeryville's bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is already stressed by recent increases in car traffic in our area. Adding more traffic to our streets will endanger bicyclists and pedestrians by increasing the probability of car vs bike/pedestrian incidents, and will serve as a disincentive for those considering using active transportation.

Several of Emeryville's major public facilities, such as the Emeryville Center for Community Life (ECCL) are located on major roadways within Emeryville. These facilities do not have sufficient bicycle and pedestrian safety infrastructure to accommodate increases in surface traffic.

I urge you to adopt the construction option that is projected to result in the LEAST increase in surface traffic within Emeryville and Oakland.

I also urge you to mitigate traffic increases in the local area by providing funds for Emeryville and Oakland to further protect its bicyclists and pedestrians along thoroughfares that will be impacted by the change in traffic flows associated with the Macarthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project.

Thank you for considering these comments.

From:	ericson30@gmail.com
Sent:	Thursday, March 28, 2019 11:02 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ericson30@gmail.com on March 28th, 2019 at 11:01AM (PDT).

name: Daniel A Alvarez email: ericson30@gmail.com telephone: 5105011250 comment: All but option C see

comment: All but option C seem significantly disruptive and unacceptable to the residents of the area, as movement around Oakland would be impossible. Natural congestion of these areas extend easily 10 or more miles from the choke points. Closure of the connectors would incapacitate the 10 - 15 mile radius from the closures, further congesting surface streets.

It was concerning that the motivation for this project is freight movement. The priority should be commuter experience since we are the most affected by congestion in this area. Closure will add significant hardship and impact to the working citizenship beyond the suffering and wasted time we already endure.

The goal should be to minimize, if not eliminate, freight from this corridor or restricting it to night hours. The port of Oakland sits on a huge rail terminal. A rail distribution system from the port of Oakland to new trucking centers at the edges of the Bay Area would eliminate most freight traffic from our already congested freeways and improve the flow of commuting traffic. Further eliminating the need for this project.

Respectfully,

Daniel Alvarez

From:	msardou@sbcglobal.net
Sent:	Thursday, March 28, 2019 2:20 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by msardou@sbcglobal.net on March 28th, 2019 at 02:19PM (PDT).

name: Mitchell Klein email: msardou@sbcglobal.net telephone: 510-878-2234 comment: This project will make life better for truckers and shipping companies, but not commuters (in fact, traffic will likely become worse with overpasses available to more trucks), I am totally opposed to the entire project concept, which benefits corporations at the expense of taxpayers. There is not even a token improvement offered to commuters.

Comment 145

CANCEL THE PROJECT !!!

From:	esmillie@gmail.com
Sent:	Thursday, March 28, 2019 3:14 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by esmillie@gmail.com on March 28th, 2019 at 03:14PM (PDT).

name: Eric Smillie email: esmillie@gmail.com telephone: 4155314396

comment: Please ensure that there are protected bike lanes on the streets that will take higher traffic during this project. Those are already dangerous streets for biking and elevated traffic will bump up the risk of crashes and conflicts. I live at the Oakland-Emeryville border and bike often in the area if the maze so I'm familiar with it.

From:	carrieaustin123@gmail.com
Sent:	Sunday, March 31, 2019 8:22 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by carrieaustin123@gmail.com on March 31st, 2019 at 08:21PM (PDT).

name: Carrie Austin email: carrieaustin123@gmail.com comment: Protected bike lanes are a must during rebuilding of MacArthur maze ramps.

Comment 147

From:	hopeabdi@yahoo.com
Sent:	Friday, March 29, 2019 6:32 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by hopeabdi@yahoo.com on March 29th, 2019 at 06:32PM (PDT).

name: Joan Peters email: hopeabdi@yahoo.com telephone: 510-529-4986 comment: I am SHOCKED that you would even consider remodeling the MACARTHUR MAZE!!! PLEASE DO NOT ATTEMPT TO CLOSE & REBUILD THIS MAZE!!!!!

I believe you work on this state's infrastructure for the people of California, NOT the trucking companies that use California roads. Or am I mistaken? If new trucks are too tall to go through I this Maze, then older trucks need to be used instead! Your expressed concern about the older trucks burning more fuel is NOT a realistic ENVIRONMENTAL concern in this case. SHUTTING DOWN the Maze for MONTHS and REROUTING FREEWAY TRAFFIC to ACQUAINT more drivers with surface streets would be an ABSOLUTE DISASTER for those of us who live in the whole Bay Area, not only those of us who live in the East Bay. These surface streets are already used too much by those who drive cars and are seeking to speed along beside the freeways. If the freeways limit access for the too-tall trucks, then the truckers must think of their own solution to this problem, not force us to suffer for their benefit. Besides, your alternative of THINNING part of the Maze sounds too dangerous in this earthquake-p!

rone area. We deserve better treatment than this.

PLEASE DO NOT ATTEMPT TO CLOSE & REBUILD THIS MAZE!!!!!

From:	Adairchristine@yahoo.com
Sent:	Saturday, March 30, 2019 5:26 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Adairchristine@yahoo.com on March 30th, 2019 at 05:26AM (PDT).

name: Chris Adair email: Adairchristine@yahoo.com telephone: 9178826754 comment: Please make sure you put in Protected Bike Lanes so that cyclists are not riding alongside all the additional cars that will be on these streets angrily speeding along as if they're still on the freeway. Protect People!

F	ROENCED
Date	MAR 2 2 2019
Caltrans Office of	Sistrict 4 Transis & Community Planning

Stephen Lowens 2152 San Jose Avenue Alameda, CA 94501-4916 March 5, 2019

California Department of Transportation District 4 P.O. Box 23660 Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Gentlemen:

I am submitting this comment to the Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration/ Environmental Assessment (NDEA) for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project.

I wish the NDEA to assess the costs and benefits of an alternative that is not included in the current document. I would like to suggest that rather than rebuilding the ramps within the Maze, which is probably the most critical freeway linkage in the entire Bay Area, that you consider modifying the existing I-80WB to Grand Avenue ramp as shown in my drawing on the following pages.

As shown in the first drawing, the existing interchange leaves I-80WB, loops over both directions of I-80, and drops down to Grand Avenue. As it exists, it can be used and is used by a large percentage of trucks coming from Berkeley and Livermore heading to the Port of Oakland. Adding the ramp shown in green on the second drawing would allow a direct connection from I-80WB to I-880SB, providing the same continuity as the current direct ramp from I-80WB to I-880SB. This revised design could be built without any serious disruption to any traffic on I-80, I-880 or I-580. It would require only a short detour for a tiny percentage of the vehicles (large trucks) that desire to travel from I-80WB to I-880SB. It asks these few drivers to make a short detour in exchange for not highly congesting the maze area for a period up to 5 years long.

The more difficult connection is from I-80WB to I-580EB. I have shown an option to do this in blue on my diagram. This could require construction above I-880, which would be disruptive. Perhaps your engineers have a way of making this connection that is less disruptive. However, I question whether this connection is really needed. Heavy trucks are prohibited from using I-580 west of Grand Avenue. The underpass in question (I-80WB to I-580EB) would thus only be useful to trucks using the MacArthur Blvd. off-ramp, the Harrison off-ramp, or I-980/24. I question whether enough large trucks are using these ramps to justify the cost of modifying the system and fouling up Maze Area traffic for up to

Comment 149 (Continued)

Caltrans District 4 March 5, 2019 Page 2

5 years. I request that your transportation planning department look into the actual demand for this connection for a small number of vehicles to a limited set of exits, and whether there are more economical ways of providing this connection.

In summary, I believe there are far less disruptive designs to solving this "problem" than are considered in the NDEA, and I urge Caltrans and our public officials to further investigate less disruptive alternatives.

Sincerely,

Stephen Lowens

Comment 150

From:	renata.foucre@gmail.com
Sent:	Wednesday, April 3, 2019 10:32 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by renata.foucre@gmail.com on April 3rd, 2019 at 10:31AM (PDT).

name: Renata Foucre email: renata.foucre@gmail.com telephone: 4156407634 comment: Hi there; This is an incomplete study and should not be approved. What about the impacts for diverting traffic into neighboring local streets for many months, thus increasing the exposure in high concentration to people living there? Specifically in West Oakland? I don't understand why there is an exemption from Air Quality Concern when it will definitely have an impact by sending all the vehicular traffic through our area. I understand that there was a study done on noise impacts for Emeryville, but not West Oakland. This document seems incomplete- there's not really a plan here, just options for construction and the results of the permanent changes but not actually any options for what the impact on the surrounding communities will be- for 1 year to 3+ years during construction. Thanks, Renata, West Oakland / Clawson resident

From:	fran quittel <franq101@gmail.com></franq101@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, April 4, 2019 1:33 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	any meetings besides 4-10 and 4-11?

I would like to attend but am not - without hardship available on those dates. thanks,

fran quittel

fran quittel franq101@gmail.com https://www.linkedin.com/in/profilefq/ 510-547-5149/ph 626-864-1400/cell The Central Park Lost Mitten Party (Amazon) Publication date: September 2018 by GINGERSPICE Press, an imprint of Regent Press ISBN 13: 978-1-58790-446-2 ~ ISBN 10: 1- 58790-446-2 www.centralparklostmittenparty.com

Through the leadership of Fran Quittel and Lisa Marshall

the FDIC restores \$270 million to 9500 bank depositors:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1USv2JfpnH8

Comment 152

From:	ifilipino@yahoo.com
Sent:	Thursday, April 4, 2019 5:38 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ifilipino@yahoo.com on April 4th, 2019 at 05:38PM (PDT).

name: Michael Santero

email: ifilipino@yahoo.com

telephone: 5105516622

comment: Please provide for protected bike lanes on San Pablo Avenue. Right now, I have to bike on the sidewalk. Thank you.

From:	lilywong325@gmail.com
Sent:	Thursday, April 4, 2019 4:45 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by lilywong325@gmail.com on April 4th, 2019 at 04:45PM (PDT).

name: Lily Wong

email: lilywong325@gmail.com

comment: We're very concerned about increased traffic along 880, 7th St, & Grand because of this project. Also, highway noise is already incredibly loud along Wood Street & Pine Street... there isn't even a noise barrier or wall along a portion of the highway, where the postal facility is located. What is Caltrans going to do to mitigate these problems before construction begins? We haven't heard anything about this and want to know that Caltrans has a plan. The highway reconstruction after Loma Prieta has already had an enormous impact on our neighborhood.

Comment 154

From:	Andrew Deal <andrew.e.deal@gmail.com></andrew.e.deal@gmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 5, 2019 2:18 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DO1
Subject:	Questions

The current project literature available on the proposed project's website is extremely lacking in explaining the true need for this project. This project will be very expensive and will significantly impact the traveling public. The site notes that there are three locations that do not meet the modern Cal Trans vertical clearance standards but makes no mention as to what impact these lower heights have on the existing transportation system. This prompts a series of questions with the underlying objective of asking: Is this project necessary?

How many vehicles (daily, weekly or yearly etc.) are affected by the current sub-standard height restrictions?
 How do those vehicles currently bypass these height restrictions? Which surface street routes or alternative freeway routes are they forced to take?

3. What is the yearly economic impact due to the current sub-standard height restrictions? If vehicles are having to take alternative routes, or use surface streets I expect this could be estimated.

4. Knowing an estimated answer to Question 3 what is the estimated ROI for this project? How many years or thousands of abnormally high vehicles will it take to utilize these three new locations to provide an economic justification to perform this project.

5. If there is an environmental concern regarding fuel consumption of these freight trucks. How do these projects compare with spending this money on other pollution alternatives. How much pollution reduction would we see if we spent this money on solar power for example?

6. Cal Trans vehicle height limits are 14 feet (<u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/trucks/height.html</u>). Why do we need to raise these areas?

7. What about the many other sub standard overpasses just north, south and east of the MacArthur Maze? What is the long term desirability of this project if there are substandard heights at many other nearby locations? 580/80 at Ashby Ave (15ft 2in)

580/80 at University Ave (14ft 5in)

580 at West MacARthur Blvd (14ft 11in)

580 Pedestrian overpass near Park Blvd (15ft 4in)

From:	Noelia from Evensi <no-reply@eventsonevensi.com></no-reply@eventsonevensi.com>
Sent:	Monday, April 8, 2019 9:01 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Encore Public Meetings-MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project has been published
	on Evensi!



Comment 155 (Continued)

The easiest way to promote your events

Encore Public Meetings-MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project will be automatically broadcast throughout Facebook, Instagram, Messenger and Evensi to a perfectly targeted audience based on geography, interests, and affinity.





Comment 155 (Continued)

MAP (/MAPS)

FOR ME (/FORME)

(https://www.evensi.us)

LOGIN SIGN UP

Encore Public Meetings-MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Wednesday 10 April 2019 5:30 PM >> Wednesday 10 April 2019 7:30 PM

IN 2 DAYS

SAVE

Oakland (https://www.evensi.us/california/oakland) > West Oakland Neighbors (https://www.evensi.us/page/west-oakland-neighbors/10003426017) > Encore Public Meetings-MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project (https://www.evensi.us/public-meetings-macarthur-maze-vertical-clearance-project-1170-47th-st-emeryville-ca-94608-2908-united-states/302468079)



Like 0

HOSTED BY

Comment 155 (Continued)

f)(https://www.facebook.com/sharer/sharer.php?u=https://www.facebook.com/sharer/sharer.php?u=https://www.evensi.us) ens Ms/bbble meetings Hacarthur-maze-vertical-clearance-project-117 0-47th-st-emeryville-ca-94608-2908-united-states/302468079)

(w) (https://twitter.com/share?url=https://www.evensi.us/public-meet ings-macarthur-maze-vertical-clearance-project-1170-47th-st-emeryville -ca-94608-2908-united-states/302468079&text=Encore Public Meetings-MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project @ 1170 47th St, Emeryville, C A 94608-2908, United States - 10-April @evensi_app)

(mailto:?subject=Encore Public Meetings-MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project&body=Encore Public Meetings-MacArthur Maze Verti cal Clearance Project - 10/04/2019 - https://www.evensi.us/public-meeti ngs-macarthur-maze-vertical-clearance-project-1170-47th-st-emeryville -ca-94608-2908-united-states/302468079)

(p) (https://www.pinterest.com/pin/create/button/?url=https%3A%2 F%2Pwww.evensi.us%2Fpublic-meetings-macarthur-maze-vertical-clear ance-project-1170-47th-st-emeryville-ca-94608-2908-united-states%2F30 2468079&media=https%3A%2F%2Fecdn.evensi.com%2Fe302468079%3F code%3DeyJ0eXAiOiJKV1QiLCJhbGciOiJIUzI1NiJ9.eyJob3N0Ijoic2NvbnRlb nQtZnJ4NS0xLnh4LmZlY2RuLm5ldCIsInBhdGgiOiJcL3ZcL3QxLjAtMFwvc DUyNngyOTZcLzU2NTUxNjc4XzIxODA2NDQ0MTIwMjUwODJfODgyMDY xNDAyNTU4Nzk4MjMzNl9uLmpwZyIsInF1ZXJ5IJoiX25jX2NhdD0xMDUm X25jX2h0PXNjb250ZW50LWZyeDUtMS54eCZvaD0zNTYxMzg0OGMxNDY vMTA1ZGIxZTI4ODFiNjy2NTczOCZvZT01RDNEMTICQSJ9.vJqYasqJkF7uNX Tzh_pFtZozfAV4CaDndJJzIyNxNVU&description=Encore+Public+Meeting s-MacArthur+Maze+Vertical+Clearance+Project+%40+1170+47th+St%2C +Emervville%2C+CA+94608-2908%2C+United+States+-+10-April+https%3 A%2F%2Fwww.evensi.us%2Fpublic-meetings-macarthur-maze-vertical-c learance-project-1170-47th-st-emeryville-ca-94608-2908-united-states% 2F302468079)



The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is holding two encore open houses for the Macarthur Maze (Maze) Vertical Clearance project. Caltrans is proposing to partially lower, raise, replace, or reconstruct connectors in the Maze. These four alternatives are being proposed to increase the vertical clearances at three locations in the Maze to meet the current Caltrans standard of 16 feet 6 inches to allow for more efficient travel of freight and oversized vehicles. Would you like additional information about the proposed project? Please visit our online public meeting at: http://www.dot.ca.gov /d4/macarthurmazeproject/ (https://l.facebook.com/l.php? u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dot.ca.gov%2Fd4%2Fmacarthurmazeproject%2F&h=AT2i-Please attend our public meetings at the following locations: Emeryville

April 10, 5:30 - 7:30 PM Emeryville Center of Community Life 1170 47th Street Emeryville, CA 94608

Oakland

April 11, 5:30 - 7:30 PM Caltrans Auditorium 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612 Members of the public are encouraged to submit written comments to Caltrans. All comments must be received by 11:59 PM on April 24, 2019.

Please submit written comments to Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Ave, MS 8B, Attn: Cristin Hallissy, Oakland, CA 94612 or via e-mail to MacArthurMaze@dot.ca.gov (mailto:MacArthurMaze@dot.ca.gov)

[Or in the online public meeting: http://www.dot.ca.gov/d4/macarthurmazeproject/ [https://l.facebook.com/l.php?

u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dot.ca.gov%2Fd4%2Fmacarthurmazeproject%2F&h=AT2i-

3F_I1cDRx_hbl9cfla9qEqWNw1vcnsIfausogC5sFYwLsRKqZMT8_LkTOtOz0bHgicQ2W4RH2tthgEeEkRJPu2iezS7903XL25XC6dukC1nKPgf3c69XVOzq6U6I

Google Chrome

Chrome is a fast, secure and free browser for ell your devices. Google Chrome

DOWNLOAD



West Oakland Neighbors

ADD TO EAVORITES (https://www.evensi.us/page/west-oaklandneighbors/10003426017)

Browse other venues in Oakland (https://www.evensi.us/california/oakland/vei l=en)



Be the first of your friends to like this

West Oakland Neighbors

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is holding two encore open houses for the Macarthur Maze (Maze) Vertical Clearance project. Caltrans is proposing to partially lower, raise, replace, or reconstruct connectors in the Maze. These four alternatives are being proposed to increase the vertical clearances at three locations in the Maze to meet the current Caltrans standard of 16 feet 6 inches to allow for more efficient travel of freight and oversized vehicles... See More

Is this your event? Claim it now

REPORT THIS EVENT

From:Manoj Yadav <bizdev@allevents.in>Sent:Monday, April 8, 2019 10:10 AMTo:MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOTSubject:Why just Facebook?

Hi, 🕠

Just saw your event page on Facebook.

I represent <u>allevents.in</u> and throughout the world, our website is the go-to destination for event lovers to discover events happening around them. We are also a trusted source of event information for Google's Event Feature (Source <u>TechCrunch</u>).

I'm sure that our users from your city would be interested in discovering your events on our portal!

Listing your event on AllEvents.in takes no more than 2 minutes and will give you an additional visibility among an unreached audience outside Facebook.

Click here to list your events. No listing fees!

Also explore how you can reach your target audience with our promotion plans.

In case of any questions or queries, reply to this email and we will help you with that.

Ignore this email if you don't want me to contact you again.

#StayHappening, Manoj Yadav Relationship Manager <u>allevents.in</u>

From:	crashtest1@live.com
Sent:	Tuesday, April 9, 2019 7:30 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by crashtest1@live.com on April 9th, 2019 at 07:30PM (PDT).

name: Gregory Rozmarynowycz email: crashtest1@live.com telephone: 4405417907 comment: I'm a North Oakland resident that relies on my bike for daily trips within the surrounding area, and am very concerned about additional surface street traffic from the interchange work.

On a recent weekend I witnessed the impacts of diverted traffic on the 40th Street/Shellmound corridor, and the increased hazards to street users. Even in this off peak period, many drivers moved aggressively and blocked crosswalks & intersections. From experience, drivers diverted onto surface streets are likely to be annoyed and unfamiliar with the area. They are likely to be following mobile navigation directions, unable to commit full attention to their surroundings. In high traffic, many will be likely to seek short cuts on normally quite side streets.

All of these behaviors pose foreseeable hazards to local pedestrians and cyclists, and it is imperative on Caltrans to mitigate the danger posed. Any impacted streets should receive traffic calming measures. Pedestrian crossings, especially those on streets like San Pablo and 40th (already frequently ignored) should be enhanced with signals and curb bulbouts. Any adjacent side streets to major corridors still lacking speed bumps should have them installed.

Finally, failure to implement a fully connected network of protected bike lanes on major corridors would be nothing short of negligent. In the best of conditions, riding 40th Street and San Pablo is a nerve racking experience; with excess drivers it will be downright treacherous. Even West MacArthur Blvd, where I frequently witness speeds in excess of 50mph, can turn dangerous when drivers park in the existing bike lanes. These necessary improvements are long overdue, and now is the time to expedite their implementation.

I hope Caltrans considers and prioritizes the real hazards this project poses to local residents over any perceived inconvenience to drivers or the minimal resources required to make improvements.

Thank you, Greg

From:	will.leben@yahoo.com
Sent:	Wednesday, April 10, 2019 10:18 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by will.leben@yahoo.com on April 10th, 2019 at 10:17AM (PDT).

name: Will Leben

email: will.leben@yahoo.com

comment: Cyclists and pedestrians, already at great risk in this area, are certain to face extra danger when traffic is diverted onto streets for this project. Without extra measures to protect them--protected bike lanes and walkways-planners for this project will be mandating more deaths and injuries.

Comment 159

From: Alan Forkosh <a forkosh@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 12:04 PM
To: Ruiz, Sergio@DOT <sergio.ruiz@dot.ca.gov>
Cc: Dave Campbell <dave@bikeeastbay.org>; Robert Prinz <robert@bikeeastbay.org>
Subject: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearence Project--Ped and Bike considerations

Sergio,

As you are probably aware, there are public meetings this week on this project (<u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/d4/macarthurmazeproject/</u>). I intend to attend the Thursday meeting at Caltrans to learn about and comment on impacts to bicycle and pedestrian flow during the construction period.

All the alternatives presented involve detouring the Bay Trail during the construction period. It is not clear if the detour will be on paths west of the railroad tracks or will involve closing the path and diverting Bay Trail traffic to surface streets including the Shellmond-40th Street bridge on the North and West Grand between Mandela Parkway and Maritime Street on the South. All alternatives except Alternative D show the construction zone occupying the whole width of the zone between I-80 and the tracks; so it is not clear if an off-road detour west of the tracks can be achieved.

In addition, the disruptions to the Maze during construction may negatively impact current bicycle facilities and use from South Berkeley through Emeryville, North Oakland, and West Oakland, as traffic currently accessing the Bridge for I-580 may divert to surface streets to access I-80 at West Grand, Powell St, and Ashby.

I have seen that Caltrans often does not adequately plan for and prepare for non-vehicular use before the projects are budgeted and construction begins. It is vital that your unit and the appropriate agencies and interest groups in the local communities affected be involved throughout the project in order that non-vehicular considerations not be overlooked.

Thank you,

Alan Forkosh Oakland, CA <u>aforkosh@mac.com</u> <u>https://al4kosh.com</u>



April 5, 2019

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Tony Tavares Director, Caltrans District 4 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612

T RE: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Y Dear Director Tavares,

ALAMEDA COUNTY John J. Bauters Pauline Russo Cutter Scott Haggerty Nate Miley

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY John Gioia David Hudson Karen Mitchoff Mark Ross

> MARIN COUNTY Katie Rice (Chair)

NAPA COUNTY Brad Wagenknecht

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY Gordon Mar Hillary Ronen Tyrone Jue (SF Mayor's Appointee)

SAN MATEO COUNTY David Canepa Carole Groom Doug Kim

SANTA CLARA COUNTY Margaret Abe-Koga Cindy Chavez (Secretary) Liz Kniss Rod G, Sinks (Vice Chair)

> SOLANO COUNTY James Spering Lori Wilson

SONOMA COUNTY Teresa Barrett Shirlee Zane

Jack P. Broadbent EXECUTIVE OFFICER/APCO

Connect with the Bay Area Air District: Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) staff has reviewed the Initial Study for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project (Project), which proposes to increase vertical clearances at three locations within the MacArthur Maze Interchange in the City of Oakland. The Air District is concerned about potential local air quality impacts from the project. We recommend that a more comprehensive analysis be conducted in an environmental impact report, and request an extension of the comment period through May 31, 2019 to allow the public sufficient opportunity to evaluate the Initial Study and provide comments.

The West Oakland community is disproportionately impacted by air pollution, especially diesel particulate matter, a toxic air contaminant. We have identified West Oakland as a priority community through our Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program and, more recently, through our Community Health Protection Program. The Air District has worked for many years to improve air quality and health in West Oakland, and these efforts continue today as we currently work with community partners to develop a West Oakland Community Action Plan. Accordingly, any increase in emissions in West Oakland would be extremely concerning, as would increased emissions in Emeryville and other affected communities.

We disagree with the Initial Study's conclusion that because the proposed project is exempt from federal Conformity requirements, there would be no air quality impacts. The California Environmental Quality Act requires lead agencies to evaluate potential air quality impacts of a proposed project, regardless of whether it is subject to the Conformity process. We strongly recommend that Caltrans conduct a robust analysis of potential air quality impacts, including: emissions from construction equipment; emissions from re-routed traffic during construction, particularly traffic impacting local streets, and; emissions from long-term operations of the re-built interchange. The evaluation should include an analysis of a no-project alternative. And, the analysis should identify project alternatives and/or comprehensive mitigation measures to assure that no local air quality and health impacts occur.

375 BEALE STREET, SUITE 600 · SAN FRANCISCO CA · 94105 · 415.771.6000 · www.baaqmd.gov

Comment 160 (Continued)

Tavares Page 2 April 5, 2019

We encourage lead agencies to contact Air District staff with any questions and/or to request assistance during the environmental review process. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Areana Flores, Environmental Planner, at (415) 749-4616, or <u>aflores@baaqmd.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Greg Nudd Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer

cc: BAAQMD Director John J. Bauters BAAQMD Director Pauline Russo Cutter BAAQMD Director Scott Haggerty BAAQMD Director Nate Miley WOEIP Co-Director Ms. Margaret Gordon WOEIP Co-Director Brian Beveridge CARB Executive Officer Richard Corey Oakland City Councilmember Lynette Gibson McElhaney

Comment 161

From:	will.leben@yahoo.com
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 9:10 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by will.leben@yahoo.com on April 12th, 2019 at 09:10AM (PDT).

name: Will Leben

email: will.leben@yahoo.com

comment: Please circulate a cost-benefit analysis for the proposed maze reconstruction. Please quantify how much need there is for a project that while in progress would add to freeway travel times and impact local traffic and air quality for several years and degrade surface streets as a result of increased use by heavy vehicles?

How many vehicles over 13.5 feet will be served by the new height clearances, and what are the respective costs of completing this project vs. doing nothing?

From: Sent:	christopher.carrington@gmail.com Wednesday, April 10, 2019 11:32 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by christopher.carrington@gmail.com on April 10th, 2019 at 11:32AM (PDT).

name: Christopher Carrington email: christopher.carrington@gmail.com telephone: 415 297-3645 comment: Dear Caltrains,

As a resident who lives in a brand new housing development located at 950 West Grand Avenue (cross street Myrtle St.), I hope every effort will be made to protect pedestrians and cyclists in our neighborhood in preparation for MacArthur Vertical Clearance Project. I support the project, but I don't want to lose our kids or elderly neighbors who already struggle to safely navigate West Grand Avenue. In some stretches there are no sidewalks, and the kids and other pedestrians must cross the street. There are bike lanes on some stretches of West Grand, but in the main, they are not well marked nor well protected. Further, many of the intersections do not have good clearance for autos turning onto West Grand Avenue from adjacent streets. For example, the intersection of Filbert Street and West Grand Ave. Motorists turning right onto West Grand Ave from Filbert St already face a very dangerous situation where they cannot see oncoming traffic. Imagine the risks to motorists if Call

trains routes port traffic trucks onto this road at this particular intersection. Something must be done to protect the public.

Cordially,

Dr. Christopher Carrington

From:	cbntwin@gmail.com
Sent:	Thursday, April 11, 2019 9:05 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by cbntwin@gmail.com on April 11th, 2019 at 09:05PM (PDT).

name: cheryl nevares email: cbntwin@gmail.com telephone: 9252543362

comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the environmental document for the MacArthur Maze bridge modification project to increase vertical clearances. I had a spot of trouble with the lack of information presented for the Need and Purpose of the project, especially when weighing the capital cost and local traffic impacts during construction. Yes, the vertical clearances are not to current standard but many bridges and other highway facilities in the state do not meet current design standards yet serve adequately. What is the cost benefit?

What about the capitalization of recent pavement and seismic upgrades to those same bridges? Is that considered in the cost to benefit analysis?

It's possible I may have missed a detailed description of the deficiencies but I was wanting to know more. How many trucks travel the corridor/bridges per day? Of those trucks, what percentage are so tall they cannot negotiate those specific bridges? What is that number on a daily basis? Where do those taller-than-average trucks travel now? If they can't pass under the bridges and are traveling elsewhere, how does that affect safety?

Besides safe and efficient travel for trucks, what are the other benefits to Californians? To lock onto efficiency in economic terms is a rather thin justification--are there economic analysis numbers to go with the claim?

The State is responding to the needs of the freight industry, some trucks being manufactured taller now than in the past because they can't be made wider to meet current freight demand. This does not seem right to me, that an industry decision is driving expensive public infrastructure changes.

Might there be other state legislated alternatives like standard triple tractor trailers allowed at certain travel times to pick up the increased demand? Are there other local truck routes that can be designated via city and county agreements?

Thank you.

From:	Jared Sewall <jared.sewall@gmail.com></jared.sewall@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, April 11, 2019 11:40 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Comments for MacArthur Maze Project

Hello Caltrans,

I am a private resident citizen who lives in West Oakland California, travels on local highways in the Bay Area, and work in Oakland California. I am a healthcare professional who works at a local hospital and am familiar with many healthcare conditions experienced by our community.

My comments are regarding the proposed raised highway overpasses at the MacArthur Maze.

After reviewing the videos provided by Caltrans on options, I am concerned regarding raising the bridges at all. The ultimate goal is it provide larger vehicles, fuel inefficient vehicles, to move more easily through our neighborhoods.

West Oakland is already plagued with poor air quality and a high volume of commercial traffic as is. Additional traffic moving through this area is unacceptable.

In addition, I am concerned with our tax dollars paying 200 million dollars for a project that provides little (if anything detracts) benefit from the community.

Please consider removing this project. For the following reasons:

1) Unnecessary based on statistics provided at community meeting (percentage of vehicles that meet the threshold that need higher clearance)

2) Community concerns-health being a top priority and pollution

3) Better use of Caltrans tax payer money.

Thank you,

Dr. Jared Andrew Sewall

From: Sent: To: Subject: Tuan Ngo <tuan_ngo10@yahoo.com> Friday, April 12, 2019 7:24 AM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT MacArthur Maze Caltrans proposal

Dear Caltrans,

As an Oakland resident who would be impacted by the MacArthur Maze proposed project, I find it unacceptable that there is a proposal to raise overpass height to 16 feet when lowest one is already currently 14.5 feet, AND most trucks are only 13.5 feet heigh.

I would like to know IN WRITING how many permit request for higher clearance statewide and for MacArthur Maze area. Please provide this important statistic to the public who would be impacted by this huge and expensive construction project.

The constant road closure, traffic congestion and re-routing, noise, pollution, negative economic impact, and disruption is NOT worth it. There are other much needed road projects that will keep Caltrans engineers busy.

Sincerely,

Tuan Ngo Oakland resident

Comment 166

From: Sent: To: rob donald <rdofca@gmail.com> Friday, April 12, 2019 8:42 AM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT

what is the purpose of this?
From:	Kate Kerr <kerrstyles@gmail.com></kerrstyles@gmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 9:25 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	New MacArthur Maze Construction

I'm concerned about the environmentail impact of the proposed project to raise the height to 16 feet. You've acknowledged your analysis is inadequate. What are you going to do on that front?

Also if most trucks are 13.5 feet, and the height is already 14.5 feet, I'm not sure why this project is necessary. How many vehicles will be served by this project and what is the cost benefit analysis.

I'd like a response in writing.

Thanks,

Catherine Temescal Resident

From:	Gretchen Koehler <gykoehler@gmail.com></gykoehler@gmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 9:34 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	l live in the 94608 Emeryville postal zip code area

and attended the meeting at ECCL a couple of nights ago....and came away saddened by the narrow, maybe unnecessary, expensive, neighborhood-destroying project of raising the bridges in the "maze". I am happy it is on "pause."

Goods movement? Goods movement? Rather than having an engineer run the meeting, I would prefer a more visionary, futuristic urban-designer expert start with an overview of how this "maze" impacts the whole area, and what the project would mean to PEOPLE who use it and live around it. (other than truck drivers) Would this project add or subtract from a future vision of less private cars, more public transportation, cleaner air, truck/pedestrian/cyclist accidents, etc.?

No concrete info on how many trucks cannot get under the current bridges? No concrete info on how Cal Trans is working to coordinate with BART, AC Transit on overall, future plans for transportation in the Bay area? Why were all the "experts" (mostly white males) standing in the back talking, whispering, while the neighborhood folks were sitting, trying to suss things out? Not good.

The presentation was too narrow in scope...too many engineering details, and no history of how we got here. Did truck companies complain? Did Emeryville and Oakland City governments complain about the local streets being used for the over-size trucks? Is money being lost at the port because truck companies don't want to come?

I felt like I was coming in pretty late in the game...AFTER lots of money had already been spent on engineers, contractors, plans, time.

On another note: I am a cyclist and have been to focus groups on the San Pablo corridor. I wish CalTrans would provide protected bike lanes on San Pablo between downtown Oakland to El Cerrito. (at least). The increase in traffic on San Pablo (I live at the intersection of San Pablo and Stanford) is overwhelming and scary. Improvements for pedestrians and cyclists need to be done now.

Gretchen Koehler Resident, zip code 94608

From:	dan.tischler@gmail.com
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 10:51 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by dan.tischler@gmail.com on April 12th, 2019 at 10:51AM (PDT).

name: Daniel Tischler email: dan.tischler@gmail.com telephone: 5105085637

comment: Caltrans has not successfully documented the need for this project. How many trucks are currently required to detour around these low clearance bridges? How much time does that take and what are the environmental impacts of the detours? This is the minimum information necessary to determine if it is reasonable to spend money on this project. For a project that could cost many millions of dollars, Caltrans must do better to document project need. There are many projects that deserve limited transportation funds and I am not convinced this project qualifies. Caltrans should either prove me wrong or pursue other efforts. Nearly every freeway underpass or overpass in Oakland is a disaster for pedestrians. Caltrans should prioritize adding lighting and improving conditions at all such crossings first.

Comment 170

From:	Daniel Gill <gill707@gmail.com></gill707@gmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 11:00 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Concerned Taxpayer

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Daniel Gill and I want to comment on the proposed Macarthur Maze Project. I believe that the benefit of this project is not worth the cost. Please reconsider your decision to go forward with this project, provide full transparency to the public with reasons how the benefit is worth the cost, and grant a variance for the existing overpass heights.

Thank you, Daniel Gill 877 47th Street Oakland, CA 94608

From:	Angelica Wu <angelica_wu@hotmail.com></angelica_wu@hotmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 11:15 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Project

Hello, sir or madame:

I am a current resident of the Emeryville area that will be directly impacted by the complex construction alternatives and traffic reroutes related to MacArthur Maze Project, for which we all agreed, on the latest community meetings, that there has not been enough environmental impact analysis done for.

Can you please confirm how many vehicles will be served by this project and what is the cost benefit analysis that justifies this current project?

Thanks,

Angelica Wu 1505 Brunswig Ln Emeryville, CA 94608

Sent from my iPhone

Comment 172

From:	kerbyolsen@gmail.com
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 11:46 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by kerbyolsen@gmail.com on April 12th, 2019 at 11:45AM (PDT).

name: Kerby Olsen email: kerbyolsen@gmail.com telephone: 9258764203 comment: How many trucks per day will be served by this project? Given the project's cost, what is the cost per vehicle? What is the economic or environmental benefit? This massively expensive project needs to have a solid cost benefit analysis, otherwise it should not be built. West Oakland is already severely burdened by air pollution, and additional truck traffic will only contribute.

Comment 173 Coltrons. 4/10/19 RE: The MAZE CRISTIN Hollissy 111 Scond Av., MSSB Ook. Co. 94612 Hello Ms Halling, Surprises to Find flyer in Moi first meeting at gaske, At J Colteons since eprt. introduction was done oke up into geoups - to on solar work earthquake, The sod part, into beaups with their friend Commantes ens -E)-SO I FUST au this matin 1 really date + Mall Som prat Com manet Clep RAMe Project VERTICAL We koop losing we

NO REGI

Comment 173 (Continued)

THE NEW YORK TIMES, THURSDAY, A

Boîte Gitano Jungle Room



NINA WESTERVELT FOR THE NEW YORK TH

Sunny Tulum goes subterranean.

The swarm of wealthy international travelers to and from New York can inspire grand attempts to recreate chic drinking and diaing destinations enjoyed in more exotic locales. That's



the story behind the Gitano Jungle Room, a lounge-y tropical restaurant and bar that opened in the James

Hotel in January as a reimagining of Gitano, a decadent beach restaurant in Tulum, Mexico.

Gitano's first iteration in New York came last summer in the form of a seasonal, palm-tree-filled oasis on a nearby lot on Canal Street. Though it quickly proved an Instagram-worthy hot spot, it was shut down twice because of health code violations. (It is set to reopen this summer.)

The new setup may be designed beautifully, but if it's authentic Mexican food or culture you're looking for, look elsewhere. Style trumps substance, and it's hard to shake the feeting that this is just another place for the moneyed clubby elite to party.

The Place

In a subterranean space beneath the James Hotel SoHo. Inside, dark Brutalist concrete contrasts with the warm, Tulum-imported furniture and lush tropical plants. An L-shaped bar sits below an airy atrium. A disco ball, crystal palm tree and a small

A Billionaire's House

An estimated 13,000 fancy New Yorkers came out for the V.I.P. opening of Hudson Yards.

Stephen M. Ross, the billionaire developer, was taking a victory lap at last week's VI.P. opening of the Shops and Restaurants at Hudson Yards, a day before the \$25 billion neighborhood-in-a-box opened to the Instagram masses.

"It's the largest project ever done in America," Mr. Ross, the chairman of the Related Companies, said on the red carpet, with evident satisfaction. "What I'm wondering is, I'm 78, what can I do next?"

But what of criticism that the gilded precinct, with its multimillion-dollar penthouses and mall full of luxury boutiques and pricey restaurants, is affordable only to fellow billionaires?

"When you're building something new, of this quality, obviously it's not for those...." said Mr. Ross, choosing his words carefully. "It obviously takes a high income to afford it."

An estimated 13,000 members of the New York gentry stepped out of their carriages and attended the private opening, including, Cocò Rocha, Anne Hathaway and Dylas Sprouse, waggishly nursing an unlit cigarette. Inside Neiman Marcus, Liza Mianelli and Charli XCX performed for a crowd that included Karlie Kloss, Yera Wang, Diane von Furstenberg and Katie Holmes.

At Estiatorio Milos, a nearby Greek restaurant known for its exotic seafood market, diners included Marfa Maples, Maggie Gyllenhaal, Tom Brady and Gisele Bündchen.

Everywhere amid the chaos — it felt like a Black Friday shopping spree for the 0.01 percent — stores and waiters were feeding the multitude with tapas, oysters, sushi, charcuterie and endless refills of wine and liquor. Considering the scale, it all went off rather smoothly.

Back on the red carpet, those who stand to profit from Hudson Yards were insisting

The New York Times

And still NO Jobs! 54397 PLASE 10 25 100 0005 - 010

February 28, 2004

Nearly Half of Black Men Found Jobless

By JANNY SCOTT

t is well known that the unemployment rate in New York City rose sharply during the recent recession. It is also understood that the increase was worse for men than for women, and especially bad for black men. But a new study examining trends in joblessness in the city since 2000 suggests that by 2003, nearly one of every two black men between 16 and 64 was not working.

The study, by the Community Service Society, a nonprofit group that serves the poor, is based on data from the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics and focuses on the so-called employment-population ratio - the fraction of the working-age population with a paid job - in addition to the more familiar unemployment rate, the percentage of the labor force actively looking for work.

Mark Levitan, the report's author, found that just 51.8 percent of black men ages 16 to 64 held jobs in New York City in 2003. The rate for white men was 75.7 percent; for Hispanic men, 65.7; and for black women, 57.1. The employment-population ratio for black men was the lowest for the period Mr. Levitan has studied, which goes back to 1979.

"We're left with a very big question," Mr. Levitan, a senior policy analyst with the society, said in an interview. "As the economy recovers, will we see a rise in employment among black men in tandem with the rise in employment of city residents generally? In other words, is this fundamentally a cyclical problem or is it more deeply structural? I fear that it is more deeply structural."

Researchers who have studied joblessness said Mr. Levitan's findings were consistent with trends among disadvantaged men, both black and white, in other Northern and Midwestern cities where manufacturing jobs have disappeared in recent decades. Some said factors that might have made the problem worse since 2000 could include welfare reform, high rates of incarceration producing gaps in job histories, and competition with immigrants for low-skill jobs.

Lawrence M. Mead, a professor of political science at New York University who specializes in social policy and welfare reform, said that labor force participation - jobholding and job-seeking - among disadvantaged men had been declining nationwide and

http://www.nytimes.com/2004/02/28/nyregion/28employ.html?pagewanted=print&position= 3/4/2004

that New York City had long had "a lower work level" than elsewhere. Others said a similar racial gap in male employment had been seen in Midwestern and Central states.

"You're really talking about a long-term problem among low-skilled, disadvantaged men," Professor Mead said. "Blacks are disproportionately disadvantaged. You're seeing this tendency to drop out. It's very serious and nobody has an answer."

Mindy Tarlow, executive director of the Center for Employment Opportunities, an employment program for men and women with criminal records that is based in Lower Manhattan, said her agency's success rate in placing clients in unsubsidized jobs had dropped to 55 percent from 65 percent between 2000 and 2003. She attributed the change not only to the recession but also to women coming off welfare and looking for work.

"I do know there are more people in the low-skill job market competing for the same low-skill jobs," she said. "In some ways, the low-skill job market has become more competitive. Welfare reform came into law in 1996, but I think the impact was starting to be felt around 2000, maybe earlier."

David R. Howell, a labor economist and professor at New School University, said service jobs were particularly hard for black men to get. He said studies had shown that employers "are particularly uninterested in hiring black men for jobs that require customer or client contact, for whatever reason." They tend to give preference to women, he said.

Mr. Levitan used data from the Current Population Survey, a monthly survey done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on a nationwide basis. He averaged the 12 monthly figures for New York City for each year. He said he used the employment-population ratio because the unemployment rate, which counts only people who are actively looking for a job, did not capture those too discouraged to keep trying.

In a recession, the number of discouraged workers goes up, Mr. Levitan said. If job losses land disproportionately on one group of people, a disproportionate share of that group may give up looking for work. In that case, changes in the unemployment rate for that group will tend to understate the relative impact of the recession on that group, he said.

Mr. Levitan found that the unemployment rate for black men in New York City rose by 5.3 percentage points, to 12.9 percent, in 2003. The employment-population ratio dropped by 12.2 percentage points, to 51.8, from a cycle peak of 64 in 2000. The employment-population ratio for Hispanic men dropped by 7.1 percentage points; the ratio for white men dropped by 2.1. The margin of error was 4 percent.

The declines among black and Hispanic women were smaller than among black and

http://www.nytimes.com/2004/02/28/nyregion/28employ.html?pagewanted=print&position= 3/4/2004

Hispanic men. Mr. Levitan said the industries that had the biggest drop in employment manufacturing, finance and professional services - were dominated by men. And the one sector that grew significantly during the recession - education and health'services, which now accounts for 18.7 percent of all jobs - is overwhelmingly female.

"It definitely reflects that black men disproportionately have had to carry the burden of the unemployment situation in New York City," Lizzette Hill Barcelona, executive director of Strive New York, a work force development agency, said of Mr. Levitan's findings. "Black men are usually the least skilled. In a tough economy, those are the jobs that you can do away with."

Andrew A. Beveridge, a sociologist at Queens College, questioned whether the data from the Current Population Survey, which is done nationally, could reliably be used to track changes in joblessness among specific groups in New York City from one year to the next. He said it was conceivable a year-to-year change might be the result of changes in the sample of people surveyed.

Mr. Levitan said the Bureau of Labor Statistics had used a methodology similar to his, using its 12 monthly surveys to create annual averages for states, metropolitan areas and cities. He said the sample size in New York City was big enough to be reliable. And he said the data from 1979 to 2003 followed a pattern consistent with the business cycle, suggesting that they accurately reflected reality.

Professor Howell, who had seen the study, said: "The magnitude of the employment-rate collapse is so large for black males that it looks like a data problem. But I don't think it is. Because you see not as startling a drop, but still a very large drop, for Hispanic males as well. It's well known that black men are at the end of the hiring queue. So it's perfectly plausible that they took the biggest hit."

Confracts 2009 The New York Those Company None Privacy Policy Search Connections Steel Steel Steel Top

http://www.nytimes.com/2004/02/28/nyregion/28employ.html?pagewanted=print&position= 3/4/2004

From:	Larry Spears <laurence_spears@vahoo.com></laurence_spears@vahoo.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 1:47 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Cc:	stateinformation@state.ca.gov
Subject:	Macarthur Maze Project

Dear Caltrans

I write to object strenuously to the proposed plan to raise the Maze freeway to sixteen feet clearance.

It is outrageous for Caltrans to claim an exemption for a full Environmental Impact Report for such a major and unjustifiable project.

The impact alone on the community I live and work in would be immense to public health, to schools and to businesses.

Caltrans has still not repaired any of the damage to our surface streets owing to their last major project. West Grand Avenue is a disgrace!

I am writing to request formally that the Governor's Office issue an immediate halt to all Caltrans activities on this project until a full EIR has been prepared, issued and reviewed by the community.

Caltrans have not been able to demonstrate any evidence of multiple requests for sixteen foot clearance rerouting around the Maze.

And the staggering cost of attempting this project cannot be justified.

I well remember Gavin Newsom's term as Mayor of San Francisco when my family lived there. And I trust his appreciation of the full impact on the Bay Area of carrying out such a major project.

Yours truly

Professor Laurence D Spears AIMC Berkeley

From:	philip@battin.dk
Sent:	Monday, April 15, 2019 8:02 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by philip@battin.dk on April 15th, 2019 at 08:01AM (PDT).

name: Philip Dam Roadley-Battin email: philip@battin.dk telephone: 4154907630

comment: This seems like a complete waste of taxpayers money as well as unnecessary nuisance to neighbors like myself in West Oakland. What is the reasoning for this vertical clearance increase and how many trucks will this be serving annually. Also, is it possible to see the actual cost/benefit analysis of this as i have a very hard time understand the financial logic behind this decision.

Thank you Philip Battin

Comment 176

From:	Gina Telcocci <ginatelcocci@yahoo.com></ginatelcocci@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 4:04 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Proposed MacArthur maze project

We are West Oakland residents opposed to this stupid & unnecessary waste of money. What is wrong with Caltrans?

Gina Telcocci & Jeff Falick

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:	Elizabeth Bishop <elizabethb@seradesign.com></elizabethb@seradesign.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 4:58 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	McArthur Maze Air Quality Concerns

Hello,

I was surprised to see a proposed negative declaration on the CalTrans Environmental Assessment for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project. Surely this project will have an impact on air quality if the proposal allows for additional freight vehicles to access this area of the freeway.

- Can you please confirm how many additional vehicles are predicted to access the area after the project is completed?
- Is air quality measured in the area currently?
- Please clarify and quantify the statement about the Air Quality not being affected by this project.

Thank you, Elizabeth

We're now in Oakland! Please note my new contact information.

Elizabeth Bishop, AIA, LEED AP

d: 510.480.4970 m: 415.471.5481 o: 510.480.4988

SERA

304 12^s St. Suite 3A, Oakland, CA 94607 Portland + Oakland seradesign.com

DISCLAIMER:

This message and any attachments are intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and / or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute this message or any information contained within, including any attachments, to anyone.

If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender and permanently delete the message and any attachments and destroy any printouts made.

Although we have taken steps to ensure that our e-mail and attachments are free from viruses, the recipients should also ensure that they are virus free.

From:	Ann Keen <akeeds@aol.com></akeeds@aol.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 5:32 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze proposed Caltrans project

I live in Emeryville and your proposal to reroute traffic to increase freeway heights appears to me to be unnecessary and a waste of precious taxpayer dollars.

Please respond and let me how many vehicles will be served by this project and what is the cost benefit analysis? Thank you. Ann Keen

Emeryville resident

Comment 179

From:	r_rango@hotmail.com
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 6:33 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by r_rango@hotmail.com on April 12th, 2019 at 06:33PM (PDT).

name: Ryan Ramos email: r_rango@hotmail.com telephone: 5105792016

comment: Increasing clearances to accommodate larger trucks (i.e. the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project) should not be a priority for Caltrans. There are more pressing projects that should be given funding over this project such as focusing on improving mass transit and mitigation efforts on Caltrans right of ways in disadvantaged communities (e.g. re-landscaping degraded right of ways and erecting soundwalls). The MacArthur Maze project runs counter to the Mission Statement of Caltrans - Safety and Health (project promotes more highly polluting truck traffic through disadvantaged communities); Stewardship and Efficiency (project is an irresponsible waste of money when other higher priority projects exist); Sustainability, Livability and Economy (this project does not improve the environment or help build communities); System Performance (this project favors a limited segment, oversized truck transportation, at the expense of the community at large); and Organizatio!

nal Excellence (this project demonstrates that Caltrans has not sufficiently understood community priorities). I strongly oppose any and all alternatives of this project as it will create significant disruption and increased pollution in the vulnerable communities surrounding this project in exchange for allowing a handful of oversized trucks to pass through. It's not a tradeoff worth making.

Ryan Ramos

DOT
ect
j

I've researched the \$200 Million dollar project and am strongly opposed to it as a waste of tax payer money. There are plenty other roads in need of repair and given the low volume of oversized traffic, it's a poor allocation of funds. As someone who used the maze daily, it's also not worth the inevitable closures to complete the project.

Sincerely, Ian Dunn

Oakland Resident

Comment 181

From:	
Sent:	
To:	
Subject:	

Lisa Bach <bookeditor@aol.com> Friday, April 12, 2019 7:40 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT Please do not do this!

Traffic is nightmarish and this project accomplished almost nothing in the grand scheme of things. It's a waste of money and will produce an enormous amount of congestion during the project.

Are streets are decaying and I would rather see the money spent toward upgrading our streets where most of us drive/bike.

—Lisa Bach Oakland, CA

Sent from my iPhone

From:	ROSEMARY KELLY <rose-bags@comcast.net></rose-bags@comcast.net>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 7:47 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur maze propósal

My husband and I live in West Oakland and we are very worried about the proposed MacArthur Maze project. It would be very disruptive and expensive. We would like to know how many vehicles will be served by this project and what is the cost benefit analysis.

Yours,

Rose Kelly & Robert Murray

Comment 183

From:	Mindy Rodman&Paul White <rodmanwhite@sbcglobal.net></rodmanwhite@sbcglobal.net>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 8:21 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	don't do it!

As a homeowner and long term resident of West Oakland I want to let you know that I am completely opposed to the overhaul of the MacArthur Maze. It is a waste of time and money that would be much better spent on other more pressing issues - like fixing the potholes and cleaning up the homeless encampments - many on CalTrans property - that spill into the streets obstructing the flow of traffic for cars and trucks. We don't need anymore wasteful government spending projects in this neighborhood. The trucks already fit underneath the maze and it already conforms to industry standards!

Yours truly, Mindy Rodman

Rodman White House sculpture that moves you! www.RodmanWhite.com

From:	Susan Harris <susanlharris@mac.com></susanlharris@mac.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 12, 2019 8:35 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Cc:	Susan Harris
Subject:	This project seems very low priority vs. other urgent needs

Caltrans-

Please listen to the community on this. Fundamentally, we do not want to encourage taller trucks! What a huge amount of noise and mess for a project that will add very little value.

Meanwhile, many highway surfaces need repair and our surface streets are crumbling!!!

Can we please prioritize truly needed projects???

Thanks for your consideration.

Susan L. Harris 4171 Shafter Avenue Oakland, CA 94609 510.420.0765 phone 510.541.8914 mobile susanlharris@mac.com

Comment 185

From:	
Sent:	
To:	
Subject	:

martha birch <hey_mt@sbcglobal.net> Friday, April 12, 2019 8:51 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT MAZE

I live and own in Emeryville:

I do NOT support this project at this time...instead we need other improved infratstructure + clean air!

Thank You, Martha Birch

From:	Harleen Serai <harleen.serai@gmail.com></harleen.serai@gmail.com>
Sent:	Saturday, April 13, 2019 7:17 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Not supportive of maze height increase

Hi,

I am resident of West Oakland and live on 34th street. I am not supportive of the proposal to raise the maze height to 16". I use the streets under the maze when I take my daughter to school everyday and I do not see many trucks. So this proposal seems like a waste of money. Plus it will have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhoods with pollution and noise.

Thanks Harleen Serai Gahlla

Comment 187

From:	Ellen Gierson <ellenrocs@me.com></ellenrocs@me.com>
Sent:	Saturday, April 13, 2019 7:23 PM
То:	Tavares, Tony F@DOT; MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	DO NOT raise the overpasses at the maze to 16 feet!

The Proposed project to raise the overpasses at the maze to 16 feet is completely unnecessary. And our community does not want to encourage larger trucks! The air pollution is bad enough as it is! Please respond to the e-mail.

Ellen Gierson 4175 Opal Street Oakland, CA 94609-2617 510.593.8678

From: Sent: To: Subject: Tyler Lappetito <tlappetito@gmail.com> Sunday, April 14, 2019 2:01 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT Wasteful Project

You're wasting taxpayer funding.

How many vehicles would benefit?

What is the cost benefit analysis?

Sent from my iPhone

Comment 189

From: Sent: To: Subject: Turner Miller <turner_miller@outlook.com> Sunday, April 14, 2019 7:51 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT Please don't

Please don't proceed with this project. It is an incredible waste of money and not wanted by anyone in the area. There is no benefit for this project and there are many other projects that would of much greater use, like fixing the potholes all over the streets.

From:	Andrew Detsch <drewd02@earthlink.net></drewd02@earthlink.net>
Sent:	Sunday, April 14, 2019 9:54 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Please do not do this project

Comment 191

From:	Nathan Wyeth <nathanwyeth@gmail.com></nathanwyeth@gmail.com>
Sent:	Sunday, April 14, 2019 10:38 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	comment on Macarthur Maze project

To whom it may concern -

I live close to the proposed Macarthur Maze construction project at 1695 15th St in Oakland and like others, I am curious what the intended benefit is of what seems like would be a large amount of spending and disruption to traffic in an already highly congested area.

What is the expected quantified benefit to the project?

How many requests per year does CalTrans get for permits for this specific area for trucks that would not fit in the existing setup and would fit under the proposed higher overpasses?

Is there any reason why this number would go up or down in the future, regardless of whether this project proceeds?

What is the alternate approach for trucks that do not fit under current overpasses if the project is not carried out to raise them? What is the cost / benefit of alternative approaches vs. the cost / benefit of the proposed project?

Thank you for considering these questions before undertaking a project that has unclear benefit but very definite impact to the local community.

Nathan

From:	Jay <livetoxcel@yahoo.com></livetoxcel@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Sunday, April 14, 2019 11:38 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze proposed Caltrans project

I'm writing to express my opposition to the

MacArthur Maze proposed Caltrans project!!

It is NOT cost effective and we don't want our tax dollars going to this waste. I'm a West Oakland resident for nearly 20 years and I oppose this project. Most trucks at 13.5 feet and that's enough to what we currently have at the maze. How many vehicles will be served by this project and what is the cost benefit analysis?

I OPPOSE this project.

Jay Swenson.

Comment 193

From:	Sarah Beachler <sarah.beach5@gmail.com></sarah.beach5@gmail.com>
Sent:	Monday, April 15, 2019 6:18 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	Please do NOT do the project

I am a citizen of West Oakland. I've been living here for 3 years and before that lived in Emeryville for nearly 2 years. I work at one of the largest tech companies in the Bay area. It's unclear what benefit the construction on the freeways would have, as the exact number of vehicles above a 13.5' clearance (and what those vehicles would be carrying/whether it's a true economic argument) have not been disclosed. The cost/benefit analysis should be crystal clear and I haven't seen one yet. The project will be incredibly expensive and cause residents in the area much strife with construction noise, rerouted traffic on already torn up streets, etc. There are MANY other projects that would be welcome by the area's citizens before freeway revamp. Figure out the homeless situation first! Figure out the massive piles of garbage that have sprouted everywhere first! You think rerouted traffic is going to do well on these streets with all the debris? Think again! You need more tax dollars coming into the area by making it a nice place to live. But businesses won't come unless the neighborhood is nicer and people with money are moving in. Btw, they HAVE been moving in, but only a small number because the neighborhood feels sketchy. Do something about the intrinsic issues before trying to pour money into Caltrain's pockets. They aren't even doing anything about the trash in Berkeley right now. They don't deserve ANY more financial boost. Please be responsible. Don't waste money on a project that doesn't have much benefit. Use that money on economy-boosting initiatives.

COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print) BILL Aboud:
Address (Home) city state zip code
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency)
Address (Business) 10 BURMA RD city OAKLANAstate CA zip code 94607
Comments: SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE C"
WITH REMAINEMENT OF LANE TO MAKE
JT SAFE TO EXHT LAST DAKLAND EXIT &
RESOLVE THE ISSUE OF CONFUSING BETWEEN
THE LAST EXT & BUS LANE
For additional comments use reverse side.

COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print) Janice EWING
Athiress (liome) 555 JEAUSTER city Ook state Chip code 94610
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency) JEAN TURRACE PS
Address (Business) city state zip code
Comments: What is the tentative Schedule
If to start the frandend
Othis construction project?
3 Are funds already appropriated
for this project of stateflocal bonds?
tor additional comments use reverse side.
St Coltrans

COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print) Janice EWING
Atiliress (Home) 235 Jean city Oak state Azip code 94610
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency) CAN TURAC ASS
Address (Business) city state zip code
comments: How has the commanity of
large been notified 2
jnmewing e yphoor com
Et Caltrans

COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print) Jance EWING
Address (Home) 55 Jean Fron city Oak state _ zip code 946/8
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency)
Address (Business) city state zip code
Comments: 15 PROJECT BEINE BUILT ON
LANDFILL? Will member of the
Community high schools, community
College lack University be employment
Candidates
For additional comments use reverse side.
Es Caltrans

Name (Plea	se Print) Janice EWING
Address (H	iome) 535 JEANS HOT OAK state Izip code 9461
Authorized	Representative: (Name of organization or agency) N TORRE Des
Address (B	usiness) 535 TAA city
Comments	AAS ANYONE CONSIDERED
A	TRUCK ROUTE THAT WOULD
mil	eror the EXISTING
TR	AIN TRACK ROUTE(5) ?

Address (Home)	Tean Stats77	DAK. state	=incade 94616
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency)	
Address (Business)	city	state	_ zip code
Comments: _Who	deepde	-decide	dto
nove this	= Chang	*/const	nuction
and wi	ng? "		
	V		

	COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print)	AY KIDO
Address (Home)32	55 LOUISE ST city 94608 state CA zip code BAKLAND
Authorized Represental	ive: (Name of organization or agency)
Address (Business)	
Comments: DUR hecpful If	CHP OFFICERS WERE AVAILABLE OR COULD BE
CALLED IF DE	TOURED TRAFFIC IS DEADILY IMPACTING
LOCAL STREE	15 + NEIGHBORHOODS. OPD ENGERCEMENT IS
UNRELIABLE	Err officient comments are severe ald.
	Telle Calérans.

COMMENT CARD
Name Plana Print Aluthan Moon
Address 554 25TH ST ANK OA 94617
AURICSS (Home) 201 2 31 city UNIT state T zip code
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency) NORTHOFFICE NETGHBORCS BEAT SX NCPC Oakland
Address (Business) city state zip code Police
comments: Our Residents have concerns
with increased surface traffic
if rehicles are defoured onto
Marthquite Are. We only will
support Detour Plans 4\$10 and
Plans B&C. For additional gomments use reverse side.

M
COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print) RON Freund
Address (Home) RGNOLMI, NEily Oner Jul State _ zip code 94608
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency) WATERGATE FORUM
Address (Business) city state zip code
comments: 1) Why do large trucks heed
ACCESS TO 580-
60 DIRECT 880-7 Bay Bridge
2) are we "voring" on the 4 charces?
3) Plan C is way More expensive-
Why NOT DROP TEL Colleges

COMMENT CARD
Name (Please Print) JAUL MUNRO
Address (Home) APT609 city Emeryville state CAzip code 94608-2050
Authorized Representative: (Name of organization or agency)
Address (Business) city state zip code
comments: Spend more money if necessary for options
that minimize disruption to free way traffic.
2 Limit detours to nights, if necessary, one or
two weekends.
(over)
For additional comments use reverse side.
ta Caltrans

Greter lowing options that Approa 3) Options that minimize disruption to component between the general public driving belbbetween 580 & the bay bridge may be perceived more generally acceptable to the public. Such as option A. And premising it dosures for could be done + mmimie with minimal closures for tie-in, could it provide improved satety demergency vehicle access?

COMMENT CARD	
Name (Please Print) Miles Lincoln	(A) (A) (A) (A)
Address (Home) City	state <u>CA</u> zip code <u>44600</u>
Address (Business)	_ state zip code
Comments: IT We Make the mare suitable for more that induce demand and create more frathic	which will
overflow to surface Streets and for their decline	air quility?
We need to think bigger: How can we could be p How can we shall our economic away from some	cople to stop driving, thing that
La marges or environment? Es Calbrans	For there comments use reverse side.

I DA MARCANE
Kano (Please Print) NDA WOYGCIS
Address (Home) state zip code
Authorized Representative (Name of organization or agency) ACTRANSIT
Address (Business) 1600 FRANKLIN City OAKLAND state CA zip code 94117
comments: What is the number of oversized trucks
that are CURRENTLY diverted of of the more
due to height constraints; Caltrans needs to state
what is driving this project other than it soft
sb-standard heights that is not a need
for such cost Et Caltrans and putent al

		COMM	ENT CARD		
Name (Please Print)	Charles	S. Bry	ant		
Address (Home)		Course	city De	state	zip code
Authorized Represent	tive (Name of organization or a	Bency) City	of Emery	ville	Diffection
Lidiress (Business)	333 Park A	ve.	city Every	ille_state CP	zip code <u>146</u>
Comments :			/		
			Maans	For mor	ro comments uso reverso sido
			udans		

Comment 202 (Continued)

- Introduce myself, Jennifer, and Andrew.
- The traffic impacts from this Project, especially during construction, will be acutely
 felt by the Emeryville community. While the City of Emeryville has a relatively small
 residential population compared to its neighbors, the City is a regional hub for
 commercial and retail activity. The daytime population, who commute in and will be
 affected by the project, is significant.
- Emeryville is also unique in that funding for City services is largely reliant on more economically sensitive revenues such as sales tax, transient occupancy tax and business license tax, unlike other cities who are able to rely on more stable property tax. Should the project affect the City's economic drivers, it could negatively impact the City's ability to sustain services to the entire community.
- The project has potential impacts on the Emery Go-Round, a fare-free shuttle service, open to all Emeryville residents, shoppers, visitors and employees of Emeryville businesses. The service is primarily funded by commercial property owners and residents through a citywide property tax assessment.
- The EGR carries over a million passengers a year providing last-mile transportation between Emeryville and BART. As such, it is vital to Emeryville's economy and quality of life.
- EGR only has use of their current bus yard until 2020, and has been looking for a long-term facility for years. They have finally found one under the MacArthur Maze along Mandela Parkway. They have been in negotiations with Caltrans and the City of Oakland for the necessary approvals to build their bus yard in this location. One week ago tonight, this project passed a milestone when the Oakland City Planning Commission unanimously approved a Conditional Use Permit for this bus yard.

Comment 202 (Continued)

- However, Alternative C of the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project would make this site unavailable to EGR and would jeopardize EGR's future operations and very existence, which would have devastating effects on Emeryville's businesses and residents. Therefore, we implore you to drop Alternative C from further consideration.
- The City of Emeryville requests that Caltrans withdraw the proposed ND and complete a more thorough, adequate analysis of the project, as it is required to do under the California Environmental Quality Act and Caltrans own policies and procedures.
CHARLES BRYANT, Community Development Director

17	MR. BRYANT: Well, I had a statement prepared that I
18	was going to say because I thought there was going to be
19	public comment at this thing. So instead of saying it
20	verbally to the group, I'll say it to you so you can get
21	it into the record.
22	So I'm Charlie Bryant, Community Development
23	Director of the City of Emeryville.
24	So the traffic impacts from this project,
25	especially during construction, will be acutely felt by

1	the Emeryville community. While the City of Emeryville
2	has a relatively small residential population compared
3	to its neighbors of Oakland and Berkeley, the city is a
4	regional hub for commercial and retail activity.
5	The daytime population, folks who commute in
6	and will be affected by the project, is significant,
7	around 30- to 35,000 people a day.
8	Emeryville is also unique in that funding for
9	city services is largely reliant on more economically
10	sensitive revenues, such as sales tax, transient
11	occupancy tax, and business license tax, unlike other
12	cities who are able to rely on more stable property tax.
13	Should the project affect the city's economic
14	drivers, it could negatively impact the city's ability
15	to sustain services to the entire community.
16	The project also has potential impacts on the
17	Emery Go-Round, which is a fare-free shuttle service
18	open to all Emeryville residents, shoppers, visitors,
19	and employees of Emeryville businesses. The service is
20	primarily funded by commercial property owners and
21	residents through a citywide property tax assessment.
22	The Emery Go-Round carries over a million
23	passengers a year, providing last mile transportation
24	between Emeryville and BART. As such, it is vital to
25	Emeryville's economy and quality of life.

1	Emery Go-Round only has the use of their
2	current bus yard until 2020 and has been looking for a
3	long-term facility for years. They have finally found
4	one under the MacArthur Maze along Mandela Parkway.
5	They have been in negotiations with CalTrans and the
6	City of Oakland for the necessary approvals to build
7	their bus yard in this location.
8	One week ago tonight on April 3rd, this project
9	passed a milestone when the Oakland City Planning
10	Commission unanimously approved a conditional permit for
11	this bus yard. However, Alternative C of the MacArthur
12	Maze Vertical Clearance Project would make this site
13	unavailable to the Emery Go-Round and would jeopardize
14	the Emery Go-Round's future operations and its very
15	existence, which would have devastating effects on
16	Emeryville's businesses and residents. Therefore, we
17	implore you, CalTrans, to drop Alternative C from
18	further consideration.
19	Also, the City of Emeryville requests that
20	CalTrans withdraw the proposed negative declaration,
21	which it sounds like is now going to happen, and
22	complete a more thorough, adequate analysis of the
23	project as it is required to do under the California
24	Environmental Quality Act and CalTrans' own policies and
25	procedures.

1	And I want to add one other thing that is not
2	in my prepared statement, which is that it seems
3	apparent to me that CalTrans does not excel at community
4	engagement. The City of Emeryville, while much smaller
5	than CalTrans, undertakes various studies and projects
6	that require significant community engagement. And when
7	we do that, we normally include on the consulting team a
8	consultant who specializes only in community engagement,
9	and they typically do an excellent job.
10	I would strongly recommend that beginning
11	immediately in CalTrans' future community engagement
12	efforts, that you hire a consultant who specializes in
13	this field and knows what they're doing because,
14	frankly, not recording this meeting and telling people
15	who came tonight to express their views that they either
16	have to fill out speaker cards or speak to a court
17	reporter or their comments will not be recorded, is
18	ridiculous.
19	I mean, with all due respect to you, you're
20	doing what you were hired to do. That's fine.
21	But not recording a meeting of this type and of
22	this magnitude is just absurd. So, hopefully CalTrans
23	will just hire people will stick to building bridges
24	and hire people who know how to do community engagement.
25	

From:	chavaoropesa@gmail.com
Sent:	Monday, April 15, 2019 7:07 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT: Hallissy, Cristin@DOT: Weingarten
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by chavaoropesa@gmail.com on April 15th, 2019 at 07:06PM (PDT).

name: Salvador Oropesa email: chavaoropesa@gmail.com telephone: 5103847542 comment: I am writing to strongly oppose on the proposed project. It seems utterly wasteful when cal trans can even keep the basic maintenance of streets around west oakland. Seems the impact on the neighborhood which is already in a bad situation would be terrible.

I would ask you respond to me in writing on how many vehicles would be served by this project? What is the cost benefit analysis of this?

I oppose this utter waste of our tax dollars!!

BLACK FILMMAKERS HALL OF FAME, INC. 405 Fourteenth Street, Suite 515 Oakland, California 94612 2628 Son fo blo Ac-OAK-6. 94612

Col-Tems Atta: Crustin Hollissy III Same Au. 1583 Oak. G.-94612

Special Screening and Reception SPIKE LEE'S Malcolm X

 $\{ x_i \} \in$



DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Minister, Civil Rights Leader, Philosopher, President of SCLC.

Born January 15, 1929 and Died April 4, 1968 of an assassin's bullet in Memphis, Tennessee. Leader of Montgomery, Alabama Bus Boycott in 1955.

Leader of the March on Washington in 1963. Organizer of the Selma, Alabama Campaign to register Negroes to vote in 1965.

Helle Again, Ms. Hall 1559, 4/11/19 Just wonter you to Know . I shower in at meeting . Emery ville Comm. Ctr. 1st Visit nice place - Room full of white people, not feeling welcomes at All- I motices Nancy Nodel Welking in end Steleft. I mention before abant earthquake meeting, and left. pont worry not coming today - That going to Morice - to see Anthew Frenklins Morio - Amozing DRACO' hope fully she'll sing - "Bridgie over trouble woter" I dropped off letter- yestenday - beoke at daske asked me " what do your word !" to Hello, on welcome to calta pris Bldg. I worked Kauser Engineer 5 + I WAS To be a "project Monogen" - but Rengenomics ended program - and I got to be Operaton at phase Company, \$ 6 prings & say Helloto people Today - JANNED + Jepred - SNIDNEP Spa

From:	Brandon Tikalsky <btikalsky@gmail.com></btikalsky@gmail.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, April 16, 2019 12:18 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Cc:	Marcus Johnson
Subject:	Questions Regarding MacArthur Maze Project

Hi,

I live in West Oakland and have some major concerns regarding the project:

- I don't see anywhere **how many vehicles are actually impacted** by the supposedly low current overpass heights.
- I don't see anywhere the **noise and environmental impacts** to West Oakland as a result of traffic re-routing.
- The roads in West Oakland are already a terrible mess and I'm extremely concerned about even more **cars and trucks being routed through local roads**.
- Is there a cost-benefit analysis that has been done and can be shared?

Thanks, Brandon Tikalsky 408-857-4943

From:	Nancy Nadel <nnadel@gmail.com></nnadel@gmail.com>		
Sent:	Wednesday, April 17, 2019 12:40 PM		
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT		
Cc:	jbauters@emeryville.org; kcarson@acgov.org; Gretchen Koehler; karin mac donald;		
	naomi@17th.com; Libby Schaaf; Hon. Rebecca Kaplan; ICE Sele Nadel-Hayes		
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project		

I attended the April 10th meeting in Emeryviille explaining various alternatives for this project and traffic rerouting alternatives.

I am against this project altogether, in other words, I would support a No Project alternative for these reasons:

1. The engineers present could not provide information to justify the project e.g. how many vehicles cannot pass due to their height. In fact there few if any vehicles that could not pass the current vertical clearance.

2. The engineer present said that the state standard is 16'. This is not true. In fact the urban state standard is 14' and the clearance at the maze already meets that standard. Most trucks are not higher than 13' 6".

3. I am appalled that money on contractors has already been wasted on this project that is a gift to them and, if built, to shippers with our precious taxpayer dollars.

4. No environmental review was conducted with serious air pollution, traffic and noise impacts on the nearby community where I am a resident and business owner.

5. Rerouting traffic onto West Grand after the maze fire badly damaged the street surface and CALTRANS refused to resurface at that time. Now the road is a mess. We do not trust CALTRANS would repair the damage to city streets in Oakland and Emeryville if you rerouted traffic to them.

6. There are so many other roads and bridges in the state that could better use repair.

Please keep me informed as to what you decide with this project.

From:	Naomi Schiff <naomi@17th.com></naomi@17th.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, April 17, 2019 1:35 PM
To:	Nancy Nadel
Cc:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; jbauters@emeryville.org;
	kcarson@acgov.org; Gretchen Koehler; karin mac donald; Libby Schaaf; Hon. Rebecca
	Kaplan; ICE Sele Nadel-Hayes
Subject:	Re: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Dear Ms. Nadel and MacArthur Maze Team,

I would like to associate myself with all the below points, and also urge that if they still support this bad idea, CalTrans make it the lowest priority of projects in the state. While we have seismically-unfit facilities and highways which desperately need serious attention, this project should not be high on any list.

I have lived very close to the maze for more than forty years. One thing I have noticed is increased use of residential streets for truck traffic, despite its impact on air quality and upon our hundred-plus-year-old sewer systems, and the impacts upon the residents of the consequent traffic congestion and noise.

Thank you for attending to the wise use of taxpayer dollars, and for avoiding boondoggle projects which do not materially help our transportation system.

Sincerely,

Naomi Schiff

Naomi Schiff 238 Oakland Avenue Oakland, CA 94611 510-835-1819

From: Sent: To: Cc:	karin mac donald <kmdonvacation@gmail.com> Wednesday, April 17, 2019 9:38 PM Naomi Schiff Nancy Nadel; MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; jbauters@emeryville.org; kcarson@acgov.org; Gretchen Koehler; Libby Schaaf; Hon. Rebecca Kaplan; ICE Sele</kmdonvacation@gmail.com>
Subject:	Nadel-Hayes Re: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Dear MacArthur Maze Team, Ms Nadel and Ms Schiff,

I would like to echo the points Ms Nadel made.

I also attended the Emeryville meeting and as a representative of the Prescott Oakland Point Neighborhood Association, a member of the AB617 Steering Committee, and 24 year resident of West Oakland, I am very familiar with the maze and the issues your proposals will cause for us. I am more than alarmed by the traffic options that were presented and very much question the need for the project to begin with.

I should add that CalTrans has neither been a trusted actor nor a willing collaborator with residents and neighborhood based groups in projects affecting our area. I can not count the number of meetings I have attended where CalTrans was invited and did not respond or show up. The fact that the project leader mentioned that she just recently, in a meeting with the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project, learned the term "community engagement" illustrates a sad truth.

The Emeryville meeting was scheduled to start at 5:30pm - too early for most people that work to reach in a timely manner; the meeting location was not at the address on the mailings; the signs that informed of the new location were placed in locations focusing on people arriving from San Pablo Ave. -those coming from Hollis - i.e. those arriving from West Oakland and more likely to take side streets, had to search for the new location... if this was your best foot forward to gain some type of buy-in from the community that will be disproportionately affected by this project then I fear for what comes next!

I agree with Ms Schiff that there are many projects that seem to be in more urgent need of your attention and I hope that despite the considerable number of consultants in the room, this is a project that can be halted.

Best regards

Karin Mac Donald

From:	Chavez, Marco <chavezma@sutterhealth.org></chavezma@sutterhealth.org>
Sent:	Friday, April 19, 2019 11:34 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	I-80 University Avenue Overcrossing Vertical Clearance Project

I am a west Oakland resident. I opt to not move forward with this project.

Thank you, Marco

Marco Chavez-Lopez

Clinical Site Manager of Gynecologic Oncology

Palo Alto Medical Foundation - Camino Division 3838 California Street, Suite 410 San Francisco, CA 94115

email: <u>chavezma@sutterhealth.org</u> office: 415-751-1847 | cell: 415-637-3726 | fax: 415-387-2613

Palo Alto Medical Foundation We Plus You

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This Electronic Mail (e-mail) contains confidential and privileged information intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is sent. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or telephone.

From: fran quittel <franq101@gmail.com> Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2019 10:20 AM To: Tavares, Tony F@DOT <tony.tavares@dot.ca.gov> Cc: margaret.woeip@gmail.com; aflores@baaqmd.gov Subject: Caltrans maze project

Glad it is on hold. I am happy to participate in any committee work involving Emeryville . . . or the MAZE. Congestion here is killing.

Fran Quittel

fran quittel franq101@gmail.com https://www.linkedin.com/in/profilefq/ 510-547-5149/ph 626-864-1400/cell The Central Park Lost Mitten Party (Amazon) Publication date: September 2018 by GINGERSPICE Press, an imprint of Regent Press ISBN 13: 978-1-58790-446-2 ~ ISBN 10: 1- 58790-446-2 www.centralparklostmittenparty.com

Through the leadership of Fran Quittel and Lisa Marshall the FDIC restores \$270 million to 9500 bank depositors: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1USv2JfpnH8



April 19, 2019

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL AND EMAIL (MacArthurMaze@dot.ca.gov)

Tony Tavares Director California Department of Transportation 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612

Rebecca De Pont Associate Environmental Planner California Department of Transportation, District 4 (Caltrans) P.O. Box 23660, MS 8B Oakland, CA 94623

Re: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project ("Project")

Dear Ms. De Pont:

On behalf of the City of Emeryville ("City"), I write to submit comments on the Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment ("ND") regarding the above-referenced Project. As an initial matter, Public Resources Code section 21092.4(a) requires the lead agency to consult with transportation planning agencies and public agencies that have transportation facilities (as defined in Public Resources Code section 21092.4(b)) within their jurisdictions that could be affected by the project in the same manner as the lead agency would consult with a responsible agency. The ND was signed on January 15, 2019. However, the City received its first notification of the Project with a notice for a Project Development Team (PDT)/Stakeholders meeting on February 6, 2019. This notice is in stark contrast to the consultation efforts the agencies have undertaken with respect to the I-80/Ashby Avenue (SR-13) Interchange Improvements. The notifications Caltrans sent to the general public, which included the City, does not constitute the consultation envisioned by the Public Resources Code. The City's preference would be to partner with Caltrans to address the Project's impacts on Emeryville residents and businesses. However, because Caltrans did not consult with the City prior to the release of the ND as required by Public Resources Code section 21092.4, the City is compelled to submit these written comments¹ on the ND.

¹ Based on their skill and expertise, City Public Works staff, Andrew Clough, PG, Public Works Director, and Ryan O'Connell, P.E., Senior Civil Engineer, and City Planning staff, Charles S. Bryant, AICP,

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 2 of 14

The traffic impacts from this Project, especially during construction, will be acutely felt by the Emeryville community. While the City of Emeryville has a relatively small residential population compared to its neighbors, the City is a regional hub for commercial and retail activity. The City's daytime population increases to approximately 32,000, and the Project's impact on these commuters will be significant. The City is also unique in that funding for City services is largely reliant on more economically sensitive revenues such as sales tax, transient occupancy tax and business license tax, unlike other cities who are able to rely on more stable property tax. Should the Project affect the City's economic drivers, it could negatively impact the City's ability to sustain services to the entire community. For all of the reasons described in detail below, the City requests that Caltrans withdraw the proposed ND and complete a more thorough, adequate analysis of the project, as required under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, § 21000, et seq.) and its own policies and procedures.

Due to the inadequate analysis of the ND, it remains unclear whether the City should also be named as a responsible agency. The Traffic Management Plan, a Project feature, will presumably require the City to participate in any such plan. The closure of certain segments of I-80, I-580, and I-880 as contemplated by the Project may impact major local arterials (such as Frontage Road, Powell Street, Christie Avenue, Shellmound Street, 40th Street, Ashby Avenue, 7th Street, W. Grand Avenue), nearby on and off-ramps, and public transportation, such as the Emery Go-Round, provided by the Emeryville Transportation Management Association, and will require Caltrans to reimburse the City for the expenses the City will incur as a result of such detours². If the City is required to carry out a portion of the Project, then the City should be named as a responsible agency. In the meantime, the City's comments related to the inadequacy of the ND follow below.

I. The ND does not adequately describe either baseline freight conditions or Project-caused freight conditions.

The ND lacks a basis for its conclusion that the Project will have no change in capacity or configuration of the current freeways. (See, e.g., ND, pp. 23, 55.) A change in the vertical clearance is a change in the capacity and configuration of the freeways. As the ND states: "This project would allow freight vehicles more direct access to and from the Port of Oakland." (ND, p. 22; see also p. 55.) Furthermore, Appendix G to the Alameda County Transportation Goods Movement Plan (2016)³ ("Goods Movement Plan") states that the Port of Oakland forecasts a 233% increase in freight tonnage from 2012 to 2040 (from 17,381 to 40,445 thousand tons per year). This Project will allow additional clearance for trucks to take new routes that they are not able to do under the current conditions. Accordingly, the Project will have an impact, and the question becomes how significant is the impact? To analyze that issue, information about baseline traffic characteristics for the Project area, such as truck routes, traffic volumes, and delays from

Community Development Director and Diana Keena, AICP, Associate Planner have contributed to these comments.

² Streets and Highway Code § 93.

³ Available at https://www.alamedactc.org/planning/goodsmovement/. Last visited on 3/19/19.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 3 of 14

existing conditions is needed. The analysis should also include a comparison to the new traffic characteristics of opening these bridge spans to taller trucks. Unfortunately, the ND does not contain any information about such characteristics.

In addition, the ND's oversimplification of the purpose and need statements is problematic. The Caltrans' Draft Project Report for Route 80/580/880 Separation (EA 4K8100), dated 2/6/2019 ("Draft Project Report") for this Project states: "The purpose of this project is to increase the vertical clearances to current standard at three locations in the Maze to eliminate lengthy, time-consuming, and costly detours of large freight vehicles transporting goods through the I-80 connectors." The bolded language was simplified when the purpose statement was restated in the ND. The language changed to, "that impede the safe and efficient movement of freight vehicles through the interchange." The ND then only mentions the roadway vertical deficiencies as the need for the Project. However, the Draft Project Report not only includes vertical deficiencies as a purpose and need for the Project, but also elaborates on the goods movement needs as a basis for this Project. The Draft Project Report states that the current height restrictions "hinder the continuous movement of large or heavy freight loads. Because these connectors are not useable by larger or heavier loads, the trucks carrying these loads need to make lengthy detours around the bridges. Besides requiring extra time, these detours also generate extra greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and other pollutants."4 Although both the ND and Draft Project Report mention the large or heavy freight loads as a guasi-"need" for the Project, there are no metrics or information given for the baseline conditions, volumes, and routing. In addition, neither analyzes the future forecasted volumes and routing of freight traffic after this Project is completed (along with completion of other vertical clearance projects on I-80). This last sentence alone constitutes sufficient reason to withdraw the ND and to re-do the environmental analysis for this Project.

The City requests that Caltrans includes information about the current traffic characteristics of all modes (explicitly highlighting truck routes, loads, special permit frequency, and special permit routing), and the projected traffic characteristics as a result of the Project and its alternatives. The flaw in the analysis of traffic conditions permeates into the other analyses in the ND that rely on the faulty conclusion that the Project does not change the capacity or configuration of the freeways. For example, for air quality, the ND states: "The proposed project is exempt per 40 CFR 93.126 as it would not increase the capacity of the MacArthur Maze or move the alignment closer to sensitive receptors" (ND, p. 24). Caltrans should update all analyses that rely on the erroneous conclusion about no change in capacity or configuration of the freeways.

Finally, the ND concludes that the Project would not have impact on population and housing and would have no growth inducing impacts. (See, e.g., ND, p. 23 and p. 68) However, the Goods Movement Plan provides that: "Goods movement is critical to the County's economy, with about one-third employment coming from goods movement-dependent industries...." (Goods Movement Plan, p. 14.) Caltrans should analyze

⁴ Caltrans' Draft Project Report for Route 80/580/880 Separation (EA 4K8100), dated 2/6/2019.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 4 of 14

whether the increased capacity for freight traffic will result in additional job creation, which in turn, could result in additional traffic, and demands on housing, as the population may increase as people move nearby to fill jobs created by the Project.

II. The ND does not adequately analyze the Project's impact on alternative forms of transportation.

A. Alternative C will permanently displace a critical transit facility serving Emeryville.

Ironically, the ND concludes that "The proposed project complies with the following plans: Sustainable Transportation Plan - The City of Emeryville." (ND, p. 22). However, the ND did not analyze the impacts of the Project and its alternatives on the Emery Go-Round. If it had, it would reach a different conclusion. Emery Go-Round is a free shuttle that is open to the public and connects the MacArthur BART station to businesses, residences, schools and other origins and destinations in Emeryville. It moves more than 5,500 passengers per day.⁵ It is owned and operated by the Emeryville Transportation Management Association ("ETMA"). However, pursuant to the City's General Plan⁶ Policy T-P-34, the City supports and subsidizes Emery Go-Round because it offers free transit for both local travel within the City and travel to the regional hubs located at the Amtrak station, the MacArthur BART station, and San Pablo Avenue at 40th Street.

ETMA is currently operating the fleet for Emery Go-Round at a temporary location within the City. It may only operate at its current location until April 15, 2020. ETMA has obtained a conditional use permit from the City of Oakland⁷ for a new site for operations located on Caltrans property. Accordingly, ETMA and Caltrans are in the process of executing a long-term lease for site ALA 580-34 with the Caltrans Airspace Lease Department.⁸ The site is adjacent to Mandela Parkway underneath the bridge spans for WB/EB 80 to EB 580.⁹ Although the site is located in Oakland, it is the only available site that is in close enough proximity to Emeryville and of a size that will allow the ETMA to continue to operate Emery Go-Round at its current service levels. The ETMA is conducting environmental technical studies and preparing a design submittal.

The ND concludes "The project would have no permanent impacts to traffic or transportation or pedestrian and bicycle facilities." (ND, p. 23.) Similarly, the ND also concludes: "The alternatives for this project would not impact the current or future land use in this area. There will be no changes in access or permanent impacts to any parks

⁵ ETMA Annual Ridership Survey, available at <u>https://www.emeryqoround.com/assets/etma-agenda-packet jan2019.pdf</u>. Last accessed 4/2/19.

⁶ The General Plan is available at <u>https://www.ci.emeryville.ca.us/385/General-Plan-and-Supporting-Documents</u>. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

⁷ Oakland CUP Approval Letter/Resolution, available at <u>https://www.emerygoround.com/assets/etma-agenda-packet_april182019.pdf</u>. Last accessed on 4/17/19.

⁸ In December 2018, the California Transportation Commission authorized District 4 to negotiate the terms of the lease with the ETMA; see also ETMA Board Agenda for April 18, 2019, at <u>https://www.emerygoround.com/assets/etma-agenda-packet_april182019.pdf</u>

⁹ Emery Go-Round Yard Location Map (Attachment A).

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 5 of 14

or trails, residences, or undeveloped land from this project." (ND, p. 22; see also p. 23). However, Alternative C would permanently block access to site ALA 580-34. Without this site, ETMA will have no future facility to base its operations. If Emery Go-Round ceases to operate, the 5,500 passengers that are moved daily by Emery Go-Round will need to find alternative means of transportation, which may include single rider vehicle trips, leading to worsening traffic conditions, and air quality conditions. Accordingly, the City requests that Caltrans analyze the impacts that the Project and its alternatives may have on the operations of Emery Go-Round.

Finally, Alternative C, which requires completely rebuilding the structures, should be abandoned. Such a rebuild would only be required if there were structural deficiencies. However, at the community meeting held in Emeryville on April 10, 2019, Caltrans' staff stated that all of the bridges have been seismically retrofitted recently and that there are no structural deficiencies. Accordingly, Alternative C is not necessary.

B. The Project will impact regional transit provider AC Transit.

Detour traffic could impact AC Transit routes, reducing reliability and increasing travel times. Impacted routes on Shellmound and 40th streets include the 57 and 36 local routes and the F, J and C Transbay routes. Together, these routes move over 10,000 riders on a daily basis. The 29 local route on Hollis Street could also be affected, which would impact an additional 1,348 daily riders.

Also, the Caltrans TMP Guidelines call for "special arrangements with local transit services to encourage transit trips and contributing funds to accommodate a significant increase in ridership." The City stresses the importance of Caltrans working closely with all local transit agencies to develop strategies to encourage alternate modes of transportation. Fewer vehicles on the roadway improves the safety of the Project's construction workers and commuters alike.

C. The Project will impact bicycle/pedestrian facilities.

In addition to failing to identify the impacts on Emery Go-Round and AC Transit, the ND does not adequately analyze the impacts of the Project on the Regional Bay Trail. First, all Project alternatives include using the existing Bay Bridge Trail segment for staging and site access, and such use "may require rerouting, realignment, and/or overhead protection during construction." (ND, p. 11.) The ND should analyze whether this impact on the Bay Bridge Trail will result in additional traffic if there is closure of the trail and users use other modes of transportation.

In addition, the ND does not analyze the impacts of the Project on a planned segment of the Regional Bay Trail. Figure 3-5 of Emeryville's General Plan is a map of the planned Regional Bay Trail, which shows the Bay Trail making a connection from Emeryville to West Oakland by way of Halleck/Beach/Wood to Mandela Parkway. The ND concludes that the Project does not impact any current or future land uses (ND, p. 22), but such conclusion is not supported without an analysis of how the Project impacts the planned

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 6 of 14

Regional Bay Trail. Accordingly, the ND should analyze the Project's impacts on this planned segment of the Regional Bay Trail.

III. The ND fails to analyze the significance of the traffic impacts during construction of the Project.

A. The Project description is inadequate without any information about the Traffic Management Plan.

A feature of the project includes the *development of* a Traffic Management Plan (TMP). (ND, p. 49.) This TMP will be developed during the design/construction phase of the Project. There is no analysis of why the development of the TMP is deferred until after Project approval, when it is a Project feature. The deferral of the development of the TMP violates existing Caltrans policy. Major TMPs may include the full spectrum of strategies. including lane requirement charts, special provisions for unique project characteristics, a large-scale public awareness campaign (with brochures, public meetings, project website, telephone hotline), COZEEP services, FSP, detours to alternate highways or surface streets, and special arrangements with local transit services to accommodate a significant increase in ridership. Accordingly, Caltrans Transportation Management Plan Guidelines¹⁰ (2015) (TMPG) policy states that TMPs are to be considered early during the project initiation or planning stage, and that they need to be refined and further developed as the project progresses through the various stages of development.¹¹ The TMPG further states that TMP development is part of the normal project development process and must be considered in the project initiation document (PID) or the planning stage.¹² This means that the project team needs to assess the potential work zone implications of a project early enough in planning so that they have an understanding of the TMP needs and costs for that project. The extent of a TMP is determined by the District Traffic Manager (DTM) during the preliminary studies of a capital project, namely the Project Study Report (PSR) or Project Study Scoping Report (PSSR).¹³ This decisionmaking on the extent of the TMP is driven by the DTM's understanding of the expected work zone impacts of a project.

The TMPG further states that since projects are generally programmed, budgeted, and given an expenditure authorization upon PSR or PSSR approval, it is important to allow for the proper cost, scope, and scheduling of the TMP activities at this early stage of development.¹⁴ For all TMPs, an itemized estimate of the proposed strategies and their respective costs are included in the PSR for proper funding consideration.

The small amount of information that Caltrans has provided about this Project since publication of the ND, regarding detours, night-time closures, weekend closures, and "extended" closures, has been inconsistent. At the Caltrans/City stakeholder meeting in

¹⁰ Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

¹¹ Available at: <u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf</u>. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

¹² Available at: http://www.dot.ca.qov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

¹³ Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

¹⁴ Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 7 of 14

Emeryville on April 3, 2019, CalTrans Corridor Manager Laurie Lau described night-time closures as westbound 10 pm to 4 am and eastbound 12am to 6am, but at the April 10, 2019, community workshop meeting in Emeryville, she described the closures as being from 10 pm to 4 am. Also, at the April 10th community workshop, closures for Alternatives C and D were described as "night and extended". Inconsistencies between PDT Meetings, Caltrans/City stakeholder meetings, and community workshops need to be resolved.

Furthermore, without a TMP during the planning phase for this Project, Caltrans cannot adequately analyze the Project's air quality impacts. The City agrees with Bay Area Air Quality Management District's comment that CalTrans is required to "conduct a robust analysis of potential air quality impacts, including: emissions from construction equipment; *emissions from re-routed traffic during construction, particularly traffic impacting local streets*, and; emissions from long tern operations of the re-built interchange."¹⁵ There is no analysis regarding the air quality impact during construction from traffic diverted to local streets, nor could there be, until Caltrans develops the TMP. Given that the TMP is a feature of the Project, and critical to adequately analyzing the air quality impacts of the Project, Without such information, the Project description is inadequate because the impacts to the environment as a result of the detoured traffic cannot be analyzed.

The City requests that the TMP for this Project be included in the planning phase, so that the City can opine on proposed strategies before the project enters into Preliminary Engineering. In accordance with Sections 1.3 and 1.4 of the TMPG, the preliminary information and memorandums regarding the TMP should be disclosed to the public as part of any environmental review.

B. The Project will impact residential streets and schools.

The TMP for this Project must consider when and where traffic will be re-routed during major construction closure events. The City of Emeryville has many low-volume, low-speed residential roadways that cannot accommodate the influx of diverted trips going around the construction zone. Improvements on streets and intersections for the roadway or alternate routes may be necessary to provide increased capacity to handle the traffic through the work zone or within the adjacent corridor. Pedestrian, bicycle, emergency vehicles and transit needs should be carefully considered to maximize the positive impact of alternative modes.

The major corridors of Emeryville that traffic will likely get routed towards (directly or indirectly) are classified as Transit Priority Streets per Emeryville's General Plan¹⁶. Signal timing and coordination improvements should be part of the TMP plan and described in the ND. This strategy involves retiming traffic signals to increase vehicle throughput of

¹⁵ Letter dated April 5, 2019, from Greg Nudd, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, BAAQMD to Tony Tavares, Director, Caltrans District 4. Emphasis added.

¹⁶ Available at: <u>https://www.ci.emeryville.ca.us/385/General-Plan-and-Supporting-Documents</u>. Last accessed on 3/28/19.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 8 of 14

the roadway(s), improve traffic flow, and optimize intersection capacity in and around the work zone. Signal timing and coordination could include transit vehicle priority equipment and plans.

If construction detours route traffic towards San Pablo Avenue, there are schools on or adjacent to San Pablo Avenue between Powell Street and 40th Street, including Emeryville Center of Community Life at 4727 San Pablo Avenue, and Escuela Bilingüe Internacional at 4550 San Pablo Avenue. Detours described in the TMP must take into consideration the start and end times of each of these schools so as to not send additional vehicular traffic towards school at their traffic peak periods. Additionally, diverted traffic on corridors near schools should be monitored, measured, and mitigated if found to be causing impacts to safety and levels of traffic stress (LTS)¹⁷ for school children traveling to/from school.

C. Temporary rerouting of traffic for Project construction could result in permanent impacts to the safety of bicycle and pedestrian users.

Caltrans' Deputy Directive 64-R2¹⁸ requires full consideration of non-motorized travelers including pedestrians, bicyclists, and persons with disabilities in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities and products. The failure to discuss the impact on non-motorized travelers in the ND is discouraging and does not give local agencies nor the public the confidence that Caltrans will follow their own policies for this Project.

Caltrans' TMPG states that there should be an analysis of the existing traffic volume and user mix, such as pedestrians, bicyclists, trucks, and buses in the corridor both on the freeway and surface streets¹⁹. This will provide the basis for establishing the goal of the TMP and in determining the capability of the surrounding surface streets to handle the additional vehicular demand and the impact on bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Construction detours and long-term construction duration windows must consider bicycle and pedestrian users. Improvements on streets and intersections for the roadway or alternate routes may be necessary to provide increased safety and provide better levels of stress due to the traffic being diverted around the work zone or within the adjacent corridors. For example, it is anticipated that the intersection at Powell and Christie will be impacted by traffic detoured due to the construction of the Project. In 2016, there was a pedestrian fatality at this intersection, and another bicyclist injury at the I-80 off ramp near this intersection.

Within the City, the combination of very high traffic volumes and increasing pedestrian and bicycle traffic raise concerns about safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Taking a

¹⁷ Available at: https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Public_Works/Level_3_-

Transportation/Berkeley-Bicycle-Plan-2017_AppendixC_Level%20of%20Traffic%20Stress.pdf. Last accessed on 4/17/19

¹⁸ Available at: <u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/docs/dd_64_r2.pdf</u>. Last accessed on 3/28/19.

¹⁹ Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 9 of 14

proactive stance, the City decided to intensify analysis and planning for pedestrian and bicycle safety. As part of this effort, the City partnered with the UC Berkeley Safe Transportation and Education Center (SafeTREC) to conduct an in-depth review of pedestrian and bicycle safety issues at six key intersections in the heart of Emeryville. The 2018/2019 study includes field observations, community input, SafeTREC corridor recommendations and professional traffic engineering review. The study area includes the pedestrian/bicycle experiences at and between six intersections within or near the Powell Street Corridor in Emeryville:

- Powell Street and Frontage Road
- Powell Street and I-80
- Powell Street and Christie Avenue
- Christie Avenue and Shellmound Way
- Christie Avenue and Shellmound Street
- Powell Street and Hollis Street

The TMP stakeholder/workgroup team meetings need to include discussions on the 2018/2019 SafeTREC study, and how elements recommended in that study could be incorporated as part of this project. The vehicles on the Powell Street corridor being detoured through official means or GPS navigation routing should be measured and mitigated if found to be exceeding thresholds, or if causing impacts to safety and levels of stress for bicycle and pedestrian users.

Additionally, Emeryville has a robust bicycle network that includes the use of bicycle boulevards. The bicycle boulevards in Emeryville have volume and speed thresholds that are maintained by the use of traffic calming elements installed on the street.²⁰ The diverted traffic on corridors on bicycle boulevards should be measured and mitigated if found to be exceeding thresholds, or if causing impacts to safety and levels of stress.

D. The construction of the Project has the potential to significantly reduce access to the Emeryville Police Department and Fire Station No. 34.

The Project will likely involve full facility closures and/or lane closures on major emergency routes. Consideration must be given to the impact on emergency services and the project must provide adequate alternatives for emergency vehicles. Additionally, any full or partial closures must consider emergency services access and parking in or through the construction zone.

²⁰ Available at: https://www.ci.emeryville.ca.us/923/Pedestrian-Bicycle-Plan. Last accessed on 3/28/19.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 10 of 14

The ND cannot simply refer to the TMP to handle the impacts to emergency services. Per Caltrans' TMPG²¹, local fire, law enforcement, and emergency services agencies shall be identified and made part of the TMP workgroup team. Identification of local emergency service facilities should be identified in the ND, and the baseline emergency response times should be discussed. This is especially significant for Emeryville. The Emeryville Police Station and Fire Station No. 34, both located on Powell on the peninsula, are west of I-80/580 on Powell Street. Any detours need to consider the impacts of construction traffic on Powell Street and the effect on emergency response times for police and fire to incidents east of I-80/580 within Emeryville, as well incidents on Caltrans' own highways.

E. The ND failed to analyze the cumulative impacts from Caltrans' other projects along the I-80 Corridor.

The ND is inadequate due to the implicit assumption that this Project is Caltrans' only project in the area. Due to the Project's location and the high potential for major regional traffic impacts, the City recommends extra focus on the "Concurrent corridor (including conflicting) construction projects in the area" section from Table 1.0 of the TMPG document. This would include the analysis and discussion of each of the 11 planned projects presented by Caltrans at a Project Stakeholder meeting on February 6th, 2019.²² Many of the projects' construction windows overlap, and traffic delays of concurrent/overlapping project areas could have significant adverse impacts to businesses and residents. While this Project alone will create a "temporary condition", the local community may be slated for a constant state of "temporary condition."

The impacted communities and local agencies must know the baseline TMP strategies for the various Project alternatives. The baseline strategies may include, but are not limited to, planned detour routing, night/weekend work schedules, pedestrian/bicycle access improvements, incentive/disincentive clauses, coordination efforts with the adjacent construction projects, signal timing/coordination improvements for alternate routes, and street/intersection improvements for alternate routes.

The combined comments from the community, local agencies, and other key stakeholders will help refine the TMP as the project goes into the Preliminary Engineering phase. Per Caltrans's own policies and procedures, as noted above, the TMP should not start in the Preliminary Engineering phase as it is indicated in the ND. The City requests Caltrans to explain why the TMP was not initiated during the Project Initiation Document (PID) phase. "It is extremely important to identify the proper scope and cost of the TMP activities in the PID, as significant post-PID approval changes will be difficult to obtain."²³ A TMP during the PID phase allows for further TMP refinement during the PA&ED process, and stakeholders can begin to be brought in to help handle the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation details of specific elements. Finally, the City requests that this TMP be officially classified as a "Major TMP". This Project is multijurisdictional in scope,

- 22 I-80 Corridor Projects Overview Map (Attachment B).
- ²³ Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

²¹ Available at: http://www.dot.ca.qov/trafficops/tm/docs/TMP_Guidelines.pdf. Last accessed on 3/19/19.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 11 of 14

multifaceted in corridor impacts and project delivery methods, and could potentially be in place over an extended time.

The I-80 Corridor has long been identified as one of the most congested corridors in the Bay Area and has been the recipient of large state/federal/regional funds to improve traffic flow. "The I-80 SMART Corridor Project took a "smart" approach to the management of one of the busiest interstates in the Bay Area and used technology and active management strategies to improve traffic flow along the I-80 corridor from the Carguinez Bridge to the Bay Bridge within Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, without requiring the construction of new roads or the widening of existing ones. Through the coordination of several project components, the corridor is managed as one integrated system. Safer, more efficient and reliable traffic flow along I-80 is essential to the current and future vitality of the Bay Area. I-80 carries as many as 270,000 vehicles a day and has approximately 25 accidents per week. On westbound I-80 between Richmond and Emeryville, the accident rate is twice as high as the statewide average for similar highways (such as I-405 in Southern California). Motorists experience as much as 25-35 minutes of delay during typical commute hours. Currently, when a traffic incident occurs. motorists traveling at high speeds may not stop in time for the sudden slowdown or may be forced to change lanes abruptly, resulting in secondary accidents that worsen congestion. Emergency vehicle access is impacted, resulting in slower incident response and recovery times."24 The ND does not adequately explain the Project's relation to the I-80 SMART Corridor Project and its direct impact to the usage of the elements implemented with it. The I-80 SMART Corridor Project was not intended to bring relief or even help minimize the impacts of major construction detours that are likely from the Project's TMP.

As indicated in the project documents of the I-80 SMART Corridor Project, "some motorists may choose to exit onto San Pablo Avenue to avoid the traffic jam, but the traffic signals on San Pablo Avenue and other arterials are not currently equipped to handle the resulting increase in traffic. Gridlock occurs, impacting bus operations and traffic flow on these streets. Without knowledge of the accident location, diverted motorists stay on city streets, and traffic jams persist. Even if motorists don't detour, they don't know how long it will take them to reach their destination due to inconsistent and unreliable travel times."²⁵ The I-80 SMART Corridor Project documents and traffic studies showed that many local arterial intersections in the direct vicinity of the Project are already in an "oversaturated" condition.²⁶ These intersections were re-timed and coordinated to be used by the I-80 SMART Corridor Project for incident management and traffic routing, but they still remain in an oversaturated condition. The ND needs to address the impacts of TMP detours at these crucial intersections.

²⁴ Available at: <u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/80smartcorridor/fags.html</u>. Last accessed on 3/21/19.

²⁵ Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/80smartcorridor/faqs.html. Last accessed on 3/21/19.

²⁶ I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing – Final Existing Conditions Memorandum (Attachment C).

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 12 of 14

F. The ND failed to analyze the cumulative impacts from other development in the vicinity of the Project area.

The ND also fails to analyze the cumulative impacts of the Project as it relates to nearby development. There are several approved developments in the City, which are expected to be completed before the Project's construction begins. The nearest development, at 1500 feet (0.3mile) north of the Maze, is the Sherwin-Williams mixed used project at 1450 Sherwin Avenue at Horton Street, which will include 500 dwelling units and 6,000 square feet of commercial uses. The Intersection mixed use project is 4,000 feet (.75 mile) from the Maze at 3800 San Pablo Avenue at 39th Street and will include 105 dwelling units and 18,000 square feet of commercial space. The Marketplace redevelopment, within a mile of the Maze at 5900-6285 Shellmound Street at 65th Street, will include 456 dwelling units and 44,000 square feet of commercial space. The Nady site residential project, 1.36 mile from the Maze at 6701 Shellmound Street at 67th Street, will include 186 apartments. Approved development projects are listed in the City of Emeryville 2018 General Plan Annual Progress Report.²⁷

IV. The Project does not include any features or mitigation measures to address potential impacts on Cultural Resources.

As stated in the Emeryville General Plan EIR, "according to the NWIC at Somona State University, there is a high possibility of uncovering and identifying additional archaeological deposits almost anywhere in the entire city. ... In general, projects in the vicinity of ...alluvial flats ... have the greatest possibility of encountering a prehistoric archaeological resource."²⁸

Given the fact that it is on an alluvial flat, there is potential that a prehistoric archaeological resource exists under the Project's site area. However, the Environmental Consequences section of the Cultural Resources discussion on (ND, p. 33) fails to analyze whether the seismic soil treatments could affect any subsurface cultural materials that exist below the site. Furthermore, the ND states: "If previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during construction, work shall be halted in that area until a Caltrans qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find." (ND, p. 33.) This provision of the Monitoring and Post-Review Discovery Plan stops short of mitigation, and there are no Project features that would ensure that archaeological resources and sites will be protected from damage.

V. The ND does not adequately address noise impacts on sensitive receptors.

"Figure 2-6 shows the residential study areas where the noise analysis was conducted" (ND, p. 42). The residential study areas neglected to study the residential units in Southwest Emeryville. Specifically, no measurements were taken in the neighborhoods

²⁷ Available at: http://www.emeryville.org/DocumentCenter/View/11314/Item-71---General-Plan-Annual-Progress-Report. Last accessed on 3/21/19.

²⁸ Emeryville General Plan, adopted October 2009, https://www.ci.emeryville.ca.us/385/General-Plan-and-Supporting-Documents.

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 13 of 14

north of 40th Street and west of Horton Street (an area which also includes a soon to be built Lennar Development site described above). Additionally, the Extended Stay America Hotel located near the intersections of Mandela Parkway and Horton Street was not included in the analysis. Caltrans should analyze the Project's noise impacts on these sensitive receptors.

VI. Notice Requested

As a reminder, the City requests mailed notice of any and all hearings and/or actions related to the Project. These requests are made pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092.2, 21080.4, 21083.9, 21092, 21108, 21161, and Government Code section 65092, which requires lead agencies and state agencies to mail such notices to any person who has filed a written request for them with the director of the agency. Please send the above-requested notices by U.S. mail and email to:

Christine Daniel City Manager City of Emeryville 1333 Park Avenue Emeryville, CA 94608 cdaniel@emeryville.org

VII. Conclusion

The proposed ND erroneously concludes that there is no impact from the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project. Unfortunately, the ND lacks an adequate description of the baseline environmental setting, and any analysis of the impacts from detours and rerouting. Without that minimal information, there simply cannot be adequate analysis of the Project's impacts. The City of Emeryville respectfully requests that Caltrans withdraw the proposed ND, adequately analyze the issues and impacts raised in this letter, including disclosing any written documents that it relies upon in such analysis, and partner with the affected local agencies in the delivery of this major project as anticipated by Caltrans longtime policies and procedures. We look forward to receiving Caltrans' response to this comment letter and to continuing to work with the agency on this and many other projects in and around Emeryville.

Very Truly Yours,

Christine S. Daniel City Manager

City of Emeryville Comments on MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project IS Page 14 of 14

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Emery Go-Round Yard Location Map
- B. I-80 Corridor Projects Overview Map
- C. I-80 ICM Timing Review Final Existing Conditions Memorandum

cc: via email only

Emeryville Mayor Ally Medina, Vice Mayor Christian Patz and City Council Members John Bauters, Scott Donahue and Dianne Martinez

Emeryville City Attorney Michael Guina

Emeryville Transportation Management Association Director Roni Hatrup

Emeryville Unified School District Superintendent Dr. Quiauna Scott

Bay Area Rapid Transit District General Manager Grace Crunican

Alameda-Contra Costa County Transit General Manager Michael Hursh

- City of Oakland Mayor Libby Schaff, City Administrator Sabrina Landreth and Director of Department of Transportation Ryan Russo
- City of Berkeley Mayor Jesse Arreguin, City Manager Dee Williams-Ridley and Public Works Director Phil Harrington

Alameda County Transportation Commission Executive Director Arthur Dao

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Executive Director Therese McMillian

Bay Area Air Quality Management District Executive Gregory Nudd

West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project Co-Director Margaret Gordon

Bike East Bay Advocacy Director Dave Campbell

California Air Resource Board Executive Officer Richard Corey

Alameda County Fire Department Chief David Rocha



Appendix F



ATTACHMENT C

Kimley **»Horn**

MEMORANDUM

To: Aleida Andrino-Chavez, City of Albany Hamid Mostowfi, City of Berkeley Melissa Tigbao, City of El Cerrito Maurice Kaufman, City of Emeryville Mike Roberts, City of Hercules Si Lau, City of Oakland Tamara Miller, City of Pinole Steven Tam, City of Richmond Barbara Hawkins, City of San Pablo David Man, Caltrans Mark de la O, Contra Costa County

From: Robert Paderna and Brian Sowers, Kimley-Horn

Cc: Kanda Raj, Alameda CTC Hisham Noeimi, CCTA

Date: April 4, 2017

RE: I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing – Final Existing Conditions Memorandum

Introduction and Project Area

The I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) program consists of multiple traffic operations systems and strategies, working collectively, to manage traffic congestion along the I-80 corridor. A key component of the I-80 ICM strategies is the management of traffic to and from I-80 during incidents on the freeway, which consists of deployment of special signal timing plans along crossing arterials to handle additional diverting traffic from the freeway. Incident management signal timing plans are developed based upon the existing signal coordination plans that operate under typical daily traffic conditions. This project also includes a signal timing study for **166** traffic signals along San Pablo Avenue and crossing arterial roadways to update peak period signal coordination plans.

The project limits and intersections for each corridor are as follows:

- San Pablo Avenue (92 signals): from Pomona Street/I-80 WB Ramps to MLK Jr./Castro Street
- Parker Avenue (4 signals): from 2nd Street to 7th Street
- Willow Avenue (3 signals) from Hawthorne Drive to I-80 EB Ramps
- Pinole Valley Road (6 signals): from Ellerhorst Street to Estates Avenue
- Appian Way (4 signals): from Mann Drive to I-80 EB Ramps
- Richmond Parkway (5 signals): from Lakeside Drive to I-80 EB Ramps
- Hilltop Drive (7 signals): from Research Drive to I-80 EB Ramps
- El Portal Drive (6 signals): from Road 20 to I-80 EB Ramps

I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing Final Existing Conditions Memorandum 1

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

- San Pablo Dam Road (3 signals): from Contra Costa Avenue to I-80 EB Ramps
- McBryde Avenue (2 signals): from I-80 WB Ramps to Amador Street
- Barrett Avenue (1 signal): at I-80 WB Ramps
- Cutting Boulevard (2 signals): from I-80 HOV Ramp to I-80 WB Ramps
- Potrero Avenue (1 signal): at I-80 Ramps/Eastshore Street
- Carlson Boulevard (2 signals): from I-80 EB Ramps to I-80 WB Ramps
- Central Avenue (4 signals): from Carlson Boulevard to I-80 WB Ramps
- Buchanan Street (4 signals): from Jackson Street to I-80 WB Ramps
- Gilman Street (3 signals): from 9th Street to 6th Street
- University Avenue (2 signals): from 9th Street to 6th Street
- Ashby Avenue (2 signals): from 9th Street to 7th Street
- Powell Street (6 signals): from Beaudry Street to Frontage Road/I-80 WB Ramps
- West Grand Avenue (7 signals): from Brush Street to Maritime Street

Figure 1 illustrate the project area, with each intersection labelled by agency.

The San Pablo Avenue corridor spans ten jurisdictions and extends from Castro Street/MLK Jr. Way in the City of Oakland to Willow Avenue, just north of Highway 4, in Contra Costa County. Traveling north, the corridor crosses the Cities of Oakland, Emeryville, Berkeley, Albany, El Cerrito, Richmond, San Pablo, Contra Costa County, and the Cities of Pinole and Hercules. San Pablo Avenue, State Route 123 from Cutting Avenue in El Cerrito to Highway 580 in Oakland, is a major north/south arterial, consisting of four to six (4-6) lanes. San Pablo Avenue serves as a regional route as well as a significant local arterial. The corridor provides access to major arterials and regional freeways including Highways 80, 580, 980, 24, and 4 with AC Transit and WestCAT services operating along this major multi-modal corridor. The surrounding land uses are varied along the corridor and include residential, commercial, and schools.

The northern section of San Pablo Avenue, between Merchant Street/I-80 Westbound Ramps in Contra Costa County and Richmond Parkway in the City of Richmond, is a four (4) lane arterial roadway with an average daily traffic (ADT) ranging from 12,400 to 19,950 vehicles per day. The roadway runs east-west between Richmond Parkway and Sycamore Avenue and the remainder of this section of the corridor runs north-south with low pedestrian and bike activity present throughout the day. This section of San Pablo Avenue provides connectivity to Route 4 and the surrounding land uses include commercial and retail throughout the entire length and residential housing at the northern end. The speed limit for the northern section ranges from 25 to 45 mph. The speed limit is 45 mph north of Parker Street and south of the City of Pinole. Along Parker Street the speed limit is 30 mph and in the downtown Pinole area the speed limit is 25 mph. The remaining stretches of the northern section have 40-mph speed limits. The main direction of travel on the northern section of San Pablo Avenue is southbound in the AM peak period,

2



Figure 1: Project Area Map

I-80 ICM ARTERIAL RETIMING

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley **»Horn**

balanced in the midday peak period and northbound in the PM peak period.

The central section of San Pablo Avenue, between Richmond Parkway in the City of Richmond and Carlson Boulevard in the City of El Cerrito, runs north-south and is a four (4) lane arterial roadway. South of Cutting Boulevard, San Pablo Avenue is classified as State Route 123. The primary surrounding land uses along this section of the corridor include commercial, retail and restaurants. Access to Interstate 80, via multiple side corridors, two BART stations, which are located near the intersections of Cutting Boulevard and Fairmount Avenue in the City of El Cerrito, and many residential neighborhoods are located along the central section of San Pablo Avenue. The speed limit along this portion of San Pablo Avenue is 45 mph from Richmond Parkway to Hilltop Drive, 40 mph near Robert Miller Drive, 35 mph from Rivers Street to Rheem Avenue, and 30 mph for the rest of the section. There is moderate pedestrian and bicycle activity throughout the day and the ADT volumes range from 15,290 to 23,630 vehicles per day. The main direction of travel on this section of San Pablo Avenue is southbound in the AM peak period, balanced in the midday peak period and northbound in the PM peak period.

The southern section of San Pablo Avenue, between Carlson Boulevard in the City of El Cerrito and Castro Street/MLK Jr. Way in the City of Oakland, is a four (4) lane arterial with an ADT ranging between 16,110 and 28,370 vehicles per day. North of Adeline Street, San Pablo Avenue is classified as State Route 123. The speed limit along the southern section of the corridor is 30 mph. The main land uses surrounding the corridor include residential, commercial, restaurants and office buildings. Moderate to high pedestrian and bicycle activity is present throughout the day, with very high pedestrian and bicycle activity near the intersection of University Avenue in Berkeley. The peak direction of travel on this section of San Pablo Avenue is southbound in the AM and balanced during the midday and PM peak periods.

The initial phase of the project included collecting and analyzing existing conditions information and updating existing conditions traffic models. This memorandum summarizes the existing conditions along the corridors and includes the following:

- Traffic data collection and reduction;
- Travel time survey information;
- Field observations; and
- Traffic model updates

Traffic Data Collection and Reduction

Data collection for this project included coordinating with the various Cities, Contra Costa County, and Caltrans to obtain timing sheets and other references, collecting traffic volumes, conducting field review, and performing travel time surveys along the project corridors.

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Weekday turning movement counts, including vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle counts, were collected in November 2016 at one hundred fifty-six (156) of the Project intersections. The turning movement counts were collected during the following peak periods, with small variations by corridor based on historic daily traffic data.

•	AM Peak	7:00 am to 9:00 am

- Midday Peak 11:30 am to 1:30 pm
- PM Peak 3:30 pm to 6:00 pm

Copies of the turning movement counts will be provided to each agency separately.

To understand daily and weekday traffic volumes along the corridors, 24-hour tube counts were collected at thirty (30) segments. The 24-hour tube counts were collected for seven (7) consecutive days from Saturday, November 12, 2016 through Sunday, November 20, 2016.

It was observed that the volume along the project corridors fluctuates on a day-to-day basis depending on I-80 operations. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes were calculated for each location and are presented in **Table 1**. The ADT count sheets and summaries are provided in the **Appendix**.

Locations	Period	EB/NB Average	WB/SB Average	Total
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	5,805	6,598	12,403
and Linus Pauling Drive)	Weekend (S-S)	3,730	4,325	8,055
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	10,260	9,030	19,290
and Hercules Avenue)	Weekend (S-S)	6,320	5,225	11,545
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	10,410	9,545	19,955
(between Appian way and Sunnyview Drive)	Weekend (S-S)	6,365	5,420	11,785
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	7,900	8,105	16,005
and Hilltop Drive)	Weekend (S-S)	5,670	5,965	11,635
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	7,340	7,950	15,290
Rumrill Boulevard)	Weekend (S-S)	6,775	6,960	13,735
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	9,145		
Van Ness Street)	Weekend (S-S)	7,955	Missing	g Data^
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	9,895	10,825	20,720
Esmond Avenue)	Weekend (S-S)	7,610	9,230	16,840
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	11,185	11,050	22,235
Knott Avenue)	Weekend (S-S)	9,440	9,935	19,375

Table 1: 24-hour Average Daily Traffic Volumes Summary

* Due to count tube displacement, some data was not available

I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing Final Existing Conditions Memorandum 5

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Tuble 2 (continues	a). 24 noar nee	rage baily mail	, in the second s	
Locations	Period	EB/NB Average	WB/SB Average	Total
Willow Avenue (between San Pablo Avenue and Hawthorne Road)	Weekday (M-F)	6,490	7,530	14,020
	Weekend (S-S)	4,755	5,705	10,460
Pinole Valley Road (between Ellerhorst Drive and Henry Avenue)	Weekday (M-F)	6,825	6,770	13,595
	Weekend (S-S)	5,225	4,885	10,110
Appian Way (between Mann Drive and Tara Hills Drive)	Weekday (M-F)	8,630	8,230	16,860
	Weekend (S-S)	6,615	6,470	13,085
Richmond Parkway (between Lakeside Drive and Blume Drive)	Weekday (M-F)	16,875	19,175	36,050
	Weekend (S-S)	Missing Data*	15,330	Missing Data*
Hilltop Drive (between Robert Miller Drive and Shane Drive)	Weekday (M-F)	10,155	8,490	18,645
	Weekend (S-S)	7,230	6,510	13.740
El Portal Drive (between Church Lane and Fordham Street)	Weekday (M-F)	13,495	10,430	23,925
	Weekend (S-S)	Missing Data*	9,440	Missing Data*
San Pablo Avenue (between Manila Avenue and Portero Avenue)	Weekday (M-F)	10,360	9,955	20,135
	Weekend (S-S)	8,280	7,550	15,830
San Pablo Avenue (between Central Avenue and Fairmont Avenue)	Weekday (M-F)	12,285	11,345	23,630
	Weekend (S-S)	10,475	9,730	20,205
San Pablo Avenue (between Gilman Street and Monroe Street)	Weekday (M-F)	11,780	13,870	25,650
	Weekend (S-S)	9,305	12,265	21,570
San Pablo Avenue (between University Avenue and Delaware Street)	Weekday (M-F)	11,080	11,730	22,810
	Weekend (S-S)	9,495	10,505	20,000
San Pablo Avenue (between Ashby Avenue and Grayson Street)	Weekday (M-F)	11,785	12,005	23,790
	Weekend (S-S)	9,440	10,505	19,945
San Pablo Avenue (between Stanford Avenue and 63 rd Street)	Weekday (M-F)	9,540	11,025	20,565
	Weekend (S-S)	7,595	9,280	16,875
San Pablo Avenue (between 47 th Avenue and 53 rd Street)	Weekday (M-F)	11,700	12,255	23,955
	Weekend (S-S)	8,825	9,985	18,810
San Pablo Avenue (between Market Street and 27 th Street)	Weekday (M-F)	7,680	8,430	16,110
	Weekend (S-S)	6,195	6,845	13,040
San Pablo Avenue (between I-80 EB Ramps and Jackson Street)	Weekday (M-F)	14,035	14,335	28,370
	Weekend (S-S)	14,155	12,890	27,045

Table 1 (Continued): 24-hour Average Daily Traffic Volumes Summary

* Due to count tube displacement, some data was not available

I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing Final Existing Conditions Memorandum
ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Table 1 (Continued): 24-hour Average Daily Traffic Volumes Summary

Locations	Period	EB/NB Average	WB/SB Average	Total
San Pablo Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	14,035	14,335	28,370
Jackson Street)	Weekend (S-S)	14,155	12,890	27,045
Central Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	9,805	11,370	21,175
and San Luis Street/Pierce St)	Weekend (S-S)	8,790	11,000	19,790
Cutting Boulevard	Weekday (M-F)	13,500	12,435	25,935
and I-80 WB On-Ramp)	Weekend (S-S)	9,590	9,740	19,330
Gillman Street	Weekday (M-F)	8,165	8,655	16,820
8 th Street)	Weekend (S-S)	7,605	7,885	15,490
University Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	15,380	16,280	31,660
9 th Street)	Weekend (S-S)	14,880	15,745	30,625
Powell Street	Weekday (M-F)	21,955	20,985	42,940
Christie Avenue)	Weekend (S-S)	20,965	19,160	40,125
West Grand Avenue (between Market Street and Adeline Street)	Weekday (M-F)	8,575	11,310	19,885
	Weekend (S-S)	5,820	8,985	14,805
West Grand Avenue	Weekday (M-F)	9,490	7,480	16,970
Telegraph Avenue)	Weekend (S-S)	6,340	6,185	12,525

* Due to count tube displacement, some data was not available

Travel Time Surveys

"Before" implementation floating vehicle surveys were conducted along the project corridors to measure the existing travel time and delays and to observe general traffic operations and conditions. The travel time surveys were primarily conducted on Wednesday, November 30, 2016 and Thursday, December 1, 2016, with supplemental runs collected thereafter when necessary. Travel time surveys were collected in both directions along the project corridors between the following limits:

- Appian Way from Fitzgerald Drive to San Pablo Avenue
- Ashby Avenue from 7th Street to San Pablo Avenue
- Buchanan Street from I-80 WB Ramps to San Pablo Avenue
- Carlson Boulevard from I-80 WB Ramps to I-80 EB Ramps
- Central Avenue from I-80 WB Ramps to San Pablo Avenue
- Cutting Boulevard from I-80 WB Ramps to San Pablo Avenue
- Gilman Street from 6th Street to San Pablo Avenue
- Hilltop Drive from San Pablo Avenue to I-80 EB Ramps

I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing Final Existing Conditions Memorandum 7

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

- Pinole Valley Road from Estates Avenue to San Pablo Avenue
- Potrero Avenue from San Pablo Avenue and Eastshore Boulevard
- Powell Street from Frontage Road to San Pablo Avenue
- Richmond Parkway from San Pablo Avenue to I-80 WB Ramps
- Fitzgerald Drive from I-80 HOV Ramps to Appian Way
- El Portal Drive from San Pablo Avenue to I-80 EB Ramps
- Willow Avenue from I-80 EB Ramps to San Pablo Avenue
- San Pablo Avenue/Willow Road (Segment 1) from 7th Street to Cummings Skyway
- San Pablo Avenue (Segment 2) from Tennent Avenue to Willow Avenue
- · San Pablo Avenue (Segment 3) from Hilltop Drive to Tennent Avenue
- · San Pablo Avenue (Segment 4) from Broadway Avenue/El Portal Drive to Hilltop Drive
- San Pablo Avenue (Segment 5) from Cutting Boulevard to Broadway Avenue/El Portal Drive
- San Pablo Avenue (Segment 6) from Gilman Street to Cutting Boulevard
- San Pablo Avenue (Segment 7) from Stanford Avenue to Gilman Street
- San Pablo Avenue (Segment 8) from West Grand Avenue to Stanford Avenue
- San Pablo Dam Road from San Pablo Avenue to I-80 EB Ramps/Amador Street
- University Avenue from 6th Street to San Pablo Avenue
- West Grand Avenue from Wake Avenue to San Pablo Avenue

The results of the "Before" study for each of the project corridors are summarized in Tables 2 through 24. Detailed travel time summaries for the corridors are included in the Appendix.

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Northbound	2:36	0:47	2.0	21.5
AM Peak	Westbound	3:50	1:56	3.5	14.6
Midday Deak	Northbound	2:25	0:40	1.7	23.2
Midday Peak	Westbound	3:07	1:11	2.4	18.0
PM Peak	Northbound	2:56	1:05	2.5	19.1
	Westbound	3:45	1:49	2.8	14.9

Table 2: Appian Way "Before" Travel Time Summary

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Fitzgerald Drive and San Pablo Avenue

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley **»Horn**

Table 3: Ashby Avenue "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Eastbound	0:55	0:22	0.7	9.1
Alvi Peak	Westbound	1:40	1:07	1.0	5.0
Midday Dook	Eastbound	0:52	0:18	0.8	9.7
Midday Peak	Westbound	0:59	0:25	1.3	8.6
PM Peak	Eastbound	1:02	0:25	0.9	8.1
	Westbound	0:50	0:09	0.6	10.1

Note: Travel time survey conducted between 7th Street and San Pablo Avenue

Table 4: Buchanan Street "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Eastbound	2:55	1:25	2.3	14.0
AM Peak	Westbound	2:05	0:41	1.7	19.4
Midday Peak	Eastbound	3:25	1:52	3.0	11.9
	Westbound	2:05	0:40	1.3	19.5
PM Peak	Eastbound	3:43	2:05	2.5	10.9
	Westbound	2:33	1:01	2.0	15.9

Note: Travel time survey conducted between I-80 WB Ramp and San Pablo Avenue

Table 5: Carlson Boulevard "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Eastbound	0:08	0:00	0.0	27.1
AM Peak	Westbound	0:21	0:14	0.7	10.1
Midday Dook	Eastbound	0:09	0:01	0.2	24.6
Midday Peak	Westbound	0:16	0:09	0.5	13.3
PM Peak	Eastbound	0:18	0:10	0.5	12.3
	Westbound	0:08	0:00	0.0	27.1

Note: Travel time survey conducted between I-80 WB Ramp and I-80 EB Ramp

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley **»Horn**

Table 6: Central Avenue "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Book	Eastbound	2:25	1:24	2.3	11.1
AM Peak	Westbound	1:51	0:54	1.8	14.5
Midday Dook	Eastbound	2:21	1:21	2.2	11.4
Midday Peak	Westbound	7:05	6:18	2.3	3.8
PM Peak	Eastbound	2:59	1:48	2.0	9.0
	Westbound	6:49	5:52	2.5	4.0

Note: Travel time survey conducted between San Joaquin Street and San Pablo Avenue

Table 7: Cutting Boulevard "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Eastbound	1:00	0:37	0.9	10.1
AM Peak	Westbound	0:33	0:12	1.0	18.3
Midday Peak	Eastbound	1:01	0:39	0.9	10.0
	Westbound	0:27	0:07	0.3	22.1
PM Peak	Eastbound	0:51	0:27	0.9	11.8
	Westbound	0:28	0:05	0.4	21.6

Note: Travel time survey conducted between I-80 WB Ramp and San Pablo Avenue

Table 8: Gilman Street "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Deak	Eastbound	1:10	0:27	0.9	15.8
AM Peak	Westbound	0:59	0:09	0.7	19.0
Midday Dook	Eastbound	1:29	0:37	1.0	12.6
Midday Peak	Westbound	1:01	0:13	0.8	18.1
PM Peak	Eastbound	2:19	1:25	1.4	8.0
	Westbound	2:05	1:03	1.6	9.0

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Sixth Street and San Pablo Avenue

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley **»Horn**

Table 9: Hilltop Drive "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Deak	Eastbound	5:00	2:16	3.3	18.0
AM Peak	Westbound	3:58	1:21	2.8	22.7
Midday Dook	Eastbound	4:32	1:54	3.1	19.9
Midday Peak	Westbound	3:53	1:24	2.9	23.2
PM Peak	Eastbound	4:17	1:36	3.2	21.0
	Westbound	4:29	1:55	4.6	20.1

Note: Travel time survey conducted between San Pablo Avenue and I-80 EB Ramp

Table 10: Pinole Valley Road "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Peak	Eastbound	2:53	0:58	2.7	16.0
	Westbound	2:46	0:49	1.8	16.8
DM Date	Eastbound	3:11	1:13	2.5	14.5
Pivi Peak	Westbound	3:18	1:18	3.3	14.0

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Estates Avenue and San Pablo Avenue

Table 11: Potrero Avenue "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Deak	Eastbound	0:55	0:38	0.7	8.1
AM Peak	Westbound	0:33	0:16	0.6	13.4
Midday Peak	Eastbound	0:38	0:20	0.6	11.5
	Westbound	0:35	0:19	0.7	12.6
PM Peak	Eastbound	0:39	0:20	0.6	11.2
	Westbound	0:44	0:25	0.7	10.1

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Eastshore Boulevard and San Pablo Avenue

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Time PeriodDirectionAverage Travel Time (min:sec)Average Stop Delay (min:sec)Average StopsAverage StopsAM PeakEastbound3:331:452.013.5Westbound3:021:122.015.8Midday PeakEastbound3:071:232.015.3							
AM Peak Eastbound 3:33 1:45 2.0 13.5 Westbound 3:02 1:12 2.0 15.8 Midday Peak Eastbound 3:03 1:44 2.7 13.5 Westbound 3:07 1:23 2.0 15.3	Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)	
Midday Peak Westbound 3:02 1:12 2.0 15.8 Midday Peak Eastbound 3:33 1:44 2.7 13.5 Westbound 3:07 1:23 2.0 15.3	AM Deak	Eastbound	3:33	1:45	2.0	13.5	
Midday Peak Eastbound 3:33 1:44 2.7 13.5 Westbound 3:07 1:23 2.0 15.3	АМ Реак	Westbound	3:02	1:12	2.0	15.8	
Widday Peak Westbound 3:07 1:23 2.0 15.3	Midday Dook	Eastbound	3:33	1:44	2.7	13.5	
	Midday Peak	Westbound	3:07	1:23	2.0	15.3	
Eastbound 5:24 3:36 2.8 8.9	PM Peak	Eastbound	5:24	3:36	2.8	8.9	
Westbound 4:15 2:23 2.3 11.2		Westbound	4:15	2:23	2.3	11.2	

Table 12: Powell Street "Before" Travel Time Summary

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Frontage Road and San Pablo Avenue

Table 13: Richmond Parkway "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
	Eastbound	5:15	1:31	3.4	22.8
Alvi Peak	Westbound	5:47	2:07	3.5	20.7
Midday Deals	Eastbound	5:50	2:00	4.4	20.5
Midday Peak	Westbound	5:13	1:41	3.6	23.0
PM Peak	Eastbound	9:37	5:30	4.7	12.5
	Westbound	5:54	2:18	4.0	20.3

Note: Travel time survey conducted between San Pablo Avenue and Appian Way

Table 14: San Pablo Avenue/Willow Road (Segment 1) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Northbound	6:11	0:44	3.4	30.1
Alvi Peak	Southbound	6:15	0:41	2.8	29.8
Midday Peak	Northbound	5:43	0:26	2.0	32.5
	Southbound	5:58	0:31	2.6	31.2
PM Peak	Northbound	5:59	0:32	2.3	31.1
	Southbound	6:08	0:39	3.0	30.3

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Willow Road/San Pablo

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

·····						
Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)	
AM Peak	Eastbound	5:08	1:12	3.9	25.8	
	Westbound	5:04	1:01	3.3	26.2	
Midday Dook	Eastbound	5:12	1:14	4.0	25.5	
Midday Peak	Westbound	4:35	0:46	2.9	28.9	
PM Peak	Eastbound	6:41	2:35	3.7	19.8	
	Westbound	5:31	1:29	3.0	24.0	

Table 15: San Pablo Avenue (Segment 2) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Tennent Avenue and Willow Avenue

Table 16: San Pablo Avenue (Segment 3) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Northbound	6:50	1:30	4.2	26.8
AM Peak	Southbound	7:14	1:47	3.8	25.3
Midday Peak	Northbound	6:40	1:21	2.8	27.5
	Southbound	6:56	1:23	4.2	26.5
PM Peak	Northbound	9:53	4:24	4.2	18.6
	Southbound	7:54	2:05	4.8	23.2

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Hilltop Drive and Tennent Avenue

Table 17: San Pablo Avenue (Segment 4) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Peak	Northbound	3:36	1:12	2.4	23.1
Alvi Peak	Southbound	3:14	0:53	1.7	25.6
Midday Dook	Northbound	3:18	0:53	2.1	25.1
Midday Peak	Southbound	2:57	0:41	1.2	28.1
PM Peak	Northbound	3:42	1:11	2.5	22.4
	Southbound	3:10	0:49	1.5	26.3

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Broadway Avenue/El Portal Drive and Hilltop Drive

Kimley »Horn

Tuble 10. Sull Tuble Atende (Segment S) Defore Thaten The Sullmary						
Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)	
AM Peak	Northbound	11:04	3:45	8.8	18.1	
	Southbound	15:53	8:13	10.3	12.7	
Midday Peak	Northbound	11:21	3:54	8.5	17.7	
	Southbound	13:09	5:40	10.8	15.3	
PM Peak	Northbound	17:26	9:16	12.8	11.5	
	Southbound	13:13	5:15	10.5	15.2	

Table 18: San Pablo Avenue (Segment 5) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Cutting Boulevard and Broadway/El Portal Drive

Table 19: San Pablo Avenue (Segment 6) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Deak	Northbound	10:45	3:28	5.8	18.8
AM Peak	Southbound	13:44	5:49	8.7	14.7
Midday Dook	Northbound	11:20	4:10	5.8	17.8
Midday Peak	Southbound	11:31	4:03	6.5	17.5
PM Peak	Northbound	18:16	9:55	9.2	11.0
	Southbound	13:55	5:58	7.7	14.5

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Gilman Street and Cutting Boulevard

Table 20: San Pablo Avenue (Segment 7) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Dook	Northbound	10:23	3:37	6.8	16.3
АМ Реак	Southbound	10:52	4:07	6.7	15.6
Midday Dook	Northbound	09:58	3:16	6.8	17.0
Midday Peak	Southbound	11:07	4:30	6.3	15.2
PM Peak	Northbound	19:16	11:46	10.0	8.8
	Southbound	11:12	4:05	6.7	15.1

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Stanford Avenue and Gilman Street

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Table 21. San Fablo Avenue (Segment 6) before Traver Time Summary						
age ed oh)						
.9						
.7						
.4						
.0						
.8						
.1						
3						

Table 21: San Pablo Avenue (Segment 8) "Before" Travel Time Summary

Note: Travel time survey conducted between West Grand Avenue and Stanford Avenue

Table 22: San Pablo Dam Road "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Deak	Eastbound	2:28	1:45	1.5	8.0
AM Peak	Westbound	1:23	0:35	1.4	14.1
Midday Deak	Eastbound	2:28	1:40	1.8	8.0
Midday Peak	Westbound	1:47	0:59	1.7	11.0
PM Peak	Eastbound	3:13	2:24	2.0	6.1
	Westbound	1:46	0:56	1.4	11.2

Note: Travel time survey conducted between San Pablo Avenue and Amador Street/I-80 EB Ramp

Table 23: University Avenue "Before" Travel Time Summary

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
AM Book	Eastbound	1:03	0:21	1.1	17.9
AM Peak	Westbound	1:16	0:31	1.1	14.7
Midday Dook	Eastbound	1:41	0:52	1.1	11.2
Midday Peak	Westbound	0:59	0:12	0.5	18.8
PM Peak	Eastbound	1:59	1:01	1.1	9.5
	Westbound	1:57	1:09	1.6	9.6

Note: Travel time survey conducted between 6th Street and San Pablo Street

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Time Period	Direction	Average Travel Time (min:sec)	Average Stop Delay (min:sec)	Average Stops (#)	Average Speed (mph)
	Eastbound	4:52	1:35	4.3	20.0
Alvi Peak	Westbound	4:14	1:07	2.7	22.9
Midday Deals	Eastbound	4:56	1:39	4.0	19.7
Midday Peak	Westbound	3:43	0:36	2.4	26.1
PM Peak	Eastbound	7:06	3:22	5.6	13.7
	Westbound	4:30	1:04	3.6	21.5

Table 24: West Grand Avenue "Before" Travel Time Summary

Note: Travel time survey conducted between Wake Avenue and San Pablo Avenue

Oversaturated Intersection Locations

An intersection with oversaturated conditions can be defined as one where the approach volume is greater than the intersection capacity, resulting in traffic during a specific amount of time (typically an hour) not being served. The goal is to identify these locations to determine if there is a need to adjust the turning movement volumes to capture the actual approach volume rather than just those vehicles that are being served (counted).

Table 25, on the next page, highlights some of the critical intersections identified from the field review and where the traffic models indicate the intersections or movements are at or nearing capacity during various peak periods. Careful consideration will be taken at these locations during the timing analysis and in selection of optimum cycle lengths and splits. At most of the intersections, the movements cleared within the peak hour that counts were collected, thus adjustments to the volumes aren't necessary. There were specific movements observed to be at or just over capacity at various intersections, but it is estimated that adjustments to the signal timing would increase the effective capacity of these movements.

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Table 25: Near or Over Capacity Locations Summary

(Time Period)	Intersection – Movement At or Near Capacity
	San Pablo Avenue/Richmond Parkway – WB left
	San Pablo Avenue/Robert Miller Drive - WB left
	San Pablo Avenue/Vale Road - SB through
	San Pablo Dam Road/I-80 EB Ramp - WB through
	San Pablo Avenue/Potrero Avenue - WB left
	Central Avenue/Pierce Street - NB through
AM	Central Avenue/San Joaquin Street - SB through
	San Pablo Avenue/Solano Avenue - SB through
	San Pablo Avenue/Gilman Street - SB through
	San Pablo Avenue/University Avenue - SB through
	San Pablo Avenue/Ashby Avenue - WB left
	Powell Street/I-80 EB Ramp - NB left
	San Pablo Dam Road/I-80 Ramps - NB left (EB Ramp)
	Central Avenue/I-80 EB Ramp - WB through
Midday	San Pablo Avenue/Carlson Avenue - SB left
	San Pablo Avenue/University Avenue - SB left
	San Pablo Avenue/John Muir Parkway - SB left
	San Pablo Avenue/Sycamore Avenue - NB through
	San Pablo Avenue/Richmond Parkway - EB left
	San Pablo Avenue/Robert Miller Drive - WB left, NB through
	San Pablo Avenue/Vale Road - EB left
	San Pablo Avenue/I-80 Ramps - EB through, NBTL (Amador St)
	San Pablo Avenue/Solano Avenue - EB left
	Central Avenue/San Joaquin Street - SB through, NB through
PM	Central Avenue/I-80 EB Ramp - WB through
	Buchanan Street/I-80 WB Ramp - SB left
	San Pablo Avenue/Cedar Street - NB through
	University Avenue/6th Street - NB left
	Ashby Avenue/7th Street - SB through, WB through
	San Pablo Avenue/Ashby Avenue - NB through
	Frontage Road/I-80 WB Ramps - EB through
	West Grand Avenue/Mandela Parkway - WB left, EB through/left

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley **»Horn**

Actuated Settings Review

A review of the existing "actuated" (initial timing) settings was conducted to identify opportunities to minimize delay during non-peak, free or non-coordinated periods and to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety. The analysis included a review of the pedestrian intervals, minimum and maximum green intervals, and yellow intervals.

Phase sequence changes and conditional service will also be reviewed during the coordination analysis. The following sections outline the recommendations for the various actuated settings.

Pedestrian Timing

A review of the existing pedestrian timing, including pedestrian clearance intervals (flashing don't walk or FDW) and Walk intervals, was conducted at each of the project signals. FDW intervals were reviewed based on the California MUTCD (CA MUTCD) guidance. CA MUTCD guidance for determining pedestrian clearance intervals, as provided in Section 4E.06 paragraph #8, is as follows:

"...the pedestrian clearance time should be sufficient to allow a pedestrian crossing in the crosswalk who left the curb or shoulder at the end of the WALKING PERSON (symbolizing WALK) signal indication to travel at a walking speed of 3.5 feet per second to at least the far side of the traveled way or to a median of sufficient width for pedestrians to wait."

The methodology for calculating FDW intervals varies by agency. The methodology used for each agency is included in the **Appendix** along with a table summarizing the crosswalk lengths and existing and recommended FDW pedestrian intervals.

Yellow and Red Intervals

The latest CA MUTCD guidelines call for establishment of the yellow interval based on the 85th percentile speed (if available), as shown in **Table 26**, with the 85th percentile speed rounded up to the nearest 5 miles per hour. For locations where 85th percentile speeds were not available, the yellow was reviewed based on posted speed using the values as shown in **Table 27**.

Approach Speed – 85 th Percentile (mph)	Yellow Interval (seconds)
25 or less	3.0
30	3.2
35	3.6
40	3.9
45	4.3

Table 26: Minimum Yellow Clearance Based on 85th Percentile Speed

I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing Final Existing Conditions Memorandum

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

Table 27: Minimum	Yellow Clearance	Based on the	Posted Speed Limit
	renorr ereurance	bused on the	r obteu opeeu Emme

Approach Speed – Posted (mph)	Yellow Interval (seconds)
15	3.0
20	3.2
25	3.6
30	3.7
35	4.1
40	4.4
45	4.8

A summary of the existing speeds and resultant yellow intervals is provided in the Appendix.

Currently, the signals have varying red clearance intervals. CA MUTCD indicates that red clearance is not required, although generally a minimum of 0.5 seconds of all red clearance time for protected left turns and 1.0 second of red clearance time for through movements is used. Red clearance intervals for all locations are provided in the **Appendix**.

Minimum and Maximum Green Intervals

Typically a minimum of four (4) seconds and a maximum of ten (10) seconds of green time should be used. In special circumstances, where the main-street phase is very heavy, a minimum green time of greater than ten (10) seconds is acceptable.

The CA MUTCD, within section 4D.105 (CA), requires that minimum green time be sufficient for a stopped bicycle to cross the road when the light turns green at locations where bicycle sensitive detection exists. Even where bicycle sensitive detection does not exist, it is recommended the minimum green to be sufficient for bicycle crossing at locations with dedicated Class II bicycle lanes. The minimum green times were reviewed to confirm the existing times, with the following methodology used:

$$\begin{array}{l} G_{min} + Y + R_{clear} \geq 6 \text{sec} + \frac{W + 6 \text{ft}}{14.7 \frac{\text{ft}}{\text{sec}}} \\ G_{min} = \text{Length of minimum green interval (sec)} \\ Y = \text{Length of yellow interval (sec)} \\ R_{clear} = \text{Length of red clearance interval (sec)} \\ W = \text{Distance from limit line to far side of last conflicting lane (ft)} \end{array}$$



The results of the review of minimum green times for bicycles is included in the **Appendix**. Based on the review, changes to the minimum green times are recommended at several project

I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing Final Existing Conditions Memorandum

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

intersections. In addition, the agencies may want to consider raising the minimum green times at the locations with less than four (4) seconds. These locations are also highlighted in the **Appendix**. At all other intersections, the minimum green times appear to be reasonable and no changes are recommended.

There is a wide range in maximum green intervals throughout the project intersections. Adjustments may be necessary once the recommended splits are developed to ensure that the maximum split times accommodate the new splits or to reduce the amount of time a phase receives. Additional review of the minimum and maximum green times will be completed during the coordination analysis and implementation of the coordination plans. Adjustments to these parameters can typically be identified more often during the detailed coordination analysis and fine-tuning review.

Existing Conditions Traffic Model

Once all the data was collected, the existing conditions traffic models were developed using the Synchro 8 software for the AM, midday, and PM peak periods. Peak hour turning movement volumes, lane information, and travel speeds were used for development of the models. In addition, existing phasing timing parameters were coded in the model.

The models were calibrated by verifying that the model data, such as queue lengths, degree of saturation, average delay, and travel time reasonably matched the observed conditions in the field. Adjustments to input data such as saturation flow rates, travel speeds, traffic volumes, and lane geometry (i.e. locations where vehicles use a wide single lane as two lanes), were reviewed to achieve a reasonable match between the model and observed conditions. Existing timing outputs from the Synchro Models are included in the **Appendix**.

ATTACHMENT C

Kimley »Horn

APPENDIX

I-80 ICM Signal Re-timing Final Existing Conditions Memorandum 21

ATTACHMENT C

Appendix Table of Contents:

Appendix A – Intersection List

Appendix B – 24-hour Tube Counts

Appendix C – "Before" Study Travel Time Summaries

Appendix D – Actuated Timings

Appendix D1 – Albany

Appendix D2 – Berkeley

Appendix D3 – Caltrans

Appendix D4 – Contra Costa County

Appendix D5 – El Cerrito

Appendix D6 – Emeryville

Appendix D7 – Hercules

Appendix D8 – Oakland

Appendix D9 – Pinole

Appendix D10 – Richmond

Appendix D11 – San Pablo

Appendix E – Existing Timing Summaries

Appendix E1 – Albany

Appendix E2 – Berkeley

Appendix E3 – Caltrans

Appendix E4 – Contra Costa County

Appendix E5 – El Cerrito

Appendix E6 – Emeryville

Appendix E7 – Hercules

Appendix E8 – Oakland

Appendix E9 – Pinole

Appendix E10 – Richmond

Appendix E11 – San Pablo

I-80 ICM Signal Timing

From:	Sara Lunson <saralunson@gmail.com></saralunson@gmail.com>
Sent:	Sunday, April 21, 2019 1:15 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur maze

Dear sir or madam.

I am concerned about this project and do not think this is worth the ecological disruption or money spender when there are pot holes all over alameda county and bad road surface on the freeways.

Please can you tell me how many permits a year are asked for that exceed 13 ft for the east bay?

Please can you tell me the projected cost and time?

Regards

Comment 213

From:	Hillary_russak@hotmail.com
Sent:	Monday, April 22, 2019 1:11 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Hillary_russak@hotmail.com on April 22nd, 2019 at 01:11PM (PDT).

name: Hillary Russak

email: Hillary_russak@hotmail.com

telephone: 650-274-6939

comment: I'm concerned about two overall issues:

-The added traffic, noise, and respiratory/pollution risks to my neighborhood for the execution of the plans, and -The goal to bring all trucks that currently must take an an alternate route to my neighborhood for their movement to and from the port.

The impact from trucks going to/from the port already creates a sooty, noisy, polluted environment for those of us living in the shadow of the maze.

Now, you want to concentrate even more such impact on this small area.

I say, "no." You cannot further pollute and destroy this lower-income neighborhood for the benefit of the whole region. The limiting height of the freeway creates some barrier redirecting a small portion of the Bay Area's trucking traffic, and, thereby sharing the impact of that noise and pollution. It's unacceptable to expect one neighborhood to continually absorb these impacts, just because we're not among the wealthy who can afford to live in the hills and suburbs.

From: Sent: To:	Brandie.albright@gmail.com Monday, April 22, 2019 9:58 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Brandie.albright@gmail.com on April 22nd, 2019 at 09:57PM (PDT).

name: Brandie Albright email: Brandie.albright@gmail.com telephone: 520-360-9691 comment: As a resident of Oakland adjacent to the Maze, I'm deeply concerned about:

1. The traffic impacts on 1-80 N/S which are already one of the *worst* traffic areas in the Bay Area

and

2. To say that air quality in the area where your proposing to re-route port-bound trucks to won't be affected is simply false. By redirecting port-bound truck traffic CalTrans will effectively be pumping in more carcinogenic air quality to a part of the Bay that is already egregiously impacted thanks to port activity and the freeways.

Do not move forward with this project.

From: Sent: To: Subject:	yvonne@pbpi.com Tuesday, April 23, 2019 12:44 AM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by yvonne@pbpi.com on April 23rd, 2019 at 12:43AM (PDT).

name: yvonne behrens

email: yvonne@pbpi.com

telephone: 5404670387

comment: Concerned about caltran's MacArthur maze re-doing. If the only purpose of this is to raise the bridges, I am unsure as to the need and the disruption that it would cause to traffic and Emeryville seems much too great for something that may not be necessary. I do find that the freeway at that juncture is a bit cluttered and if there were talk about somehow ameliorating the traffic flow, I would be interested in hearing that. Thank you.

Yvonne Behrens

Comment 216

From:	Jskoman@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, April 23, 2019 6:26 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jskoman@gmail.com on April 23rd, 2019 at 06:26AM (PDT).

name: Jim Koman email: Jskoman@gmail.com telephone: 804-279-3118 comment: Please articulate why this is needed. I live in Emeryville and the Macarthur maze is a key freeway access point. Also concerned about heavy trucks using residential streets during construction.

From:	shessini@hotmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, April 23, 2019 10:36 AM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by shessini@hotmail.com on April 23rd, 2019 at 10:35AM (PDT).

name: Sylvie Hessini email: shessini@hotmail.com telephone: 415-725-2421

comment: I live on Park ave in Emeryville. I am very concerned regarding the impact of this ill conceived project. The construction noise, toxic air and displacement of large trucks on our already maximally congested streets will be calamitous. Additionally, 80, 880 and the maze are already at a breaking point! There's no room for more traffic in safe fashion, even with the height updates on the freeways at the maze. We need to continue spreading the traffic around so that west oakland and emeryville don't bear the brunt of toxic air, noise and mass crowding of trucks. This is a very BAD idea! Please reconsider.

Comment 218

From:	kevin.mulvey@gmail.com
Sent:	Tuesday, April 23, 2019 3:08 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by kevin.mulvey@gmail.com on April 23rd, 2019 at 03:07PM (PDT).

name: Kevin CW Mulvey email: kevin.mulvey@gmail.com telephone: 610-235-6541

comment: I am strongly opposed to causing this amount of stress, dirt, pollution and massive inconvenience simply to accommodate some trucks that would like to use a larger size container. Let them 1) modify their trucks or 2) find another route or 3) find another port or 4) put it on trains or 5) use the trucks as they are. Our community has already spent more than 4 years fighting against a deceptive developer (Phil Tagami) who promised a benign bulk export terminal at the former Army base, and instead contracted in secret w Utah counties to ship coal. The people of this community have suffered enough. No more "development" that benefits others, at our expense.



April 23, 2019

Rebecca De Pont, Associate Environmental Planner California Department of Transportation, District 4 PO Box 23660, MS 8B Oakland, CA 94623

Dear Ms. De Pont:

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration (ND) / Environmental Assessment for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project (Project) located in the City of Oakland (City). EBMUD has the following comments.

GENERAL

EBMUD owns and operates multiple rights-of-way (R/W) near the proposed Project as shown on the attached maps. R/W's 5550 and 4051 A&B are 25-feet-wide interconnected easements southeast of the project area. R/W 4950, R/W 823, and R/W 822 are 25-feet-wide easements that are connected to additional R/W's further north and contain EBMUD's Special District No. 1 interceptor system. R/W 1741-A and R/W 1741-B are 50-feet-wide easements that provide access to a 12-inch water distribution main that serves the East Bayshore Recycled Water Treatment Plant and the surrounding services. The integrity of these pipelines and interceptors needs to be maintained at all times. Any proposed construction activity in EBMUD rights-of-way would be subject to the terms and conditions determined by EBMUD including relocation of the water mains and/or rights-of-way at the project sponsor's expense

WATER RECYCLING

EBMUD's Policy 9.05 requires that customers use non-potable water, including recycled water, for non-domestic purposes when it is of adequate quality and quantity, available at reasonable cost, not detrimental to public health and not injurious to plant, fish and wildlife to offset demand on EBMUD's limited potable water supply. Appropriate recycled water uses could include landscape irrigation, commercial and industrial process uses, toilet and urinal flushing in non-residential buildings and other applications including construction water.

The proposed Project is located within EBMUD's East Bayshore recycled water service area in the proximity of recycled water distribution pipelines. As such, EBMUD recommends that the project sponsor continue to coordinate with EBMUD to provide recycled water for any potential

375 ELEVENTH STREET , OAKLAND , CA 94507-4240 , TOLL FREE 1-806-40-EBMUD

Re: Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration / Environmental Assessment for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Rebecca De Pont, Associate Environmental Planner April 23, 2019 Page 2

outdoor irrigation and construction purposes that could be trucked from EBMUD's Main Wastewater Treatment Plant (MWWTP)_that is adjacent to the Project. Additionally, the project sponsor should make sure to coordinate their construction activities with EBMUD to avoid and protect the existing recycled water pipeline located within the Project area.

WASTEWATER

EBMUD's MWWTP and interceptor system are located in close proximity to the proposed Project, in some cases directly underneath structures that are proposed to be modified as part of the Project. EBMUD's North, South, and Adeline Interceptors are all located between structural supports of the various highway overpasses in the MacArthur Maze area. EBMUD's primary electrical substation that provides power to the entire MWWTP is located directly underneath the southbound Interstate 880 overpass. EBMUD owns a tunnel aligned directly beneath these highway overpasses and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks that allow access into and out of the MWWTP at the northeast corner of the site. This gate provides an alternate entry and exit point for staff and emergency vehicles. These facilities are all critical to the continued operation of the EBMUD wastewater system, and necessary to protecting public health and the health of the San Francisco Bay. Damage to MWWTP facilities could result in interruptions in normal wastewater operations and/or make it difficult or impossible to operate the plant in compliance with applicable permits and other regulatory requirements. In addition, construction activities could affect EBMUD operations and the safety of EBMUD employees if activities do not adequately prevent materials, equipment, or other debris from falling onto EBMUD property.

Caltrans has already proactively reached out to EBMUD and given EBMUD the opportunity to provide input through the project development process. EBMUD appreciates the opportunity to coordinate with Caltrans on this Project, and requests that Caltrans facilitate EBMUD's continued participation as the project moves through the environmental documentation, design, and construction phases to ensure that activities associated with the project do not negatively impact the safety of EBMUD's staff and the operation of EBMUD's facilities.

If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact Timothy R. McGowan, Senior Civil Engineer, Major Facilities Planning Section at (510) 287-1981.

Sincerely,

Dave FRenten

David J. Rehnstrom Manager of Water Distribution Planning

DJR:CC:nl sb19_043.doc

Attachment





 From:
 jpsf@me.com

 Sent:
 Tuesday, April 23, 2019 7:53 PM

 To:
 MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT

 Subject:
 MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by jpsf@me.com on April 23rd, 2019 at 07:52PM (PDT).

name: James Stephenson

email: jpsf@me.com

comment: This project will have detrimental effects on Emeryville: traffic congestion, unsafe streets for bicyclists and pedestrians due to additional traffic, noise pollution, air pollution (diesel trucks working on the project) and so on. This project also isn't necessary. Please stop this useless project that spends too much money and negatively impacts the Emeryville community.

Thank you

From:	bryce2@obviously.com
Sent:	Tuesday, April 23, 2019 8:15 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by bryce2@obviously.com on April 23rd, 2019 at 08:14PM (PDT).

name: Bryce Nesbitt email: bryce2@obviously.com telephone: 510-558-8770 comment: Dear Caltrans;

This is going to be a tough one to "mitigate". Addition of the heaviest truck traffic on I-80 is clearly not just an effect but a goal.

I-80 north of the maze is clearly already bad, this will just make things worse. The crash rate is high, and the traffic makes the carpool lanes not work (which leads to more traffic).

Possible mitigation:

(0) Automated speed limit enforcement for trucks, based on travel time from transponders and plate readers. This may address some after hours truck crash danger.

(1) Significant automated cameras and enforcement pockets to clear cheaters out of the carpool lane. Make those lanes work!

(2) Add an additional 2 feet between the carpool lane and the 1st travel lane. Use this so the carpool lane is less affected by stopped traffic, and as a motorcycle "lane split" lane. This may be the greatest improvement short of a 2nd full time carpool lane.

(3) In peak hours electronically create a second carpool/bus lane.

(4) As part of the ramp changes at the maze, rebuild the MacArthur Boulevard onramp so that AC Transit Transbay buses can reach the bridge bi-bidirectionally. Travel time improvements results in ridership increases. Currently AC Transit can only use this access point ONE WAY.



April 24, 2019

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Cristin Hallissy Caltrans District 4 111 Grand Ave, MS 8B Oakland, CA 94612

DISTRICT

ALAMEDA COUNTY John J. Bauters Pauline Russo Cutter Scott Haggerty Nate Miley

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY John Gioia David Hudson (Chair) Karen Mitchoff Mark Ross

> MARIN COUNTY Katie Rice (Vice Chair)

NAPA COUNTY Brad Wagenknecht

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY Rafael Mandelman Hillary Ronen Tyrone Jue (SF Mayor's Appointee)

SAN MATEO COUNTY David Canepa Carole Groom Doug Kim

SANTA CLARA COUNTY Margaret Abe-Koga Cindy Chavez Liz Kniss Rod G. Sinks (Secretary)

> SOLANO COUNTY James Spering Lori Wilson

SONOMA COUNTY Teresa Barrett Shirlee Zane

Jack P. Broadbent EXECUTIVE OFFICER/APCO



RE: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project – Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Cristin Hallissy,

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) staff has reviewed the Initial Study (IS) with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the MacArthur Maze (Maze) Vertical Clearance Project (Project). The Project proposes to partially lower, raise, replace, or reconstruct connectors in the Maze located near the Oakland/Emeryville border. These four alternatives are being proposed to increase the vertical clearances at three locations in the Maze to meet the current Caltrans standard of 16 feet 6 inches to allow for more efficient travel of freight and oversized vehicles.

The Air District is concerned about potential local air quality impacts from the Project. We recommend that a more comprehensive analysis be conducted in an environmental impact report (EIR).

The West Oakland community is disproportionately impacted by air pollution, especially diesel particulate matter, a toxic air contaminant. We have identified West Oakland as a priority community through our Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program and, more recently, through our Community Health Protection Program. The Air District has worked for many years to improve air quality and health in West Oakland, and these efforts continue today as we currently work with community partners to develop a West Oakland Community Action Plan. Accordingly, any increase in emissions in West Oakland would be extremely concerning, as would increased emissions in Emeryville and other affected communities.

We disagree with the Initial Study's conclusion that because the proposed project is exempt from federal Conformity requirements, there would be no air quality impacts. The California Environmental Quality Act requires lead agencies to evaluate potential air quality impacts of a proposed project, regardless of whether it is subject to the Conformity process.

375 BEALE STREET, SUITE 600 · SAN FRANCISCO CA · 94105 · 415.771.6000 · www.baaqmd.gov

Hallissy Page 2	April 24, 2019
•	

We strongly recommend that Caltrans conduct a robust analysis of potential air quality impacts and include the following information and analysis in the EIR:

- Provide baseline information on the Bay Area Air Basin's attainment status for all criteria pollutants and the implications for the region if the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) are not attained or maintained by statutory deadlines.
- 2. Provide baseline information regarding existing sources of air pollution and air pollution concentrations in the Emeryville and West Oakland communities.
- Quantify the Project's potential construction and operational impacts to local and regional air quality. The analysis should evaluate whether the project will have a cumulatively considerable net increase for construction and operational emissions, including emissions from re-routed traffic during construction.
- Include a discussion of the current health effects of exposure to criteria pollutants occurring in Emeryville and West Oakland.
- Estimate and evaluate the potential health risk to existing and future sensitive populations within the Project area from toxic air contaminants (TAC) and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) as a result of the project's construction and operations.
- 6. Staff recommends all feasible measures be implemented, both onsite and offsite, to minimize air quality and GHG impacts. The EIR should prioritize onsite measures, followed by offsite measures within the Emeryville and West Oakland communities and near the proposed Project. Examples of potential emission reduction measures that may be evaluated and considered include, but are not limited to:
 - Stringent, enforceable measures to keep detoured traffic off local residential streets.
 - Prohibiting or minimizing the use of diesel fuel, consistent with the Air District's Diesel Free By '33 initiative (<u>http://dieselfree33.baaqmd.gov/</u>)
 - Requiring construction vehicles to operate with the highest tier engines commercially available.
 - Prohibit trucks from idling for more than two minutes or prohibit idling altogether.
 - Implement a program that incentivizes construction workers to carpool, use EVs, or use public transit to commute to and from construction sites. The program may include the following features, if feasible:
 - a. Provide a shuttle service to and from the nearby BART station;
 - b. Provide preferential parking to carpool vehicles, vanpool vehicles, and EVs;
 - c. Schedule work shifts to be compatible with the schedules of local transit services.
 - Implement waste reduction, disposal, and recycling strategies in accordance with sections 4.408 and 5.408 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CALGreen).

Hallissy Page 3	April 24, 2019
0	

- Plant dense rows of trees and other vegetation as environmental biofilters along detour routes, at a minimum near sensitive land uses (e.g. residential, child care centers, schools, elderly facilities, hospitals, etc.).
- Provide air filtration systems rated at a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV)
 13 or higher in buildings associated with sensitive land uses along detour routes.
- Evaluate the Project's consistency with the Air District's 2017 Clean Air Plan (2017 CAP). The 2017 CAP can be found on the Air District's website <u>http://www.baagmd.gov/plans-andclimate/air-quality-plans/current-plans</u>.
- The Air District's CEQA website contains several tools and resources to assist lead agencies in analyzing project alone and cumulative air quality impacts. These tools include guidance on quantifying local emissions and exposure impacts. View and download tools at <u>http://www.baagmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-actceqa/ceqa-tools</u>.
- 9. Include all appendices or technical documents relating to the air quality, toxic air contaminant and GHG analysis, such as emissions assessment calculation and the health risk assessment files. Without all the supporting air quality documentation, the public may be unable to effectively review the air quality and GHG analyses in a timely manner.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, or would like to schedule a meeting, please contact Areana Flores, Environmental Planner, at (415) 749-4616, or <u>aflores@baaqmd.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Greg Nudd Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer

cc: BAAQMD Director John J. Bauters BAAQMD Director Pauline Russo Cutter BAAQMD Director Scott Haggerty BAAQMD Director Nate Miley WOEIP Co-Director Ms. Margaret Gordon WOEIP Co-Director Brian Beveridge CARB Executive Officer Richard Corey Oakland City Councilmember Lynette Gibson McElhaney



Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

April 23, 2019

Michael Hursh, General Manager

Rebecca De Pont, Associate Environmental Planner California Department of Transportation, District 4 PO Box 23660, MS 8B Oakland, CA 94623

Dear Rebecca De Pont,

The MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project will affect a key regional junction for AC Transit service. As proposed, the project has the potential to greatly disrupt and delay Transbay Express and local bus services, with no benefit to transit as either a project construction mitigation or project outcome.

This letter details AC Transit's concerns with the project as proposed in the Initial Study (IS). It also advocates for larger project scoping, including transit enhancements to benefit the region's growth at a potentially marginal increase in project cost and scale, depending on the alternative pursued.

AC Transit currently runs Transbay Express buses on I-580 leading up to the approaches to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, including lines B, E, NX, NX1, NX2, NXC, NX3, NX4, P and V. On the I-880 to westbound I-80 connector, AC Transit operates lines 800, O, OX, S, SB and W. Along I-80, AC Transit operates lines C, F, FS, G, H, L, LA and Z. Any weekday delays on these Transbay lines will affect over 14,000 passengers per day, while weekend delays will impact over 3,000 passengers per day.

Major local bus lines on surface streets that could be affected by traffic congestion caused by diverting motorists include lines 72, 72M, 72R and 800 serving San Pablo Avenue and Line NL serving West Grand Avenue and Grand Avenue. These lines alone carry over 13,000 daily passengers. Construction detours could also affect Emeryville traffic and impact over 9,000 daily passengers on lines 57, 36, 29 operating on and around Powell St.

By proposing a Negative Declaration for this project, Caltrans asserts there will be no effect on Air Quality, Transportation and Traffic, with a less than significant impact on noise. AC Transit strongly disagrees with these assertions, which consider none of the impacts during the construction period. Also, this proposed major infrastructure project centers around the most impactful choke points of the San Francisco/East Bay commute affecting 14,000 daily trips, projected to grow by a third by 2025. It would be a regional wasted opportunity if Caltrans did not use this project to both meet its vertical height clearance goals but also improve the daily commute for all Bay Area residents.

Section 1.2 Purpose and Need

The IS states the purpose of the project is to meet the Caltrans standards for vertical height clearance, which would allow access for oversized freight vehicles through the maze. While there are stated worthy goals of reducing the numbers of oversized vehicles diverting through local streets, and subsequent reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, the numbers of these affected vehicles (and therefore the scale of this impact) is not specified. This *need* is not articulated anywhere in the IS document. The lack of information on which to initiate a project of this scale, let alone see it through to an initial study is a critical flaw.

Section 1.4.2 Construction Impacts

All the alternatives would create delays to existing Transbay Express bus service, resulting in added operating costs and lost ridership. This should be detailed in the IS. Based on the time required for closures, the construction of Alternative C would cause the highest level of impact to Transbay buses and Alternative B would have the least disruption to existing operations. In addition, all project alternatives would cause traffic to divert onto local streets during construction, creating delays to local bus lines described above.

Section 1.4.2 Project Alternatives

AC Transit recommends any alternative selected should include significant improvements to transit priority in its scope. The most suitable Alternative to include transit priority is Alternative C, which could include widened connector ramps to provide HOV or transit-only lanes. The lanes would benefit AC Transit Transbay Bus service and other HOVs.

Section 1.4.2 Transportation System Management & Transportation Demand Management

The IS states that "No TDM or TSM measures have been incorporated into the build alternatives for this project." AC Transit urges Caltrans to re-consider the scope of this project to include transit benefits to facilitate regional growth and mode shift to transit and help meet the state's GHG reduction goals.

The Traffic Management Plan should include mitigations that reduce construction delay to Transbay and local bus service. Overnight or weekend closures should be undertaken to minimize impacts to transit and best management practices to shorten construction times.

Section 2. Affected Environment

- AC Transit's Major Corridors Plan and Multimodal Design Guidelines should be considered under the local plans and programs list. There will be local impacts during the construction phase and Caltrans should refer to these documents to consider the type of improvements for local arterials as mitigations.
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Regional Transportation Plan should be considered under the regional plans and programs list. The plan discusses the Freight Emissions Reduction Action Plan that supports the purpose of this project. It also details recommendations from the Core Capacity Transit Study that outline the importance of transit improvements to support focused growth and reduce GHGs, specifically on the capacity of the

Bay Bridge corridor. Caltrans should explore any synergies from combining these goals into one project. It could be more cost effective than pursuing these goals individually.

AC Transit disagrees with the statement on the negligible impacts to growth:

"There would be no changes in access to employment, shopping, or other destinations, or permanent impacts to travel times, travel behavior, trip patterns, or the attractiveness of some areas to development."

There are two points Caltrans needs to consider:

- This project explicitly allows for increased truck movements through the maze. It will increase
 slow moving traffic with the potential to increase travel times for all vehicles. Caltrans needs to
 quantify this impact.
- The opportunity cost of not including transit/HOV lanes in the project scope is not included. The
 project could lead to lower regional growth and reduction in attractiveness for development etc.,
 due to the increased congestion projected through 2040.

Section 2.5.4 Construction Mitigation for Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

There is no mention of the impacts to transit as part of the potential construction closures. AC Transit requests the following mitigation measures for any of the alternative's construction phases:

- Install temporary bus lanes on I-580, new or modified connectors and on the following surface streets: West Grand between I-580 and the bridge, San Pablo Avenue between 20th Street and 40th Street.
- Fund and expedite the planning and design phases of the Powell St On-Ramp Westbound I-80 transit priority project. This intersection could be critical during any construction phase with detoured traffic. Expediting and funding this project would help mitigate transit impacts if traffic is detoured to I-80.

Our Board of Directors is expected to pass a resolution on April 24th, 2019, officially supporting these mitigation measures as part of the project.

Long-Term Project Impacts - Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reductions

Senate Bill 391 sets greenhouse gas emission targets. The IS asserts that estimates of greenhouse gases cannot be made at the project alternative level. By considering construction impacts alone, the IS asserts that all the alternatives would have similar GHG impacts. However, there can be a significant difference in GHG emissions between alternatives during a lifetime of operations. For example, a design that results in time savings to transit or HOV travel time can promote a mode shift toward more sustainable means of transportation. This can be modeled and the GHG emission reductions calculated. Neglecting to include designs that meet both the project purpose and support the mode shift is a significant oversight that must be remedied before a final project alternative is selected.

A modification to the project could produce long-term emission reductions during the operation of the facility. In this regard, the project alternatives do not have the same climate change impacts based only on the embedded energy of construction. The section on "State Efforts" for GHG reduction, while noteworthy is not relevant to this project.

This approach encourages planning for sustainable highways by addressing climate risks while balancing environmental, economic, and social values—"the triple bottom line of sustainability."10 Program and project elements that foster sustainability and resilience also support economic vitality and global efficiency, increase safety and mobility, enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve the quality of life. Addressing these factors up front in the planning process will assist in decision making and improve efficiency at the program level, and will inform the analysis and stewardship needs of project-level decisionmaking.

From SB 391

(b) A strategies element that shall incorporate the broad system concepts and strategies synthesized from the adopted regional transportation plans prepared pursuant to Section 65080. The California Transportation Plan shall not be project specific.

Section 3.3.4 CEQA Conclusion

This section is mostly irrelevant regarding the GHG emissions of the various project alternatives. Caltrans is making a dubious claim that the state's policies, programs or projects (including those done by Caltrans elsewhere in the State) obviate the need and desirability to reduce GHG emissions associated with the long term operation of the project. Focusing only on construction impacts limits the necessary public disclosure of cumulative impacts.

The lack of transit and HOV accommodation in these design alternatives is a major oversight. Currently, buses and carpools on I=580 experience the same congestion as in the general purpose lanes. Enshrining this situation for the 40-year life of the project is not acceptable and under no circumstances should this project be undertaken in a manner that precludes needed improvements to the transit and HOV network.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the project. Unfortunately, the current iteration of the IS is lacking in a discussion of environmental impacts to AC Transit's service and riders as a result of the project and project construction. We look forward to seeing our comments addressed in the next iteration of the environmental documents and project scope.

Sincerely.

Michael Hursh General Manager

Ce: AC Transit Board of Directors Tony Tavares, Caltrans District 4 Director Sabrina Landreth, Oakland City Manager Christine Daniel, Emeryville City Manager Eric Levitt, Alameda City Manager Dee Williams-Ridley, Berkeley City Manager Therese McMillan, MTC Executive Director

ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT RESOLUTION NO. 19-015

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING TRANSIT PRIORITY IMPROVEMENTS TO MITIGATE CONGESTION ASSOCIATED WITH THE MACARTHUR MAZE VERTICAL CLEARANCE PROJECT

WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") has issued a draft Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for a proposed project to increase vertical clearance on some roadways within the MacArthur Maze; and

WHEREAS, the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District ("District" or "AC Transit") operates nearly 1,000 bus trips each day through the MacArthur Maze, carrying more than 14,000 passengers through the interchange each weekday; and

WHEREAS, the construction associated with the project will likely divert significant automobile, freight, and transit traffic onto streets in the cities of Berkeley, Emeryville, and Oakland; and

WHEREAS, this change in traffic patterns will result in significant delays for transit operations and customers as well as negatively impact conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians; and

WHEREAS, once complete, the project will lead to an increase in freight traffic through the interchange, competing for already limited space for transit and leading to delays and increased operating costs for the District; and

WHEREAS, the region has made relieving congestion and reducing automobile traffic across the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge a priority, including the completion of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Core Capacity Transit Study and through the recent passage of Regional Measure 3; and

WHEREAS, funding from Regional Measure 3 will result in a 30-percent increase in AC Transit Transbay service through the area which should be supported through opportunities to prioritize this increase in transit capacity; and

WHEREAS, the Alameda County Transportation Commission ("ACTC") has prioritized improvements to local bus transit service through its County-wide Transportation Plan, which has resulted in such efforts as the San Pablo Avenue Corridor Project; and

WHEREAS, the District plays a critical role in reducing congestion in the region and will continue to do so through planned efforts detailed in documents such as the Major Corridors Study; and

WHEREAS, the inclusion of elements supporting transit priority and facilitating complete streets (include transit, bicycles, and pedestrians) within the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance

Resolution No. 19-015

Page 1 of 3

Project is necessary mitigation for the impacts from construction and increased freight movement through the interchange; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans extended the public comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report to April 24, 2019 at 11:59 p.m. with public hearings held in Emeryville and Oakland on April 10 and 11, respectively.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Directors of the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District does resolve as follows:

<u>Section 1.</u> Requests that Caltrans include transit-only lanes on all roadways in the project where AC Transit currently operates transit service.

<u>Section 2.</u> Requests that Caltrans include measures to mitigate transit service disruption and prioritize transit service in identified mitigations during the construction phase of the project through improvements including but not limited to: dedicated transit lanes, transit signal priority, transit queue-jump lanes, bus stop optimization and traffic signal coordination/actuation.

<u>Section 3.</u> Requests that Caltrans coordinate with the cities of Berkeley, Emeryville and Oakland to provide dedicated transit lane access to the Bay Bridge.

<u>Section 4.</u> Requests that Caltrans ensure any elements of the project or mitigations associated with the project or its construction conform to and support existing regional plans being developed or already adopted by MTC, ACTC, the District, and the cities of Berkeley, Emeryville, and Oakland.

<u>Section 5.</u> This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage by four affirmative votes of the Board of Directors.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 24th day of April, 2019.

Walluce

Joe Wallace, President

Attest:

martytener

Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary

Resolution No. 19-015

Page 2 of 3

I, Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary for the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors held on the 24th day of April, 2019, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: VICE PRESIDENT ORTIZ, DIRECTORS YOUNG, HARPER, SHAW, PEEPLES, PRESIDENT WALLACE

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: WILLIAMS

ABSTAIN: NONE

Loda Arkeneiro

Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary

Approved as to Form and Content:

. .

Denise C. Standridge, General Counsel

Resolution No. 19-015

Page 3 of 3


Mary D. Nichols, Chair Jared Blumenfeld, CalEPA Secretary Gavin Newsom, Governor

April 24, 2019

Cristin Hallissy Senior Environmental Planner California Department of Transportation, District 4 111 Grand Ave, MS 8B Oakland, CA 94612

Dear Ms. Hallissy:

Thank you for providing the California Air Resources Board (CARB) the opportunity to provide comments to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) on the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) and proposed Negative Declaration (ND) for the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project (Project).

The goal of the Project is to allow for larger freight vehicles to travel through the MacArthur Maze by increasing vertical clearances at three locations. The MacArthur Maze is directly adjacent to the West Oakland community, and CARB is concerned that the Project has the potential to increase community exposure to harmful diesel particulate matter (diesel PM) and other air pollutant emissions.

Recent legislation has placed additional emphasis on the need to address communityscale impacts. Assembly Bill (AB) 617 (C. Garcia, Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017) established a new, community-focused framework to address air pollution disparities at the neighborhood level. Among other provisions, AB 617 requires CARB to identify communities with high cumulative exposure burdens to air pollution and select communities for community-specific emissions reduction programs and/or community air monitoring.

In September 2018, CARB's Governing Board selected West Oakland as one of the initial 10 communities for this community-focused action, recognizing the cumulative exposure from air pollution sources impacting the community like freight, freeways, industry, and seaport operations. The West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (WOEIP) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) are actively engaged in a planning process under AB 617 to develop and implement a community-specific action plan to reduce exposure to air pollution in West Oakland.

arb.ca.gov

1001 | Street • P.O. Box 2815 • Sacramento, California 95812

(800) 242-4450

Ms. Hallissy April 24, 2019 Page 2

AB 617 underscores the need for public agencies to collaborate with communities, industry, and each other to avoid further exacerbating elevated air pollution levels in communities across the State. Caltrans has indicated that the environmental process for the Project is on pause to allow Caltrans to review community, city, and other stakeholder feedback on the Project and determine what additional information and analysis is needed to address questions and concerns. CARB commends Caltrans for this decision. As Caltrans undertakes its new process to work with the community and other stakeholders, we submit the following comments for Caltrans to consider:

1. Community Engagement

In pausing the Project, Caltrans has taken an important first step towards addressing community concerns. Moving forward, Caltrans should continue to work closely with the community to understand potential impacts and identify mechanisms to improve outreach and public engagement associated with the Project, as well as future efforts.

2. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Caltrans prepared the IS/EA to examine the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives being considered for the Project. Although Caltrans has paused the environmental review, Caltrans expected to determine that the Project would not have a significant effect on the environment, including air quality, while also stating that the Project was not be required to include an air quality analysis. Caltrans cites title 40 CFR section 93.126 to support its assertion that it is exempt from seeking a determination that its Project conforms with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and therefore does not need to conduct an air quality study. As an initial matter, an exemption from conformity, even if applicable, does not speak directly to whether a project need not conduct a separate state-law CEQA analysis – the two regimes are distinct. Caltrans would need to point to an applicable CEQA exemption if it wishes to avoid an analysis.

Moreover, the exemption does not appear to be applicable: Title 40 CFR section 93.126 provides an exemption for conformity determinations for bridge replacement projects when there are relatively urgent safety risks to the general public related to the existing bridge's structural integrity. The Project's stated purpose is to enable a small population of freight vehicles that currently exceed the height limits of the MacArthur Maze to use the interchange, rather than remedying an alleged deficiency in the interchange's structural integrity that could put the general public, as a whole, in danger. As such, CARB believes that the exemption in title 40 CFR section 93.126 does not apply to the Project and that Caltrans must, instead, pursue a conformity determination.

Ms. Hallissy April 24, 2019 Page 3

In addition, even if the exemption in title 40 CFR section 93.126 applied to the Project, the exemption would only relate to national standards for criteria air pollutants subject to SIP measures, not toxic air contaminants (TACs) such as diesel PM or California criteria air pollutant standards.¹ These pollutants could still create locally significant impacts in a community that already experiences increased air pollution, even if the project did not affect regional criteria pollutant compliance. The IS/ND is currently deficient in informing the public and decision makers of the Project's generation of emissions, including TACs, during construction and beyond, until the end of the useful life of the project. This is especially important in areas, such as the Bay Area, where the air basin is in non-attainment for several criteria air pollutants.² Further, the California Supreme Court recently reaffirmed the requirement that when a lead agency prepares its CEOA document, it must make "a reasonable effort to discuss relevant specifics regarding the connection between two segments of information already contained in the EIR [or IS/ND], the general health effects associated with a particular pollutant and the estimated amount of that pollutant the project will likely produce."3

3. Project Justification

Caltrans has indicated that one of the primary goals of the project is to reduce the number of trucks that detour off of highways and onto local streets because of insufficient vertical clearance at the MacArthur Maze. To date, however, Caltrans has not provided information as to the scale of the current problem. Without information on the current number of trucks detouring onto local streets because of insufficient vertical clearance, it is unclear to CARB whether the Project is necessary or appropriate. Before moving forward with a new environmental analysis for the Project, CARB urges Caltrans to collect, analyze, and disseminate data that describe the number and type of trucks that are currently detouring that would otherwise use the MacArthur Maze. If these results demonstrate that there is not a large problem to address, Caltrans should consider not pursuing the Project.

More broadly, as Caltrans is aware, road capacity expansions tend to lead to increased vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and ultimately increased congestion as road use expands to match capacity. Caltrans should carefully review the Office of Planning and Research's guidance on these topics and ensure that they have been weighed both in

¹ See Mission Bay Alliance v. Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 160, 203, which provides a discussion of the evaluation of a project's TACs in the CEQA impact analysis context.

² http://www.baaqmd.gov/about-air-quality/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status.

³ Sierra Club v. County of Fresno (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 521.

Ms. Hallissy April 24, 2019 Page 4

the project justification and considered to the extent they bear upon any CEQA areas of analysis (for instance, increased traffic might lead to increased air pollution).

4. Air Quality Impacts and Mitigation

As Caltrans looks towards a new environmental review process, CARB is concerned about localized increases in air pollution exposure from several elements of the Project. Caltrans should carefully consider air quality issues in these areas and work towards fully mitigating any potential impacts should the Project move forward.

- a. Construction: Construction equipment and operations can contribute to increased air pollution in the community and greenhouse gas emissions, Although the IS/EA identifies a set of project-level strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from construction (e.g., including compliance with applicable air quality rules and regulations, proper tuning and maintenance, and limiting construction equipment idling time to two minutes), it does not discuss associated air quality impacts and does not consider the full set of feasible mitigations. For example, to maximize diesel emissions reductions from construction practices and equipment are utilized. Caltrans should also only contract with construction companies capable of meeting this requirement. CARB staff are available to further discuss technology availability and potential construction mitigation measures with Caltrans.
- b. Traffic detours during construction: Although traffic detours during construction would be temporary, the increased freight and passenger traffic on local streets has the potential to increase air pollution exposure in West Oakland, a community that already experiences a high cumulative exposure burden to air pollution. Even these temporary increases in exposure can create health impacts, particularly for vulnerable populations. CARB urges Caltrans to work with the community and technical experts to identify construction schedules and detour routes that would minimize exposure increases in the community. CARB staff are available to assist with this analysis as needed.
- c. Increased freight traffic through the MacArthur Maze: The goal of the Project is to allow for larger freight vehicles to travel through the MacArthur Maze. While there may be some exposure benefits associated with the Project if it successfully moves freight traffic currently driving on local streets onto the highway, the Project may have the consequence of increasing capacity for larger freight vehicle traffic, leading to increased concentration and duration of toxic air contaminant, criteria air pollutant, and greenhouse gas emissions. This

Ms. Hallissy April 24, 2019 Page 5

> would potentially exceed the baseline air pollution and congestion challenges in the area. Caltrans should consider these potential impacts in deciding whether to move forward with the Project and consider feasible mitigations.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. We appreciate the coordination with your staff to date and are available to participate as appropriate in any interagency working groups that Caltrans convenes. If you have questions, please contact Ms. Heather Arias, Chief, Community Planning Branch, at 916-322-6054 or by email at heather arias@arb.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Karen Magliano, Director Office of Community Air Protection

cc: Ms. Margaret Gordon Brian Beveridge Co-Directors West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project 349 Mandela Parkway Oakland, California 94607

> Jack Broadbent Chief Executive Officer/Air Pollution Control Officer Bay Area Air Quality Management District 375 Beale Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, California 94105

Henry Hilken, Director Planning and Climate Protection Bay Area Air Quality Management District 375 Beale Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, California 94105

CITY OF OAKLAND

DALZIEL BUILDING • 250 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA, SUITE 3315 • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612-2032

Planning and Building Department Office of the Director

(510) 238-3941 FAX (510) 238-6538 TDD (510) 238-3254

April 24, 2019

VIA EMAIL (MacArthurMaze@dot.ca.gov, tony.tavares@dot.ca.gov)

Tony Tavares Director, Caltrans District 4 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612

RE: MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Dear Director Tavares,

We have conducted a review of the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment, dated January 2019. We understand that the environmental review process and project overall have been paused while Caltrans determines the additional information and analysis needed to thoroughly assess the project need and impacts during construction. We sincerely appreciate this decision, as based upon our review of the report and all available project documentation we do not believe that there has been adequate analysis of the project impacts in the Initial Study to support the proposed Negative Declaration, and we believe that the environmental document is deficient. In addition, the City of Oakland was not adequately consulted in the development of the Initial Study, although our transportation facilities and communities will be affected by the project.

The City of Oakland is concerned that the information has not fully and quantitatively addressed in sufficient detail regarding why the project is being proposed, how the existing environment could be affected by the project, the potential impacts of each of alternative, and the proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures. As Caltrans continues to evaluate this project, the City of Oakland has identified areas requiring additional analysis, information and/or clarification as outlined herein:

Purpose and Need

The Purpose and Need for the proposed project does not provide information to address the following items:

- What are the project limits for reconstruction?
- What is the overall footprint of the study area?
- What are the number of trucks (daily, annually) that are currently diverted due to the height limitations within the MacArthur Maze?
- What alternative routes do these trucks use and what are the potential impacts of these diverted trucks?
- What would be the benefits if these trucks were no longer diverted from the MacArthur Maze?
- Have agencies (Port of Oakland, etc.) or operators (trucking companies, etc.) raised concerns about height restrictions? What agency/concerns were the impetus for this project?

Alternatives

Please consider whether there are additional alternatives that may meet the project purpose and needs (once further refined) and whether the alternatives presented are in fact necessary:

- Are there additional alternatives that meet the purpose and need that can result in lesser or no impacts? For instance, we believe that Detour No. 5 may meet the needs of oversized vehicles traveling Westbound on I-80 to Southbound I-880 without the disruptive construction period. Similarly, Detour No. 6 may meet the needs of vehicles traveling from Eastbound I-80 to Eastbound I-80.
- Is the vertical clearance project necessary to connect Westbound I-80 traffic with Eastbound I-580 since trucks are prohibited on I-580 after Grand Avenue?

Construction Impacts

The IS/EA summarizes details of construction at a high level, but information about the construction effort was not provided in sufficient detail to screen out the potential impacts during construction. The report should provide the following information:

- How would construction staging and falsework affect the Bay Bridge Trail?
- What are the specific staging plans for each design alternative? If staging area details have
 yet to be determined, how was the report able to conclude there would not be any
 construction-related impacts, particularly for Alternative C, where the staging area would
 extend beyond Caltrans ROW?
- What is the detailed construction schedule for each alternative, including partial and full lane closures (location and duration), hours of operation, number of workers by stage, oversize (heavy) equipment, off-site parking, and transportation needs?
- What are the impacts on adjacent land uses, including but not limited to the approved Mandela Hotel (on empty lot next to Target), the City's Tuff Shed site at 3401 Mandela Parkway, and the approved Emery Go-Round Yard located adjacent to Mandela under the I-580 ramps?

Transportation

MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

• What would be the detour route for each design alternative? Indicate the specific streets that would be used to detour the freeway traffic noting the volume of trucks and cars anticipated to use these detour routes and the associated time of day and night. Indicate the duration that the detour routes will be used. Based on this, the impacts during construction to traffic, air quality and noise need to be analyzed.

- How would detour routes be enforced such that regional/freeway traffic does not divert onto local residential streets, resulting in traffic safety, noise and air quality impacts?
- A summary of how bus service would be affected: what would bus routes be during construction, would additional bus service be needed to maintain schedules, what information would be provided to passengers, would any bus stops be closed during full closures on the MacArthur Maze? Would priority bus lanes be installed during construction to mitigate transit impacts?
- Overall, a Traffic Management Plan should have been developed with the City of Oakland, other impacted cities and transit agencies, and community stakeholders to identify and mitigate potential impacts. In particular, streets proposed as potential detour routes, including, but not limited to, San Pablo Avenue, Grand Avenue, and Mandela Parkway are high injury corridors where severe and fatal traffic injuries concentrate in the City of Oakland. The proposed project may significantly exacerbate traffic safety along these corridors and should explore opportunities to mitigate any potential impacts.

Noise

A Construction Noise Assessment for the proposed project was approved April 11, 2018 to ensure that construction activities would not result in a significant impact to nearby residents. To verify and ensure that adequate limits of the off-site impacts have been properly assessed related to the potential increases of truck traffic for both construction trucks and rerouted trucks/cars related to detours and road closure for stationary noise impact, a review of the assessment is requested to confirm these assumptions.

Also, if construction noise levels are expected to exceed the contract specification criteria or the construction noise levels exceedance of the ambient (baseline) noise level, and there are sensitive receptors near the project site, this level of detail should be included in the environmental document along with the associated mitigation or avoidance measures.

Visual/Aesthetics

Please provide the Visual Impact Assessment for further review.

For Alternative C along with other alternatives, it would be appropriate to review the checklist to determine the considerations for the level of analysis considered and documented to ensure compatibility and consistency including lighting.

Air Quality and Cultural Resources

Although the project is exempt under the Clean Air Act conformity rule under 40 CFR 93.126, Table 2- widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes) and an air quality study is not required, the document and technical review fails to provide full scope of off-site access and traffic detours that will impact the local communities related to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. The request for clarify the purpose and need should also be related to definition related to air quality. Therefore, an assumption without technical substantiation is requested to ensure minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special mobile source air toxic (MSAT) concerns.

Physical Environment

Please provide copies of all Technical Studies listed in Appendix E, including but not limited to:

- · Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff
- Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography
- Natural Environment
- Hazardous Materials
- Air Quality
- Noise/Vibration
- Traffic Impact Study. The traffic impact study should document the proposed benefits of the project from a traffic analysis perspective and demonstrate the proposed project would not result in any significant transportation-related impacts. The analysis should include a review of the crash history for the study area, including a crash analysis and collision diagrams for MacArthur Maze and the proposed detour routes, and associated mitigation or avoidance measures. Should the analysis determine that physical and/or operational elements (such as speed limit, drainage, lane widths, shoulder conditions, lighting, sun glare, sight distances, etc.) are contributing to the crashes or contributing to unsafe conditions then these elements should be addressed as part of the final design.

Funding

If there is any federal funding proposed to be used for this project, were there any other associated reports/analyses that were completed? For example, was there any review associated with Environmental Justice issues?

Biological Section

Mention of clearing and grubbing outside of the breeding season (February 1 – September 30) which indicates presence or suitable habitat so reviewing the technical studies would be important to ensure the footprint and resource study area assumptions. A similar review should be conducted for the wetlands and potential jurisdictional areas. Bats siting's along with presence and location will be important to review to ensure proper mitigation and buffers for the species.

Section 4(f)

MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

The Bay Bridge Trail (trail) is the segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail system located within the proposed project footprint. It extends from the trailhead on Shellmound Street in Emeryville, to the East Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The trail is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Under alternatives A, B and D, the trail may require a temporary detour and/or overhead protection during construction. Alternative C may require overhead protection and a temporary detour of the trail during construction, and a minor trail realignment after project construction is complete. For all alternatives the trail is anticipated to be returned to its existing condition after construction is complete.

The segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail known as the Bay Bridge Trail is considered a transportation trail, as it is owned and maintained by Caltrans. Impacts to this trail are exempt from 4(f) as they meet the criteria set forth in 23 CFR 774.13 (F) (4) which states that trails, paths, bikeways, and sidewalks that are part of the local transportation system and which function primarily for transportation meet the requirements for a 4(f) exception. All properties discussed above either have no use per section 4(f) or are exempt from 4(f). Therefore, the provisions of Section 4(f) do not apply.

Other

Comment Period. The comment period was extended to 11:59 PM on April 24th, 2019. However, based on the materials that have not been made publicly available, such as supportive documentation for the Purpose and Need, Traffic Report, Natural Environment Study, Water Quality Technical Report, Visual Impact Study, Hazardous Materials Report, Air Quality/Noise/Vibration Study, or details pertaining to Construction effort, staging, schedule, and detour routes, we believe the comment period should be extended once these materials have been provided to allow adequate time for detailed review.

Conclusion

The MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment, dated January 2019, does not fully or adequately assess potential impacts. The City of Oakland has provided numerous areas required for additional study in order to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. Should this project move forward, the City of Oakland can provide a more comprehensive review of the environmental documents once the data and analysis requested above is provided.

Sincerely,

William Gilchrist Director of Planning and Building Department

6

Director of Planning and Building Department

cc: Mayor Libby Schaaf, City of Oakland Lynette Gibson-McElhaney, City Councilmember, District 3 Sabrina Landreth, Oakland City Administrator Ryan Russo, Director, Department of Transportation, City of Oakland Edward Manasse, Interim Deputy Director, Bureau of Planning, City of Oakland Nicole Ferrara, Policy & Intergovernmental Affairs Advisor, Department of Transportation, City of Oakland Michael Hursh, General Manager, AC Transit Christine Daniel, City Manager, City of Emeryville

From:	kittenchow@comcast.net
Sent:	Wednesday, April 24, 2019 6:02 PM
To:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by kittenchow@comcast.net on April 24th, 2019 at 06:01PM (PDT).

name: Erick Harrison email: kittenchow@comcast.net

telephone: 5104185180

comment: I've been an Emeryville property owner since 2003 and traffic during commute hours has grown immensely since then. Regional shopping traffic is also a daily problem. Closing the highway and routing all of that traffic onto Emeryville streets would not be acceptable because our streets would be constantly gridlocked, much more pollution would occur and it would be very hazardous for bicyclists and pedestrians. It's already very dangerous to cross most big intersections in Emeryville. I am opposed to this vertical clearance project just so that a few trucks can use the interchange. The impacts on Emeryville will be enormous. Thank you

Comment 227

From: Sent:	ctream@gmail.com Thursday, April 25, 2019, 1:32 PM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten,
	Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by ctream@gmail.com on April 25th, 2019 at 01:31PM (PDT).

name: Charles Ream

email: ctream@gmail.com

comment: Hello Caltrans District 4. This entire process with the Maze project shows that we (citizens of California) need much clearer insight into how Caltrans allocates funding and an explanation the principles and priorities behind those decisions. How can this hugely impactful and expensive project, which appears to have no real utility, rise to the top of the list when California has so many other dire needs and shortfalls when it comes to transportation? We need to prioritize the safety of people walking, biking, and taking transit in our state. These funding decisions should be based on community input, cost/benefit analysis, safety studies, and a concern for our sustainable environmental future. I'm sure that raising the height of these bridges to meet current federal guidelines makes sense to an engineering team deep in the halls of Caltrans headquarters, but hopefully this experience will lead District 4 administrators to make better decisions about how these !

projects are selected and moved forward in the future.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Bobby Lee <bobby@visiblee.me> Saturday, April 27, 2019 1:21 PM MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT Emeryville Impact

Dear Caltrans,

I'd like Caltrans to better detail the impact the project will have in Emeryville. Specifically along Shellmound, Powell, and 40th streets. Both noise, traffic, dust, pollution, and construction impact. And present mitigation measures.

Thank you.

-Bobby



City of Alameda • California

April 23, 2019

Rebecca De Pont, Associate Environmental Planner California Department of Transportation, District 4 PO Box 23660, MS 8B Oakland, CA 94623

Dear Ms. DePont,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Negative Declaration.

Upon review of the Negative Declaration, we found that the document failed to adequately analyze and disclose the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act. In the proposed Negative Declaration for the project, Caltrans is asserting that the project will have no impact on Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Air Quality, Noise, or Transportation and Traffic. With respect, we strongly disagree.

The construction of the MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project ("the Project") will delay and disrupt Transbay Express and local bus services, which in turn will result in secondary impacts on other transportation systems as Transbay Express riders shift to other modes to avoid the delays and disruptions caused by this project. The City of Alameda, whose residents and businesses rely on effective and efficient Transbay Express bus service cannot afford these delays and disruptions.

AC Transit currently runs Transbay Express buses on I-580 leading up to the approaches to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, including lines B, E, NX, NX1, NX2, NXC, NX3, NX4, P and V. On the I-880 to westbound I-80 connector, AC Transit operates lines 800, 0, OX, S, SB and W. Along I-80, AC Transit operates lines C, F, FS, G, H, L, LA and Z. Any weekday delays on these Transbay lines will affect over 14,000 passengers per day, while weekend delays will impact over 3,000 passengers per day.

The State of California and the cities of the Bay Area have all committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions to reduce the global and local impacts of climate change. The transportation sector is the single biggest source of greenhouse gases in the Bay Area. If the State of California's primary transportation

Planning, Building and Transportation 2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 190 Alameda, California 94501-4477 510.747.6800 • Fax 510.865.4053 • TTY510.522.7538

C Printed on Recycled Paper

agency is going to propose a major construction project at the most constrained and sensitive intersection or freeways in the San Francisco/East Bay commute affecting 14,000 daily transit trips (projected to grow to over 20,000 by 2025), then that project must include features to **increase transit efficiency and reduce regional greenhouse gases**, such as:

- Permanent improvements to the MacArthur Maze to include widened connector ramps to provide HOV or transit-only lanes. The lanes would benefit AC Transit Transbay Bus service and other HOVs.
- Purchase of additional Transbay buses for AC Transit to facilitate increased Transbay service by AC Transit
- Construction period temporary bus-only lanes:
 - From Alameda's connections to the I-880 freeway to the Bay Bridge that avoid the construction zones.
 - New or modified connectors and on the following surface streets: West Grand between I-580 and the bridge, San Pablo Avenue between 20th Street and 4Qth Street.
- A construction period Traffic Management Plan that reduces construction delay to Transbay and local bus service. Overnight or weekend closures should be undertaken to minimize impacts to transit and best management practices to shorten construction times.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the project and the adequacy of the draft Negative Declaration. Unfortunately, we find that the Negative Declaration fails to adequately disclose the environmental impacts of the project as currently proposed. The City of Alameda is ready and willing to work closely with Caltrans and our regional transit providers to design and implement a project that will have fewer impacts and improve the regional transportation system for all users.

Sincerely,

Andrew Thomas,

Acting Director for Planning, Building and Transportation, City of Alameda.

From: Sent:	gallo087@gmail.com Sunday, May 5, 2019 11:36 AM
То:	MacArthur Maze Freight Corridor Project@DOT; Hallissy, Cristin@DOT; Weingarten, Carl@DOT
Subject:	MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by gallo087@gmail.com on May 5th, 2019 at 11:35AM (PDT).

name: Alicia Gallo email: gallo087@gmail.com telephone: 9169951092 comment: This proposed project will have significant detrimental impacts on all aspects of the Emeryville community. I urge CalTrans to re-evaluate the necessity for this project, the Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment, and to engage in open and honest dialogue with City leaders, staff, residents,

and community members.

GOVERNMENT & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Comment 231



May 8, 2019

Tony Tavares District Director California Department of Transportation - District 4 P.O. Box 23660 Oakland, California 94623-0660

RE: Letter to Request Coordination for Proposed MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project

Dear District Director Tavares:

Stanford Health Care has a clinic in Emeryville at 5800 Hollis Street that is 1.3 miles from the MacArthur Maze. At our Emeryville facility we provide a wide range of outpatient care such as cardiovascular, digestive health, neurology, pain management, and urologic cancer services. We are extremely concerned that freeway lane or ramp closures as part of the proposed project will impact our patients arriving from San Francisco on Interstate 80, arriving from the east on Interstate 580, and coming from the south on Interstate 880.

If the proposed MacArthur Maze Vertical Clearance Project moves forward, it is critical that you coordinate with us to minimize daytime traffic impacts to our patients. Our clinic hours vary but most see patients Monday through Friday between 8:00am and 5:00pm.

We would also like to better understand how the California Department of Transportation is planning to address the following:

- Develop detailed traffic management plans to accommodate the more than 250,000 cars that pass through the Maze daily and preserve access for patients visiting our Emeryville facility at 5800 Hollis Street.
- · Minimize daytime impacts for drivers who need to reach Hollis Street in the City of Emeryville.
- · Provide notice for closures and alternative routes.
- Minimize traffic congestion on adjacent streets that may be impacted by freeway lane or ramp closures.
- · Coordinate with organizations such as Stanford Health Care who are interested parties.

Thank you for your consideration and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions at 650-498-4639.

Sincerely,

Jon Cowan Director of Local Government & Community Relations

cc: Rebecca De Pont, Associate Environmental Planner, California Department of Transportation, District 4

300 Pasteur Drive | Stanford, CA 94305-5547

JENNIFER TEJADA, Emeryville Chief of Police 5 ---000----CHIEF TEJADA: So I'll just read what I wrote here. 6 7 The traffic management plan for this project must consider when and where traffic will be rerouted 8 9 during major construction closure events. We have many low volume, low speed residential streets that 10 absolutely will not be able to accommodate the rerouted 11 traffic. 12 13 And then we have the issue of pedestrian, bicycle, emergency vehicles, and transit needs that also 14 need to be considered for any rerouting of traffic 15 during the closure periods. 16 17 So then -- so, you know, from a first responder perspective, we need to take into account how emergency 18 19 vehicles will get from A to B, especially because Fire Department 1 and the police department are down at the 20 west end of Powell Street. So we will need get to the 21 22 other side of the freeway during this construction 23 project and how will that be impacted by the project and 24 how can we avoid any delays. That will be important to 25 be part of the management plan.

Г

1	So and then the other thing that I thought
2	about on the way here is a communication plan. So, for
3	example, during the project, if there is any nuance that
4	comes up around the closures, that we have a
5	communication plan in place; that CalTrans, with the
6	project coordinator, whoever knows, contact the police
7	department, you know, give us 24-, 72-hours notice so
8	that we're aware of any changes in traffic diversion,
9	closures, anything like that that will affect your
10	response abilities, times.
11	That's all I have. Thank you.
12	000

LAURA MCCAMY

12	000
13	MS. McCAMY: Okay. So my name is Laura McCamy. I
14	live in Emeryville, and what I would like to say is I
15	think this project I don't see the need for this
16	project. I think it's going to have a huge adverse
17	impact on Emeryville. I am very concerned about the
18	traffic impact on our streets. I'm very concerned about
19	closing the Bay Bridge bike and ped trail, biking and
20	walking trail, which was just opened recently.
21	I feel like we have about ten years left to
22	deal with global warming, and this is a project that is
23	going to cause a huge carbon footprint during
24	construction. It's going to increase the carbon
25	footprint of the freeway after construction. And it's

1	going to increase the adverse environmental affect on
2	our streets during construction. So it's going to have
3	a very big carbon footprint, really negative, and it's
4	exactly the opposite of the projects we need CalTrans to
5	be doing right now.
6	I strongly oppose this project, and I really
7	encourage CalTrans to reconsider and I'm also very
8	I think it's a misallocation of SB1 funds. I think
9	those funds were meant to improve transportation in
10	California, and I don't I understand there's an issue
11	with big trucks. I think there are other ways to fix
12	that issue. I don't think this is an improvement that's
13	going to benefit most people in the East Bay. That's my
14	comment.
15	000

NANCY NADEL

15 ---000---MS. NADEL: My concern is that when there was a fire 16 17 at the maze and it was closed to traffic, traffic was rerouted through Oakland, specifically on West Grand. 18 CalTrans did not pay for repaving West Grand, and it is 19 now in terrible shape. So I want to make sure they have 20 in their budget enough money to repave any city streets 21 that they will be routing traffic on while this project 22 23 is going on. 24 ---000---

NELS SUNDQUIST, IKEA 24 ---000---25 MR. SUNDQUIST: I'm with Ikea. I'm just here to --

I have some questions about some of the alternative 1 2 routes and ensuring that they are able to be used by 3 18-wheelers that may be bringing in our product. Typically, our trucks come in to unload between 4 5 1:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m. So, depending on when 6 construction is happening, alternative routes are started, that could impact our ability to receive our 7 8 goods. 9 The important consideration for you to know 10 about is that our peak business month is August. Often 11 the holidays between Thanksgiving and New Years are 12 considered peak for other businesses, but for us, our 13 catalog drop back to college is actually our busiest 14 time and will drive the greatest number of visitors 15 through the Emeryville area through our store. ---000----16

SCOTT DONAHUE, City Council Member

1	MR. DONAHUE: Having looked at the alternatives, the
2	first two where the shutdowns would be at night only,
3	that looks like the best for our city. Night only is
4	better than weekends, because we actually have more
5	traffic on our weekends because of shopping, and it's a
6	critical source of income for us.
7	So Alternative A and B could be done at nights
8	only. That's major. That makes a difference for us.
9	The most devastating, looks like the most
10	difficult for our city, would be the most expensive
11	alternative, I think it was C yes, it was
12	Alternative C, the total rebuilding of the two roads
13	extending over the greatest amount of time covering the
14	most amount of area for noise, everything else, that
15	would be the least desirable from an Emeryville point of
16	view.

17

Okay. Those are my comments.