East Span Seismic Safety Project

Correspondence between U. S. Navy and Caltrans
Caltran's Request for Property on Yerba Buena Island for Retrofit on the Bay Bridge

Tuesday, December 10, 1996
1:00 p.m.
Treasure Island, S.F. CA
Building # 1, Conference Room # 215

Meeting called by: Larry Florin - Director  Note taker: TBA
Type of meeting: Property Meeting  Timekeeper: TBA
Facilitator: Larry Florin - Director

Attendees: Larry Florin, Stuart Sunshine, Harry Yohada, Michael Cohen, Capt. Hanel and Ken Parsons

Please read: Materials that you need for Agenda Topics

--- Agenda Topics ---

1. Update on Caltran's proposal for rebuilding Bay Bridge
2. Update on Reuse Plan for Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island - City

Discussion:

Conclusions:
Action Items:

Person(s) Responsible:

Deadline(s):

Special Notes:

Directions: Take the Yerba Buena Exit from the Bay Bridge
Follow the directions to Treasure Island
Pass the red guard gates and look to your immediate right
You will see Building #1 (yellow and shaped like a horseshoe)
Enter the building at the 2nd entrance to your right
Come up the stairs to the second floor conference room #215.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PHONE/FAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Clarke</td>
<td>SPPA</td>
<td>(415) 395-5481/5474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTG. Pyle</td>
<td>NAVSTA T.J.</td>
<td>(415) 395-5049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Robert</td>
<td>NAVSTA T.J.</td>
<td>(415) 395-5074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McCarty</td>
<td>NAVSTA T.I.</td>
<td>(415) 395-5086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Russe</td>
<td>NFA WEST</td>
<td>(415) 395-5005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Yama</td>
<td>CALTANS D4</td>
<td>(510) 286-5900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Baker</td>
<td>CALTANS D4</td>
<td>(510) 286-5476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Richards</td>
<td>CALTANS D4 RW</td>
<td>(510) 286-5400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Murphy</td>
<td>CALTANS RW</td>
<td>520 286-5899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Guinn</td>
<td>Caltans Maint</td>
<td>510 286-5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Casey</td>
<td>LT R.W. Eng.</td>
<td>510 286-5289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hulsebus</td>
<td>Caltans-Design Alicia</td>
<td>(510) 286-5085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Tejeda</td>
<td>Mayor's Office</td>
<td>(415) 234-0662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Cohen</td>
<td>Cal. Attorney's office</td>
<td>(415) 554-3911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Flores</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sj failed to act on the plans only.

SF said CT does not want their Navy camps.

SF said they want CT to assume responsibility of these camps.

Transfer - how to implement: DB said CT still preparing paperwork.

Need more & sound discussion, we need to meet all CT units community.

Navy said to put in C & areas also.

For area: we will find SF/SF agree in CT request.

SF concerned in their access if CT gets 100m area - CT said we propose reciprocal access for these areas & other areas on Y81 (for both parties).

SF proposed they get fee & give easement to CT. DR said we want fee (easement doesn't give any control we would want). - agreed, pending.

SF said they need powercard area with 100m area for parking for

Navy house - DR said we could live with that.

SF other concern is issue about tunnel - prime spot for development.

We should be OK to this.

For areas where SF land is needed to CT, SF proposes mutually agreeable for compensation.

SF wants to reduce impact to redevelopment plans on Y81.

SF believes they now have their redevelopment plans defined to discuss in detail how to modify our proposed R/W line.

CT stated we can't accommodate larger SS and water pipes. SF said they don't plan on increasing these.

"Insgesamt für Verhandlung" - "Räumlich-Ikonomische" for access, we agree.

SF suggested setting up a working level meeting to discuss R/W limit lines in detail & CT/SF need closer control.

Hyra gave CT my name as contacts for this matter. SF treated C?

Some:

- Situation is CT going to reduce for suit land projects?

- SF has some in west & easterndig tunnel - still analyzing data.

- SF has asked in west & easterndig tunnel - still analyzing data.

- SF has asked in west & easterndig tunnel - still analyzing data.

- CT to participate in land drainage (like D7300A) is HYY.

- Navy to officially communicate. Can anyone do "CT?"
Confirmation of Meeting between Caltrans, City of SF, and Navy

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, January 15, 1997
Time of Meeting: 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Location of Meeting: Naval Station Treasure Island
Building 1, 2nd floor conf. room

Purpose: Working level meeting to discuss issues regarding Caltrans proposed request for property on YBI adjacent to the Bay Bridge

Topics: Easements
Staging areas for Construction

CITY REUSE COMMITTEE
Confirmation of Meeting between Caltrans, City of SF, and Navy

Date of Meeting: Wednesday, January 15, 1997
Time of Meeting: 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Location of Meeting: Naval Station Treasure Island
Building 1, 2nd floor conf. room

Purpose: Working level meeting to discuss issues regarding Caltrans proposed request for property on YBI adjacent to the Bay Bridge

Topics: Easements
Staging areas for Construction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Bejar</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>510.286.5471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJG Ray Pyle</td>
<td>NAVAL STATION STAFF CIVIL ENGR.</td>
<td>(415) 395.5418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Hills</td>
<td>CT Maint.</td>
<td>510.286.4494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford H. Davis Jr.</td>
<td>Caltrans Maint.</td>
<td>510-276-1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Holcomb</td>
<td>Caltrans - Design</td>
<td>(510) 246-5085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Couchman</td>
<td>Caltrans - Planning</td>
<td>(510) 246-5572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Weisha</td>
<td>Caltrans - Construction</td>
<td>(415) 557.7325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR P.L. Jordan</td>
<td>NASTA T.I.</td>
<td>415-395-5033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Fassett</td>
<td>EPA WEST - TI BOM</td>
<td>415-244-3324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Kendall</td>
<td>SF Planning Dep</td>
<td>415-558-6290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Goldfine</td>
<td>Caltrans - ENVIRO, ENV TLAD</td>
<td>830/286-6203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Telada</td>
<td>Mayor's Office, TI</td>
<td>274-0662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen V. Baradar</td>
<td>Caltrans - Env. Eng.</td>
<td>(510) 286-5636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James B. Sullivan</td>
<td>EPA West - ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>(415) 395-5454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Ruse</td>
<td>EPA West</td>
<td>(415) 244-3779-3005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Rags</td>
<td>Caltrans R/lc</td>
<td>(510) 286-5381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Richards</td>
<td>Caltrans R/lc</td>
<td>(510) 286-5400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- May have already made comments to others
- Demanding that we retrofit ramps
- Navy claims that their EXP. Doc would be delayed by CTS request.
Navy will not complete HazMat Remediation until 2000. Some w/in the 100 meter Smith
Data Sheet

Work Plan - Jim Dan

PIPSAN LOAD

MATRIX
Mr. Kenneth Y. Parsons  
Base Conversion Commander  
Naval Station, Treasure Island  
Department of the Navy  
Engineering Field Activity, West  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
900 Commodore Drive  
San Bruno, CA 94066-5066

Dear Mr. Parsons:

During the past 20 months the California Department of Transportation (Department) has worked closely with the Yerba Buena Island/Treasure Island (YBI/TI) base conversion staff and City and County of San Francisco (City) staff. This working group has attempted to develop a mutually agreeable transfer of the necessary fee title right of way for the San Francisco - Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB). There have been numerous meetings held in an attempt to address the fee area that the Department needs while addressing the issues of other current and possible future "users" of the islands.

In a March 28, 1996 letter to you (copy attached), the Department requested a 100 meter wide fee right of way (50 meters on either side of the center line of the existing structure). This letter also identified additional areas that would be needed on a temporary basis for the actual construction activities that would occur during the seismic retrofit of the structure.

The 100 meter fee requirement was based on input from the divisions that make up the Department and are responsible for keeping the SFOBB operating in a manner that is safe for the motoring public. Maintenance crews responsible for the day-to-day care of the bridge reviewed the activities normally conducted on, above and below the structure and determined that the 100 meter swath was the minimum needed to allow them to complete their required work in a safe and quality manner. The same approach was taken by the Department's Construction engineers, reaching a similar conclusion. The Department's Right of Way staff has had extensive experience with the last two major seismic events in the State (Loma Prieta in 1989 and Northridge in 1994) in dealing with similar areas, that is, the area that is located within this 100 meter swath of overhead structures. In many instances where development had been allowed to take place within close proximity to overhead structures there were costly (in terms of time lost and capital dollars spent to "clear the right of way") delays before repair and/or reconstruction activities could be undertaken.
The Department requires a number of Temporary Construction Easements (TCE's) in conjunction with the proposed retrofit of the existing SFOBB. The $1.3 billion seismic retrofit project is currently scheduled to be completed in the year 2004. The Department is entitled to the TCE's by virtue of the agreement executed between the Navy and the State dated December 20, 1962, Clause 8. This document states that the Navy agree's that "Should any reconstruction work be performed on the portion of the Bridge and approaches thereto crossing YBI, the State shall have the right to occupy areas adjacent to such construction work as may be necessary to accomplish such work", subject to Navy approval. The State is requesting a commitment for the areas needed based on the existing document. Mapping of the areas is enclosed.

In a July 10, 1996 letter to you (copy attached) the Department notified the Navy that a new structure was being considered and that we would be seeking a 100 meter fee right of way for any new structure constructed. This letter said that the Department would be submitting a request for right of way requirements for both scenarios (retrofitting of the new structure and building a new structure) for the SFOBB.

The construction of a new structure would require additional right of way (both fee and easements) on the eastern portion of YBI. Enclosed you will find maps which reflect this new alignment. You have indicated that time is of the essence. With this in mind, the Department requests that you convey the right of way necessary for both the seismic retrofit and the new structure. Any excess land will be handled in accordance to the Federal Land Transfer procedure.

In our meeting on January 15, 1997 you stated that you were planning to recommend the transfer of the entire island in fee to the City. The Department is strongly opposed to this course of action.

The issue of financial responsibility for retrofitting the western YBI ramps, was also raised at the January 15, 1997 meeting. At that meeting you made the statement that since the State participated in the cost and construction of these ramps you felt the State was obligated to retrofit and maintain the ramps. The December 20, 1962 agreement states... "After the reconstruction work on said west side road connections is completed STATE shall have no obligations in the future to maintain or reconstruct any portion of such reconstructed roads, ramps, structures and improvements". This issue is clearly addressed in the cited agreement - the ramps are not the responsibility of the State.
On January 23, 1997 the State forwarded an informational letter to Mr. A. K. Mockus - Right of Way Program, Federal Highway Administration stating our intention to submit a complete land transfer package to his office by February 7, 1997 (copy attached). We are proceeding with the completion of the package and will submit a complete package (narrative request, metes and bound description and reference maps) based on the requirements stated in this letter to the Federal Highway Administration within the next two weeks. It is the Department's intent to complete the transfer prior to the Navy's vacating of the islands.

It is essential that these right of way issues be resolved immediately. Please contact me at (510) 286-5900 if you require assistance in expediting this process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

HARRY Y. YAHATA
Interim District Director

Attachment

c: City of San Francisco
Mayor Willie Brown
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Department of the Navy
Commanding Officer
Engineering Field Activity - West
Attention: Code 2412
500 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-5006

Mr. Larry Florin
Project Director
The Mayor's Treasure Island-Project Office
410 Palm Avenue
Building 1, Room 237
Treasure Island
San Francisco, CA 94130

Mr. A. K. Mockus
Right of Way Program
Federal Highway Administration
980 9th Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814-2727
February 7, 1997

4-SF-80
E.A.: 010300
SFOBB Seismic Retrofit/
New Structure
YBI/TI Land Transfer

Mr. Kenneth Y. Parsons
Base Conversion Commander
Naval Station, Treasure Island
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-5066

Dear Mr. Parsons:

This is an application for lands held by the United States Government, located on Yerba Buena Island that are being disposed of under the Defense Base Closure Act of 1993. The State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is requesting to acquire fee simple ownership of Right of Way 100 meters wide for the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB) across Yerba Buena Island as well as the fee simple ownership of the proposed new alignment.

The areas requested are as follows:

For the existing alignment, 50 meters on either side of current centerline is required. Above the tunnel, the requirement is only to an elevation of 270 feet reserving to the grantors the full use of the land above that elevation for any and all purposes whatsoever, providing said use does not interfere with the use, operation, maintenance, repair, construction, reconstruction or retrofit of the bridge and tunnel facilities.

The area required for the alignment of a possible span replacement bridge is different from the existing only on the eastern side of the tunnel. In the new alignment, the centerline continues straight east of the tunnel rather than changing to a more southerly direction as does the existing alignment.

These two alignments are shown on the attached maps titled "Right of Way Existing Bridge" and "Right of Way New East Span"
Currently, the existing right of way for the SFOBB over Yerba Buena Island is held as an easement for the bridge footings, structure and tunnel. Caltrans' experience in the last decade with seismic events occurring in the State (Loma Prieta in 1989 and Northridge in 1994) has demonstrated the necessity of holding title in fee simple for these type of emergencies as well as routine maintenance and scheduled retrofit. This bridge is the key to the Bay Area transportation network and with 280,000 vehicles per day, is the busiest toll bridge in the world. With the City of San Francisco intending to develop Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands to attract visitors, more use of the bridge can be anticipated. Caltrans has an enormous responsibility to keep this facility in top condition and to be able to respond in emergencies.

Also included is Caltrans' requirement for Temporary Construction Easements for the retrofit and/or new bridge construction. Enclosed are maps and descriptions. The use of these areas will be needed until December 31, 2010. (Entitlement by virtue of Clause 8 of December 20, 1962 "Agreement between United States of America and State of California relating to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge crossing of Yerba Buena Island").

This application and attachments are being sent to our Federal Sponsor, the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration for review and approval. This is our formal request for the Public Benefit Conveyances for transportation related activities. It is our understanding that FHWA will be using the Federal Land Transfer process to convey title to the State of California Department of Transportation.

It is essential that this right of way transfer occur as soon as possible. Please contact me at (510) 286-5900 if you require assistance in expediting this process.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
Interim District Director

Attachments
cc: City of San Francisco  
    Mayor Willie Brown  
    400 Van Ness Avenue  
    San Francisco, CA 94102  

Department of the Navy  
Kristy Spake, Commander  
Engineering Field Activity West  
Attn: Code 2412 (KS)  
900 Commodore Drive  
San Bruno, CA 94066-2402  

Mr. Larry Florin  
Project Director  
The Mayor’s Treasure Island-Project Office  
410 Palm Avenue  
Building 1, Room 237  
Treasure Island  
San Francisco, CA 94130  

Mr. A. K. Mockus  
Right of Way Program  
Federal Highway Administration  
980 9th Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2727  

Lindy Lee - MS 37  
Right of Way Program  
1120 N Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5690
Mr. W.R. Till  
Chief, Bridge Section  
Eleventh Coast Guard District  
United States Coast Guard  
Bldg 50-6, Coast Guard Island  
Alameda, CA 94501-5100

Dear Mr. Till:

We are in receipt of your letter dated January 10, 1997 (16591 Ser: 014-97, San Francisco Bay (8.9)) transmitting the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) concerning the proposed seismic retrofit of the San Francisco Bay Bridge for the Navy to execute. However, we do not believe that the consultation leading to the development of an acceptable MOA has been completed.

In Tom McDonnell's letter of October 10, 1996 to me he states that "(t)he proposed seismic retrofit work will not have a noise effect on historic properties on Yerba Buena Island ..." Furthermore, in the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Historic Property Survey Report and Finding of Adverse Effect (Revised), Abridged Version, dated April 4, 1996 forwarded to us by Caltrans we can find no mention of any noise issue. However, in a meeting on January 15, 1997 with CALTRANS representatives we were advised that during construction of those elements of the retrofit project in the vicinity of Quarters 1 and the other historic senior officers' quarters the noise levels will be so loud that it will be impossible to occupy these buildings. Furthermore, we were advised that this inconvenience could last for approximately 18 months.

We are currently in negotiations with the City of San Francisco for the lease of these quarters for a conference center and supporting facilities, including potential dining and sleeping accommodations. The noise generated by the proposed project will jeopardizes this planned compatible reuse of these historic properties. Furthermore, if the noise generated by the various activities connected with the retrofit project are so great as to render the use of these buildings virtually impossible for a period of 18 months. What physical damage might then occur from the sound vibrations or the noise generating equipment? Clearly, these are potentially adverse conditions that require serious thought and discussion prior to our execution of the proposed MOA. In addition, if the noise level is as high as stated in Building 1 on Treasure Island, what are the physical impacts on that historic building and Building 2 and 3, also historic and currently leased as sound stages to motion picture companies.
Please advise Caltrans of these issues and request that a meeting be convened in the near future to discuss them, for the purpose of finding amenable ways to avoid damaging these historic properties during the retrofit project. Please contact Mr. Louis S. Wall, at (415) 244-3015 with respect to scheduling the meeting.

Sincerely,

KENN Y. PARSONS
Base Conversion Manager
Naval Station Treasure Island

Copies to:
CAPT. Lynne E. Hanel, CO, NAVSTA TI
Cherilyn Widell, CA SHPO
Lee Keatinge, ACHP, Lakewood, CO
Mara Melandry, CALTRANS, Oakland
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Phone 1</th>
<th>Phone 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Baker</td>
<td>Naval Station Staff Civil Eng</td>
<td>510 286 5476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Pyke</td>
<td>Naval Station Staff Civil Eng</td>
<td></td>
<td>(415) 395-5448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Hills</td>
<td>CT Maint. Caltrans Maint.</td>
<td>510 286-4494</td>
<td>510 286-4450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford H. Day Jr.</td>
<td>Caltrans - Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>(510) 286-5572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hulsebos</td>
<td>Caltrans - Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(510) 286-5572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Couchman</td>
<td>Caltrans - Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>(415) 557-7925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Wiecha</td>
<td>Nvsta T.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>415 315-5038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDR P.L. Jordanek</td>
<td>Efa West - TI BCM</td>
<td>415 244-3004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terson Parsons</td>
<td>SF Planning Dep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>415 558-6290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Kendall</td>
<td>Caltrans - Env. Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td>510/286-6205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolande GoldFine</td>
<td>Efa West - Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Tejada</td>
<td>Efa West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen V. Baradar</td>
<td>Caltrans R/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James B. Sullivan</td>
<td>Caltrans R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morise Ross</td>
<td>Caltrans R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 27, 1997

Mr. Leo A. Lozano, AICP
Senior Planner
MLCP Planning Branch (SP)
Coast Guard Island
Alameda, CA 94501-5100

Dear Mr. Lozano:

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE (SFOBB) REPLACEMENT

Caltrans has recently initiated the environmental review for replacing the east span of the SFOBB. As a result, it may not be necessary to relocate Macalla Road. The impacts to your facilities as a result of constructing a new east span and removing the existing east span are not yet known. We will keep you informed as plans become more defined.

Please contact me at 286-4679 or Assistant Project Manager Steven Hulsebus at 286-5085 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Harry Y. Yahata
Interim District Director

By

Ken Terpstra
Project Manager

cc: Morise Russ
Deputy Base Conversion Manager
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Base Conversion Office, Code 64.1
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066

bcc: DSteinhauser - Executive
DMulligan - Executive
KTerpstra - Prog & Proj Mgmt
VKP/SLH, PC, BZ
Mr. Kenn Parsons
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Dr.
San Bruno, CA 94066-5006

Dear Mr. Parsons,

We are responding to your letter of February 11, 1997, to Mr. W.R. Till of the Coast Guard regarding the Memorandum of Agreement for the seismic retrofit of the existing San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge, which is being prepared pursuant to the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act. A distinction needs to be made between seismic retrofit of the existing bridge and a new East Bay span, which is now under study.

Although Caltrans representatives discussed construction related-noise at the January 15, 1997, meeting with representatives of the Navy and the City and County of San Francisco, this discussion was in the most general terms and presumably was for construction of a new bridge, not for retrofit of the existing bridge, the subject of the Memorandum of Agreement. A detailed analysis of construction noise for a new bridge by Caltrans environmental engineers has not been completed and therefore the conclusion that the buildings mentioned in your letter will be uninhabitable is not substantiated. All the issues raised in your letter will be discussed and evaluated in the NEPA document for the new bridge. Potential noise and vibration including temporary construction noise impacts will be discussed in the NEPA environmental document as well as any necessary 106 documents for the new bridge. If the studies indicate a need for mitigation, such measures will be adopted in the Final EIS.

Caltrans is beginning the environmental and scoping process pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act for several alternatives to providing a seismically safe means of transportation to and from San Francisco. These alternatives will include the No Build; seismic retrofit of the existing bridge; and a new East Bay span. Other alternatives may yet be identified. As part of that process, an Addendum Historic Properties Survey Report, Finding of Effect, and Memorandum of Agreement (assuming there are adverse effects to historic properties once the alternative is selected) will need to be prepared to cover the new east span alternative. During the preparation of the Addendum Historic Properties Survey Report, Caltrans will establish an area of potential effect for the new bridge alternatives; one criterion is the potential for changes in noise and vibration levels on Yerba Buena and Treasure Islands. The results of this work will be included in the NEPA environmental document which will cover all possible environmental impacts, including temporary construction noise, permanent noise and vibration.
Further, the impacts you discuss in your letter are more accurately described as land use in character; you describe the buildings' future uses as a conference center and sound stages as opposed to the noise being effects to their historic significance. As previously described in our letter of October 10, 1996, the retrofit project on the existing Bay Bridge will not have a noise effect on the historic properties. The State Office of Historic Preservation has agreed with this assessment as witnessed by its signature on the Memorandum of Agreement for the seismic retrofit of the existing bridge.

In the meantime, the Memorandum of Agreement currently at your office which has been signed by Caltrans, the Coast Guard, and the State Office of Historic Preservation can be signed by you; it will complete the 106 process (once signed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation) for the West Bay spans and West Bay approaches in the City and County of San Francisco and will allow Caltrans to proceed with the seismic work on those portions of the Bay Bridge. As you know, the Bay Bridge is of vital importance to the State and especially to the Bay Area. Because retrofit of the bridge is essential to protect public safety, Caltrans is anxious to proceed with the work on the West Bay span. As noted above, Caltrans will be consulting with the Navy and others during the development of the new project for the East Bay span.

Accordingly, we hope that the Department of the Navy can sign the MOA to facilitate progress on the West Bay portions of the work.

Please call Mara Melandry at 510-286-5582 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Harry Y. YAHATA
Interim District Director

by

Robert L. Gross
Office Chief
Environmental Planning South

cc: Claudia Nissely, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Cherilynn Widell, State Office of Historic Preservation
Hillary Gittleman, Environmental Review Officer, City and County of San Francisco
Robert G. Hocker, Jr., Captain, Department of the Navy, W.R. Till, US Coast Guard
K Parsons
March 4, 1997
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bcc: DMulligan, KTerpstra, TAnziano, BMcDonnell/MBuss (HQ Env Division)
MMeandry/MMortenson, AHope
Mr. Harry Y. Yahata
Interim District California
State of California
Department of Transportation
Box 23440
Oakland, CA 94623-0440

Dear Mr. Yahata:

This letter is in response to your letters of January 28 and February 7, 1997 to this office regarding the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) requests for land on Yerba Buena Island. Your requests appear to be premature considering the issues that still need to be resolved. As you know, the Navy, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and the City of San Francisco have met with Caltrans staff on many occasions, in an effort to try to resolve several outstanding issues. With so many issues still to be resolved, the Navy cannot endorse your applications as they are now structured.

In our last meeting on January 15, 1997, we were advised that Caltrans intended to acquire ownership of the 100+ meter swath across the entirety of YBI plus a temporary construction easement for most of the eastern end of YBI. The two proposed Caltrans ownership scenarios you now show would include lands owned or currently being transferred to the USCG plus a historic building located on the eastern tip of the island. These lands are also desired by the City of San Francisco. During the meeting, we were also told that Caltrans needs could be satisfied with easements on lands currently owned by the USCG but not with easements from the City if they took ownership.

From your letters it is unclear if your position has changed on this matter or if you now intend to seek ownership of the lands proposed for transfer to the USCG. Obviously lands currently owned by the USCG could not be conveyed by the Department of Defense.

The temporary construction easements included the YBI fire station and most of the vacant paved area surrounding it for a period up to December 31, 2010. They also encompassed the front lawn area, almost to the front door of the historic "Nimitz House" and seven other Victorian era homes and related out-buildings. We were also informed that the noise level during the retrofit or new construction would be so high that normal conversation in Building One on Treasure Island (TI) proper would be difficult if not impossible. By inference then, we must conclude that the reuse of that building and the three adjacent buildings currently being used for film production (a noise sensitive endeavor) as well as all of the family housing on YBI would be in jeopardy for many years. This I believe would be unacceptable to the City if reuse is to become economically viable anytime soon. It would also appear to make it very difficult for the existing USCG residents and employees to continue to live and work on YBI during construction. This also brings into question
what the real environmental impacts would be on the “Historic” structures on both islands.

Another issue that we have tried to resolve over the past two years is the ownership of the ramps and possible improvements to them. We understand that Caltrans apparently does not want or desire to own the ramps and that improvements to their configuration would/could not be made using retrofit dollars. It would seem that if a new span is to be constructed, it would be prudent to also improve the ramps at least on the east side of the island to better than 1930’s transportation technology standards.

Still another major issue that needs to be resolved is that of the lead in soil contamination that has been identified under the Bay Bridge on YBI. Data from soil sampling conducted by the Navy in 1995 in that area, shows a high lead concentration of 3,710 ppm. Responsibility for required cleanup actions will need to be determined as a condition of any real estate agreement.

The City of San Francisco, as indicated in their letter to you on 20 February 1997, also shares our concern over the issues that I have raised. Since these issues are still before us, as is the more basic decision of retrofit vice a new bridge, I would ask that you withdraw your applications for the time being. While the Navy desires to facilitate the seismic improvements to this vital Bay Area transportation artery, we also feel that we need to understand the environmental and economic impacts of any plan to ensure that it makes sense for the community as a whole. As now structured, there are too many unknowns and issues still undecided.

Navy and City staffs are available to discuss these issues in more detail at your earliest convenience. I can be reached at 415-244-3001. Since Larry Florin from Mayor Brown’s TI Project Office is now located on TI, it is easy to arrange a meeting on short notice. Captain Lynne Hanel, Commanding Officer of the Naval Station Treasure Island, has kindly offered to host any meeting in her Command Conference Room in Building One.

Sincerely,

KENNY Y. PARSONS
Base Conversion Manager
Naval Station Treasure Island

Copy to:
USCG
NAVSTA TI
City of San Francisco (Larry Florin)
FHA (A. K. Mockus)
NAVFACENGCOM (Code 60 - Mike Henson)
Mr. Kenneth Y. Parsons  
Base Conversion Commander  
Naval Station, Treasure Island  
Department of the Army  
Engineering Field Activity, West  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
900 Commodore Drive  
San Bruno, CA 94066-5066

SUBJECT: Treasure Island Caltrans Request

Dear Mr. Parsons:

We are writing in response to a request from California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to endorse the attached proposal for Public Benefit Conveyance (PBC). The Caltrans application seeks both areas encompassing the right of way of the existing San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB), as well as the required area necessary for the proposed new alignment of a new SFOBB eastern span. In particular Caltrans is requesting the following areas:

In fee simple title, 50 meters on either side of the centerline of existing SFOBB right of way (see attached map titled “Titled Right of Way Existing Bridge”). Above the bridge tunnel, the requirement is only to an elevation of 270 feet reserving to the grantors the full use of the land above the elevation for any and all purposes whatsoever, providing said use does not interfere with the use, operation, maintenance, repair, construction, reconstruction or retrofit of the bridge and tunnel facilities.

The area required for the alignment of a new eastern span of the SFOBB. In the new alignment, the centerline continues straight east of the tunnel rather than changing to a more southerly direct as does the existing alignment (for more detail see attached map titled “Right of Way New East Span”).
Please find enclosed Caltrans' request and sit plan proposal. Please disregard the request for temporary construction easements as that is beyond the purview of this PBC request. Furthermore, Caltrans has informed us that it is drafting a more detailed set of description maps. We will forward them onto you when we receive them.

We have reviewed the Caltrans proposal and find that it meets the parameters of 23 U.S.C. Therefore, we recommend approval of the request. If there are questions or if you need further information, please contact Mary Jane Daluge at (916-498-5012).

Sincerely,

/s/A.K. Mockus

For
David H. Densmore
Division Administrator

Enclosure

C.C.:  
FHWA, Mary Jane Daluge, (E-Mail) (w/o enclosure)  
Caltrans, HQ ROW, Fred Gay (w/o enclosure)  
Caltrans, HQ ROW, Lindy Lee (w/o enclosure)  
Caltrans, District 4 ROW, Jim Richards (w/o enclosure)
Mr. Harry Y. Yahata  
Interim District Director  
State of California  
Department of Transportation  
Box 23440  
Oakland, CA 94623-0440

Dear Mr. Yahata:

This letter is in response to your letter of March 4, 1997 responding to our letter of February 11, 1997, to Mr. W. R. Till of the United States Coast Guard regarding the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) prepared pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act implementing regulation, for the seismic retrofit of the Bay Bridge. We appreciate your need to proceed with the retrofit project for that portion of the Bridge between Yerba Buena Island and San Francisco, while studies proceed with the proposed replacement bridge from Yerba Buena Island to Oakland.

Nevertheless, as stated earlier in my letter of March 10, 1997, there are too many issues requiring resolution with respect to the project's impact on Navy property on Yerba Buena Island for us to participate in the MOA in its present form. It is suggested that the scope of the retrofit project and the related MOA be modified to limit the work to that portion of the Bridge that is west of Yerba Buena Island. After a complete and comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement is prepared to address the impacts of both the retrofit and replacement projects on the historic and other resources of Naval Station Treasure Island, we can adequately develop another MOA, as appropriate.
We are advised by Mr. Till that on March 25, 1997 he will be meeting with representatives of the Federal Highway Administration and your office to discuss this issue. He has suggested that after that meeting it would be appropriate for us to meet to discuss direction for resolving our concerns. As stated in my previous letter, the Navy and City staffs are available to discuss these issues in more detail at your earliest convenience. I can be reached at 415-244-3001.

Sincerely,

Kenn Y. Parsons
Base Conversion Manager
Naval Station Treasure Island

Copy to:
U. S. Coast Guard (W. R. Till) USCG
NAVSTA TI
City of San Francisco (Larry Florin)
Federal Highway Administration (A. K. Mockus)
NAVFACEENGCOM (Code 60 - Mike Henson)
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, (Claudia Nissely)
State Office of Historic Preservation, (Cherilynn Widell)
Environmental Review Officer, City and County of San Francisco, (Hillary Gittleman)
I spoke w/ Kenn Parsone this morning about setting up a meeting this week with him (and Larry Florin of the City if necessary) to go over our mutual interests in YBI, the base closure and the land transfer.

Kenn said that he had recently been informed by Larry Florin of the City of San Francisco that Mayor Willie Brown had been in contact on this issue with "the big guy in Sacramento" (I assume he was referring to Director Van Loben Sels and that Stewart Sunshine of the City had also been involved). Larry told Kenn that he wanted to hold off on having another meeting at the level I was requesting until after a face-to-face could be held between the City of San Francisco (assumed to be Stewart Sunshine) and District 4 District Director Harry Yahata. Kenn thought that such a meeting was supposed to take place this week.

I told Kenn that I would check things out on my end and talk to him later this week.

Bob Macpherson is checking this out with Harry Yahata and we will know more by tomorrow. My gut level feeling is that we will not be meeting with Kenn Parsons and Larry Florin this week, nor before our April 10, 1997 internal meeting on this issue.

thank you.
Commissioner Mary King  
C/O MTC  
101 8th Street  
Oakland, CA. 94607  

Dear Madam:  

This letter is being sent to express the Coast Guard's position with respect to the potential replacement and alignment of the new Bay Bridge. The Coast Guard currently owns and occupies most of the property on Yerba Buena Island that is south of the Bay Bridge and tunnel. The Coast Guard Base is made up of several activities which conduct multiple missions including; search and rescue, aids to navigation support, and vessel maintenance and repair. Due to the location and topography of the property our missions are already restricted. Several informal meetings with CALTRANS have been held to discuss and review the various replacement scenarios, alignments and impacts.

The Coast Guard would prefer selection of the north alignment due to the impacts generated by the south alignment. The south alignment of the bridge replacement will generate significant impacts on the mission and operation of the Coast Guard Base. These impacts include but are not limited to; increased noise in the housing areas due to the closer proximity of the bridge traffic, the loss of Coast Guard property and flexibility for future planned uses of that property, the demolition of two buildings, and the reconstruction and alignment of the main entrance road. We would expect that these and any other impacts be mitigated to accommodate Coast Guard operations if the south alignment is selected.

We look forward to working with your Task Force and CALTRANS to review and evaluate the bridge alternatives. Please include us in any future agency and public review milestones. The Coast Guard Point of Contact for this project is Mr. Leo Lozano. He can be reached by telephone at (510) 437-5765. Please feel free to contact him or myself at any time.

Sincerely,  

R. L. SMITH II, P.E.  
Lieutenant Commander, U. S. Coast Guard  
Chief, Planning Branch  
Civil Engineering Division  
By direction of the Commander  

Copy: Commander, USCG Pacific Area (Pr)  
Commanding Officer, Group San Francisco  
State of California, Department of Transportation  
Commander, USN Engineering Field Activity West
Hans Kreutzberg  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer  
P.O. Box 2390  
Sacramento, CA

Dear Mr. Kreutzberg:

This is to notify you of a change in the nature of activities involved in the seismic retrofit efforts at the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB), and a change in responsible federal agency.

First, as you know, the Governor of California has decided to replace rather than retrofit the east bay portion of the SFOBB. Although some minor retrofit activities will be conducted at the east bay spans, the retrofit work there should have no significant effect on the historic character of the bridge or properties in the historic district on Treasure Island. Accordingly, the MOA which we submitted on November 29, 1996 needs to be revised to reflect the change in the scope of work.

Second, the Coast Guard has determined that a bridge permit will not be required for the seismic retrofit work, thus there remains no Coast Guard undertaking with this project, and it is no longer appropriate for us to serve as the federal coordinator.

In accordance with our agreement with the Federal Highway Administration, they will serve as lead federal agency for both the seismic retrofit and the east bay span replacement project.

Since the east bay span replacement project will require a Coast Guard bridge permit, we will serve as a cooperating agency in the environmental review processes.

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please call me at (510) 437-3516.

Sincerely,

W. R. Till  
Chief, Bridge Section  
U. S. Coast Guard  
By direction of the District Commander

Copy: FHWA, USN, ACHP, Caltrans 04
Record of Telephone Conservation

Date: July 21, 1997

Participants:
Mark Shindler - Caltrans, R/W
Steven Hulsebus - Caltrans, Toll Program
John Clifford - San Francisco Appraiser
William Rutledge - Navy Appraiser
Yon Chaikowski - Navy Appraiser

File: 4-SF,Ala-80
4251-01200k

Discussion:

John called for this conference call to ask about Caltrans' upcoming plans for a new eastern span of the SFOBB and its impacts to YBI. They are preparing an appraisal of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The following are some of the questions and topics covered:

- They wanted to know what alternatives are still viable. I told them north and south alignments are still legitimate options. I told them decision on which way to go is up to the Bay Bridge Task Force headed by Mary King, Alameda County Supervisor. I also told them other members of this task force and its role in representing the Bay Area in choosing a new bay bridge. I told them Caltrans prefers a skyway on a south alignment because it is the most economical. They wanted to know why a north alignment was being considered. I told them for aesthetic reasons - it's the alignment that can accommodate a cable supported bridge, a "statement bridge."

- They asked about impacts to the Torpedo Building and the Nimitz House. I explained that final alignments are not set but that it is our goal and my belief that Caltrans will not destroy these and other historic properties on YBI. We may span over the Torpedo Building with the new bridge on a northern alignment and possibly go over or come very close to the Nimitz House with detour structures for the northern alignment.

- They asked many questions about the ramps and their capacity. They were led to believe in a meeting with San Francisco staff that the western ramps would be replaced with new ramps on the eastern end of the YBI tunnel. I explained that we had prepared a plan to see if it were feasible to place all the ramps on the east side only. But that Caltrans was not advocating this plan. I mentioned that Caltrans prepared a very preliminary cost estimate for the construction cost of placing these ramps on the east side only and it ranged from $25 million to $30 million and that this did not include land costs or the costs to remove the west side ramps. I also mentioned that as of now, new ramps are not a part of the new bridge project.
They asked about how loud the construction noise would be and if it could be heard from houses on the west side on the tunnel. I told them I was unable to say anything about this other than to say if pile driving were to be needed, that this would most likely be the loudest operation.

I mentioned to them that Caltrans has also stated that we seek to own in fee 100 meters of R/W centered about the centerline of the new bridge. I mentioned that more R/W would be needed during construction than for the final bridge R/W. They wanted to know how much more. I declined to speculate other than to mention that I thought the contractor would likely want to make use of most of the flat terrain on the east side of the island for possible staging areas. Mark mentioned that the contractor would likely want to make use of the docks on Treasure Island as well. I let them know that the construction work will extend right up to the tunnel portal on the east side of the island.

They asked Mark how Caltrans would pay for property used for temporary construction easements. Mark told them it would be at fair market value in the form of an easement.

They asked for plans for the alignments and temporary structures, information on the capacity of the existing ramps, and cost information. I told them I would send them what I have available.

Steven Hulsebus
Branch Chief, Toll Program
August 14, 1997

Mr. Kenn Y. Parsons
Base Conversion Manager
Naval Station Treasure Island
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, California 94066-5006

Dear Mr. Parsons:

Attached for your review is a reduced set of construction plans for the Interim Seismic Retrofit of the East Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

Please return your comments by September 2, 1997, so we can evaluate them for incorporation into the final plans.

If you have any questions or need further information about this request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (510) 286-5085, or Katja Greve, Project Engineer, at (510) 286-4476.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

By BRIAN MARONEY
Project Manager
Toll Bridge Retrofit

Attachment

c: City of San Francisco, Coast Guard, Army

bc: DMulligan, BMaroney, KTerpstra, SHulsebus, KGreve
DBaker
Attendees:

City and County of San Francisco
Larry Florin
Hillary Gitelman
Carol Roos
Mary Woods

Caltrans Staff
Mara Melandry, Environmental Planning
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental Planning

Consultant Team
Ken Jong, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management

Distribution List:

Attendees listed above
Paul Rosetter, San Francisco City Planning
Denis Mulligan, Caltrans Toll Bridge Program
Steve Hulsebus, Caltrans Toll Bridge Program
Cindy Adams, Caltrans Environmental
Ken Parsons, Dept. of the Navy, Base Conversion Manager,

Naval Station, Treasure Island
Meeting Purpose:

- Review EIS process for the East Span Seismic Safety Project
- Learn of key City and County of San Francisco (City) issues pertaining to the project
- Learn more about Treasure Island Reuse Plans

Meeting Summary:

Welcome Introduction: Mara Melandry, Caltrans
Mara Melandry, Environmental Manager of the East Span Seismic Safety Project, thanked everyone for coming and everyone introduced themselves. Mara distributed a brief information packet about the East Span Seismic Safety Project which included the following items: EIS target schedule, list of environmental studies, conceptual range of alternatives, design variations, and alternatives considered and withdrawn. Caltrans also distributed some project area maps and some large scale alternative drawings.

Discussion of City Issues:
The group reviewed the maps and discussed various aspects of the project. The City Staff identified the following key issues:

- How will the collection of ramps function in terms of safety for the island and bridge? The City feels all of the ramps should be evaluated in the EIS and assessed in the project. The City feels the project limits are too narrow because all of the ramps are not included.
- Caltrans explained that it does not own the ramps and the project will evaluate the east bound on-ramp but that all other ramps are not directly impacted by the project. The City asked Caltrans to reconsider this position.
- The City Staff inquired about the details of the temporary bridge to carry traffic until the new bridge is connected to Yerba Buena Island. The consultants explained that the need for the temporary structure is to maintain ten lanes of traffic during construction. The temporary structure will be in place for six months to one year. It was noted that the temporary structure has the potential to impact historic buildings and falcon habitat. The potential impacts of the temporary detour structure on the Nimitz House and the Torpedo Building are noted as key issues.
- The City Staff inquired about the extent of the disruption during construction and asked that more detail be provided in the EIS.
- The City questioned the need to study the southern alignment. Caltrans explained why both the southern and northern alignments will be studied. The City suggested dropping a southern alignment (S-1) and looking at an alternative that would address the City’s needs on ramps.
Larry Florin noted that Mayor Willie Brown had previously sent a letter to the MTC Task Force endorsing the northern alignment. He said that the City may be rethinking its position on this given new factors. Caltrans encouraged the City to write a letter as soon as possible to explain its position on the alignment of the ramps on Yerba Buena Island.

Larry Florin recalled a previous communication with Denis Mulligan in which he thought Caltrans said they would close the ramps on the west side. [Subsequent to the October 28th meeting, Caltrans clarified this issue. The ramps on the west side of the island will only close if new ramps on the east side are built. At this time only the east bound on-ramp on the east side of the island is slated for reconstruction because it will be affected by the new bridge. Reconstructing the west bound ramp is not a funded project at this time and is not part of the East Span Project.]

Larry Florin said the City is concerned about construction impacts and specifically the impact of the temporary structure, proposed construction staging areas on the island, and what type and how much equipment would be involved and how equipment would be brought to the island. The issues of how much construction vehicular traffic will be on the island and how much construction water traffic (barges) will be around the island needs to be defined. The City asked whether piers would be built and if Pier 1 at Treasure Island is being considered as a staging area.

The City staff said that due to time constraints they would like to postpone discussion of the reuse plans and joint EIR/EIS until a future meeting. Caltrans agreed to a future meeting.

It was confirmed that the project will not increase the capacity of the existing bridge.

Bicycle access to Yerba Buena Island is a key issue. What will the impacts of bicycle access be on the island? What will happen to bicyclists at the point the bridge reaches the island? Where will they go and will they impact proposed reuse of the island? Caltrans agreed to include this discussion in the EIS.

The City asked that the EIS look at the issue of bicycle demand.

The City said it would want to look further at the specific alignment impacts on Yerba Buena Island.

The City indicated that Mary Woods of San Francisco City Planning and Paul Rosetter of San Francisco City Planning would be the City’s primary representatives on the Caltrans Project Development Team. Larry Florin said he would participate in key meetings.

Next Steps/Action Items:
A second coordination meeting was scheduled for Thursday, November 20, 1997 at 9:00 a.m. in Hillary Gitelman’s office at 1660 Mission Street in San Francisco.
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Interagency Coordination Meeting with the City and County of San Francisco
November 20, 1997

Attendees:

City and County of San Francisco
Hillary Gitelman
Paul Rosetter
Carol Roos
Mary Woods
Pedro Ance
Peter Albertson

Caltrans Staff
Mara Melandry, Environmental Planning
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental Planning

Consultant Team
Ken Jong, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Scott Steinwert, Public Affairs Management
Dani Hamilton, Public Affairs Management

Distribution List:

Attendees listed above
Larry Florin, Office of the Mayor, Treasure Island Project
Kenn Parsons, Dept. of the Navy, Base Conversion Manager,
   Naval Station, Treasure Island
Denis Mulligan, Caltrans Toll Bridge Program
Steve Hulsebus, Caltrans Toll Bridge Program
Cindy Adams, Caltrans Environmental Division - HQ
Meeting Purpose:
- Update the City on the status of the project
- Continue to discuss key City and County of San Francisco (City) issues pertaining to the project
- Learn more about Treasure Island Reuse Plan

Meeting Summary:
Welcome / Introductions: Mara Melandry, Caltrans
Mara Melandry, Environmental Manager of the East Span Seismic Safety Project, thanked everyone for coming and everyone introduced themselves.

The minutes of the meeting held with the City and County of San Francisco on November 6, 1997 were reviewed, and City staff made the following comments:
- The minutes should clarify that Paul Rosetter and Carol Roos would be the City’s primary representatives on the Caltrans Project Development Team.
- The minutes should clarify that the City questioned the need to study both southern alignments. At the prior meeting, City staff suggested that Caltrans focus on the S-2 Southern alignment and pay less attention to the S-1 alignment because of the impact on EBMUD outfall.

Overview of Alternatives and Discussion of Temporary Structures and Construction Staging
- Mara Melandry gave an overview of the six alternatives being studied for the EIS.
- City staff asked if all alternatives require temporary structures. Ken Jong said yes and presented the temporary detour structures and explained that the southern alignment detour extensions are longer than the northern alignment detour structures. Ken explained that most construction materials will be delivered by water on barges and that it is anticipated that workers will be bused into work on Treasure Island. Ken also explained that major construction staging will be in the East Bay and not at Treasure Island.
- The City asked if the barge area and loading will be near the parade grounds. Hillary Gitelman stated that it is important to the City that the Caltrans EIS identify staging areas or the City may feel the EIS is inadequate. The City needs to know if any sites at Treasure Island will be leased for staging. Mara Melandry explained that contractors will try to use existing staging areas in the East Bay. Barge moorings on Treasure Island are contemplated but if they are used, they will avoid the seal haul out area on the southwest side of Yerba Buena Island. Any impacts due to barge moorings on the Island will be assessed in the environmental document.

Update on East Span Environmental Study
Most technical studies are in progress. The current schedule for release of technical studies and the DEIS are as follows:
- Final technical reports – April 1998
- Publish DEIS – August - September 1998

Retrofit versus Replacement
Hillary Gitelman requested more details on the economic life cycle analysis done by Caltrans as part of its evaluation of retrofit versus a replacement bridge. Caltrans will give the City a copy of the study.

**Status of Yerba Buena Island Re-use Plan and EIS**
- The U.S. Navy is the lead on the EIS process. The EIS is scheduled for a Washington review in early January 1998. The DEIR/EIS is scheduled to be published in February/March 1998 or at the end of January, 1998 if all goes quickly.
- The re-use plan is general and presents three conceptual alternatives, which have various densities. The City feels that the land is subject to public trust guidelines. The public trust issue is still under discussion with the Navy.
- The City will create a detailed land use area plan after the Navy’s EIR/EIS is completed.
- Proposed uses on Yerba Buena Island near the bridge alignments include public, residential, and institutional areas. The part of Yerba Buena Island near the bridge is flat and is one of the few areas capable of supporting high-density housing.
- The City identified three historically sensitive areas on Yerba Buena Island: The Torpedo Building, quarters 1-8 which includes the Nimitz House, and the Coast Guard Station.
- The City staff also noted Clipper Cove as an important area for marina development; the City is concerned that construction of a new bridge may affect its operation.

**Pedestrian/Bicycle Access**
City staff raised several questions regarding pedestrian/bicycle access:
- *Where will bicyclists go once they get to the island? What bicycle facilities will Caltrans provide on YBI? How will bicyclists get to Treasure Island from the bridge?* Caltrans is still studying bicycle access issues. The group discussed the definition of destination facilities for bicyclists. With good ferry access, bicyclists can get to Treasure Island.
- The City is still in the planning stage of the bike issue. Caltrans agreed to do low, medium, and high estimates for bicycle use.

**Alignments**
Mayor Willie Brown initially sent a letter to MTC supporting the northern alignments. The City staff asked if there is an advantage to an incremental adjustment to any of the alignments. The City needs time to further study the alignments to determine if Caltrans has looked at all ways to minimize impacts.

**Ramps**
Mayor Willie Brown is writing to Caltrans soon regarding the Yerba Buena Island ramps issue. The City's position is that the ramps should be included in the East Span project. City staff emphasized the ramps are substandard and in the City's mind, all of the ramps are cumulatively related to the East Span Project. Ken stated that the alternatives are being designed so as not to preclude improving ramps in the future. The City requested a copy of the initial ramp studies done by PB. PB left the preliminary drawings with the City.

**Storm Drainage/ Maintenance**
• **What are the plans to remove stormwater drainage from the elevated bridge?** Caltrans is studying treating the first flush from the bridge. The details and requirements are still being evaluated.

• **How will bridge be maintained?** Caltrans is still evaluating plans for long term maintenance of the bridge.

**Next Steps/Action Items:**
Both agencies agreed that both the East Span Project and the Treasure Island reuse plan need to consider each other during the development process. The group agreed to hold another working meeting the last week of January, 1998. Caltrans or PAM staff will set up the meeting. As noted above, Caltrans will also supply the City with the life cycle analysis of the existing bridge.
December 4, 1997

Beverly Freitas
Engineering Field Activity West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Attn: Code 2412 (BF)
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-2402

Dear Ms. Freitas:

Caltrans is now in the process of making plans for the new eastern crossing of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and will need to make various studies on Yerba Buena Island. We are currently aware of two borehole studies that need to be done, one by our Structures Foundations office and one by Environmental of our district office. These studies involve taking core samples at various locations on the island, the borehole will be backfilled with grout or capped and locked for further study. In any case the testing will be done in a safe and professional manner.

We anticipate other needs for study will arise in the design stage and we would like to request a License from the Navy to be on all of Yerba Buena Island and to perform the various required studies from December 31, 1997 to December 31, 2002.

Sometime in the year 1999 or 2000 once design is finalized, according to the current schedule, we will be asking the Navy and Coast Guard for Temporary Construction Easement sites and permanent sites for the new bridge alignment.

This letter is a request for License for all Navy property on Yerba Buena Island for Caltrans to perform investigative studies for design preparation of the new east span.

I am enclosing a brochure, "East Span News", which covers design information and some target dates.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter and your anticipated quick response, we would like to have this License for study/design purposes in place by December 31, 1997.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

Enclosure
December 17, 1997

The Honorable Willie Brown, Jr.
Treasure Island Project
410 Palm Avenue
Building 1, Room 237
Treasure Island
San Francisco, CA 94130

Dear Mayor Brown:

Thank you for your letter regarding the ramps of Yerba Buena Island. We received your letter on November 26, 1997.

We agree that ramps on the Island are important element to the success of the Treasure Island Reuse plan and that the ramps are substandard. As you are aware, the replacement of the ramps is not currently funded. Caltrans looks forward to working with you and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to secure funding for the ramps. When funding is secured, a separate environmental document can be prepared. If the funding issue is resolved shortly, the new ramps and the seismic safety project on the East Span could be constructed at the same time. Caltrans agrees that it is desirable to construct both projects at the same time.

Replacement of the ramps is not related to the purpose and need of the East Span Seismic Safety Project. Furthermore, the ramps are outside our jurisdiction since they are owned by the Navy. To include replacement of the ramps in the East Span Seismic Safety Project environmental document would be to expand the scope beyond the intent of seismic safety. Caltrans, accordingly, cannot amend the project scope to include ramp reconstruction in the East Span Seismic Safety Project. At the same time, it appears that with any of the replacement alternatives for the East Span project, the eastbound on-ramp must be demolished and replaced; this on-ramp conflicts with all the replacement alternatives. Accordingly, this will be addressed as part of the East Span Seismic Safety Project.

We would like to clarify the status of the pedestrian/bicycle path on the east span. It is not an alternative to be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); it is rather a design variation for each replacement alternative. Further, while such a facility is not yet funded, legislation has been passed which will allow MTC to decide whether to continue the $1.00 toll surcharge for an additional two years to fund amenities such as a path. A funding mechanism is therefore in place for the pedestrian/bicycle path, should MTC decide to fund it. Should MTC decide not to fund the pedestrian/bicycle path, the seismic safety project can continue to move forward with the design variations that do not include it. This is very important because federal law prohibits approval of a project that is not fully funded.

The Honorable Willie Brown, Jr.
Treasure Island Project
410 Palm Avenue
Building 1, Room 237
Treasure Island
San Francisco, CA 94130

Dear Mayor Brown:

Thank you for your letter regarding the ramps of Yerba Buena Island. We received your letter on November 26, 1997.

We agree that ramps on the Island are important element to the success of the Treasure Island Reuse plan and that the ramps are substandard. As you are aware, the replacement of the ramps is not currently funded. Caltrans looks forward to working with you and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to secure funding for the ramps. When funding is secured, a separate environmental document can be prepared. If the funding issue is resolved shortly, the new ramps and the seismic safety project on the East Span could be constructed at the same time. Caltrans agrees that it is desirable to construct both projects at the same time.

Replacement of the ramps is not related to the purpose and need of the East Span Seismic Safety Project. Furthermore, the ramps are outside our jurisdiction since they are owned by the Navy. To include replacement of the ramps in the East Span Seismic Safety Project environmental document would be to expand the scope beyond the intent of seismic safety. Caltrans, accordingly, cannot amend the project scope to include ramp reconstruction in the East Span Seismic Safety Project. At the same time, it appears that with any of the replacement alternatives for the East Span project, the eastbound on-ramp must be demolished and replaced; this on-ramp conflicts with all the replacement alternatives. Accordingly, this will be addressed as part of the East Span Seismic Safety Project.

We would like to clarify the status of the pedestrian/bicycle path on the east span. It is not an alternative to be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); it is rather a design variation for each replacement alternative. Further, while such a facility is not yet funded, legislation has been passed which will allow MTC to decide whether to continue the $1.00 toll surcharge for an additional two years to fund amenities such as a path. A funding mechanism is therefore in place for the pedestrian/bicycle path, should MTC decide to fund it. Should MTC decide not to fund the pedestrian/bicycle path, the seismic safety project can continue to move forward with the design variations that do not include it. This is very important because federal law prohibits approval of a project that is not fully funded.
Mayor Brown  
December 17, 1997  
Page 2 of 2

Caltrans looks forward to working with San Francisco and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in securing the necessary funding for this important transportation improvement. Please contact me at (510) 286-5900 to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA  
District Director

c: Larry Dahms (Metropolitan Transportation Commission)  
Kenn Parsons (Department of the Navy)  
Hilary Gitelman (City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department)
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Interagency Coordination Meeting with the City and County of San Francisco
1660 Mission Street, Suite 2001, San Francisco, CA
March 30, 1998

Attendees:
City and County of San Francisco
Annemarie Conroy, Director, Mayor's Treasure Island Office
Christine Tejada, Mayor's Treasure Island Office
Eila Arbuckle, Mayor's Treasure Island Office
Joseph Cruz, Mayor's Treasure Island Office
Suzana Montana, Planning Dept.
Paul Rosetter, Planning Dept.
Carol Roos, Planning Dept.
Mary Woods, Planning Dept.
Pedro Arce, Planning Dept.
Mark Primeau, Director, Dept. of Public Works
Nelson Wong, Dept. of Public Works
Michael Cohen, City Attorney's Office
Chuck Swanson, Public Utilities Commission, Treasure Island Utilities
John Young, Dept. of Health Services

Other Agencies
Kenn Parsons, Navy Treasure Island Base Conversion Manager
Marvin Norman, Navy (EFA-West) Office of Counsel
Linda Kratochuil, Navy (EFA-West) Real Estate

Caltrans Staff
Denis Mulligan, Program Manager, Toll Bridge Program
Steven Hulsebus, Toll Bridge Program
Mara Melandry, Environmental Planning
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental Planning
Clive Endress, Landscape Architecture
David Hall, Structures Aesthetics
Jay Mirza, Structures Aesthetics
Michael Whiteside, Structures
Attendees: (continued)

Consultant Team
Ken Jong, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Al Ely, T.Y. Lin International/Moffatt & Nichol Engineers
Rafael Manzanarez, T.Y. Lin International/Moffatt & Nichol Engineers
Donald MacDonald, MacDonald Architects
Caspar Mol, MacDonald Architects
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Molly Bowden, Public Affairs Management

Distribution List:
Attendees listed above
Kofi Bonner, Mayor’s Office
Gerald Green, San Francisco Planning Dept.
Hillary Gitelman, San Francisco Planning Dept.
Brian Maroney, Caltrans Toll Bridge Program
Cindy Adams, Caltrans Environmental Division - HQ
Ade Akinsanya, Caltrans Structures
Meeting Purpose:
- To continue project discussions between the City and County of San Francisco and Caltrans
- To provide an update on the East Span Seismic Safety Project design concepts
- To further define the project issues of importance to the City and County of San Francisco
- To communicate the progress of the City and County of San Francisco’s Yerba Buena Island land use plans and Caltrans’ EIS process for the East Span Seismic Safety Project
- To introduce architectural and engineering team members

Meeting Summary:
**Welcome / Introductions:** Denis Mulligan, Caltrans
Denis Mulligan welcomed everyone. The attendees introduced themselves and their agency/organization.

**Overview of East Span Seismic Safety Project: Denis Mulligan**

*A. Project Purpose*
The purpose of the project is to improve the seismic safety of the East Span of the Bay Bridge to protect the emergency lifeline route. The purpose and need of the project does not include improving the ramps on Yerba Buena Island (YBI). Denis noted that funding is not currently in place for ramp improvements. He stated that if funding were in place, the ramps project would be evaluated in a separate environmental document but construction of the ramps could coincide with the construction of the new bridge. Caltrans will to cooperate with the agencies if a funding source for the ramps is found.

*B. Funding*
SB60 legislation designated funding sources for the East Span Project, which include the State Gas Tax, Seismic Retrofit Revenue Bonds, and bridge tolls. There are no federal funds designated for this project. There was a $1 increase in the bridge tolls beginning January 1, 1998 to help pay for a new East Span. Collection of this $1 toll surcharge during the first 8 years will pay for a skyway alternative. MTC has the authority to extend the surcharge for an additional two years to pay for bridge amenities, including a signature span near Yerba Buena Island, a relocated Transbay Transit Terminal and a pedestrian/bicycle path, depending on costs and funds generated by the surcharge. The legislation for funding with the $1 toll surcharge does not include improvements to the YBI ramps as an amenity to be considered.

*C. Target Schedule Dates*
- Caltrans chooses the preferred alternative - January 1999
- Final EIS released - June 1999
- Construction begins - February 2000
- New bridge open to traffic - February 2003
D. Roles of Key Agencies

- Caltrans owns, operates and maintains the bridge.
- The U.S. Navy currently owns the ramps on YBI.
- MTC can decide to extend the bridge tolls to fund amenities. The Legislature limited the pedestrian/bicycle access decision to MTC. No other agency can make it a permit condition.

Timeline for Decisions:
- MTC decides which amenities to fund - end of June, 1998
- The next MTC Bay Bridge Task Force meeting will be April 8, 1998. San Francisco has 2 members on the 7 member Task Force.
- The next MTC Engineering and Design Advisory Panel (EDAP) meeting will be April 15, 1998.
- If MTC does not choose a bridge design within 30 days after it is presented with 30% design plans, Caltrans has the authority to choose the bridge design.

Bridge Concepts and Aesthetics
Michael Whiteside introduced the T.Y. Lin/Moffat & Nichol engineering team. They are developing the cable-stayed and self-anchored suspension concepts.

Al Ely presented a drawing of an alignment alternative located north of the existing bridge. A northern alignment is currently most favored by the engineering teams for construction and safety reasons.

Rafael Manzanarez presented the group with a slide show of the bridge concepts. The team is pursuing 2 bridge types: cable-stayed and self-anchored suspension. The team is evaluating single and double portal towers for the suspension and cable-stayed concepts. He noted that in each case, there will be two decks, separated by approximately 50 feet. They are evaluating using steel or concrete for the skyway structure.

The team is developing a pedestrian/bicycle path concept two feet below the bridge deck. They are evaluating placing one path on the south side of the bridge or two paths, one on each side of the bridge. They are also developing concepts without the pedestrian/bicycle path to facilitate the decision-making process.

Update on the City and County of San Francisco’s Yerba Buena Island Land Uses
Suzana Montana discussed some of the opportunities and limitations San Francisco sees on Yerba Buena Island (YBI) and Treasure Island (TI). She noted that the utilities on the islands need to be replaced to bring them up to current standards. In order to fund improvements on Treasure Island, the City plans to use revenue generated from the development of housing, hotels, and resorts on YBI. They have been planning to use the flat area of YBI for much of the development of a visitor-oriented area and to use the Torpedo Building for special events and other uses.
The new bridge will take up eleven acres of land on YBI. Suzana stated that she, as a planning staff member, would prefer a southern alignment because it would use less of the flat area within San Francisco’s expected jurisdiction. Denis stated that Mayor Willie Brown wrote to Caltrans, stating the City’s preference for a northern alignment. San Francisco representatives on the Task Force have voted for a northern alignment. Annemarie Conroy stated that she will talk further with Mayor Willie Brown about San Francisco’s position on the alignment of the new bridge.

Impact Assessment
A. Engineering Issues
YBI Ramps
Suzana stated that she wants all of the ramps on YBI to be improved and she wants Caltrans to own and operate them.

Ken Jong stated that the eastbound on-ramp from YBI will be upgraded because it will have to be removed for construction of the new bridge. Improvements to the other ramps on YBI are not part of the East Span project and will not be evaluated in the EIS. However, the design of the bridge will accommodate future improvements to the other ramps. NEPA states that the EIS can only evaluate projects that are funded. Since the ramps have not been funded, they will have to be included in a separate EIS when funding is secured.

Ken Jong presented three possible YBI ramp alternatives for future ramp improvements. He noted that the existing on-ramp on the west side of YBI cannot be improved due to space limitations. One alternative is to construct ramps using Caltrans standards for design.

Denis noted that Caltrans is also considering non-standard ramp designs because they might have fewer land-use impacts, visual impacts, or cost less. He noted that the owners of the ramps will have tort liability and therefore should be concerned about safety.

Michael Whiteside stated that the project team is evaluating the constructability and safety of 6 ramp alternatives. Cost of construction is not an eliminating factor at this stage.

One member of the group asked if Caltrans has considered placing a westbound on-ramp on the left side of the deck. Caltrans will not evaluate this option due to safety reasons. Caltrans standards state that on-ramps be constructed on the right side of the highway because traffic is slower on right and drivers expect ramps to be on the right.

Temporary Detours and Structures
The team is considering alternatives for detour structures in order to maintain traffic flows while replacing the existing bridge section near the YBI tunnel. The alternatives include an option with both decks on the north side of the existing bridge, an option with one deck on the north side, and one on the south side, and an option with both decks on the south side. The team is analyzing the construction feasibility of each of these alternatives. The detour structures will be in place for 9 months to 1 year.
One member asked if the detour structures will carry electricity and water lines. Ken answered that the project team is working under the assumption that all lines on the existing bridge will need to be maintained on the detour structure as well as the new bridge.

B. Construction Issues

- **Is building a new bridge less expensive than retrofitting the existing one?** The initial cost of a new bridge is more expensive than the retrofit alternative; however, if the life-cycle of the bridge is considered, a new bridge is much less expensive.

- **Will there be any bridge closures?** Caltrans is still looking at the possibility of bridge closures. The goal is to keep 10 lanes of traffic open during peak hours, but Caltrans is considering some alternatives that would require limited bridge closures. Annemarie Conroy stated that she prefers bridge closures if they reduce impacts to YBI land uses by avoiding construction of some temporary detours.

- **Is Caltrans considering a double-deck option for the replacement bridge?** Denis answered that last summer MTC discussed locally desired options. Both the representatives from San Francisco and Oakland on the Bay Bridge Design Task Force want side by side decks. Accordingly, Caltrans is not considering a double-deck bridge.

- **How will Caltrans gain the right of way for the bridge?** Caltrans will approach the Navy to get the necessary right of way for the bridge. Caltrans does not want to take any more land than is needed to operate and maintain the bridge. In a letter to the Governor, Mayor Willie Brown stated that if he signed AB 699, the City would agree to grant an easement for the bridge.

- **How will lead paint from the existing bridge be addressed during demolition?** The contractors will be responsible for lead paint removal.

- **When painting the cables of the bridge, will paint fall on the land uses below the bridge?** If a cable-stayed bridge design is selected, the cables will be wrapped in plastic and will not be painted. If a self-anchored suspension bridge is selected, there will be paint used. No lead paint will be used on the new bridge.

- **Will there be impacts to roads on YBI?** Steven Hulsebus stated that they may need to widen roads on the island, but it is too early to know exactly what impacts will be expected. The EIS will evaluate impacts to roads on YBI.

- **Where will construction staging be located?** Caltrans historically does not provide construction access/storage areas. Contractors will be contacting the City and other entities to lease properties. Denis stated that San Francisco and Oakland may be able to implement their hiring policies in this way.

- **Are there shell mounds in the area considered for bridge construction?** An archaeological dig has just been completed, and a site is present in the vicinity of tower YB3. Caltrans will give San Francisco a copy of the report and a map of the site when it has been completed.

- **How can San Francisco Planning Department be involved in choosing the design?** Denis answered that they may speak with the San Francisco representatives on the MTC Bay Bridge Design Task Force, interact with the design team in the San Francisco focus meetings, comment on the environmental document and attend the public hearings.

- **How can San Francisco businesses find out about contract opportunities?** Denis answered that Caltrans posts all contract opportunities on their web site. In addition, Steve Heminger
will give a presentation to MTC on local hiring for the project on April 8th. You may contact Steve Heminger at MTC (510) 464-7810.

- *Can Caltrans restrict the contractors from working in environmentally sensitive areas?* Yes, Caltrans can make that a stipulation in the contract. The Torpedo Building, as well as any other sensitive area, can be protected from construction impacts. Caltrans is planning to have workers bussed or barged in to the island to reduce parking.

**C. Environmental Issues**

- Annemarie Conroy stated that in the short-term she has concerns about access to the island and construction noise that could take away the value of the film hangars on TI. Mike Davis stated that noise will be studied in the EIS. Caltrans has placed noise receptors at the film hangars in order to tell exactly what to expect. The EIS will address construction and traffic noise impacts and will recommend mitigating actions.
- Annemarie also stated that any impacts to Clipper Cove are of concern to San Francisco.
- Carol Roos asked that the EIS address impacts bicyclists will have on the islands as well as a description of any bicycle circulation paths on the island (or lack there of). Caltrans stated that it will include that in the EIS.
- Suzana Montana expressed concerns over noise and shadow and possible construction impacts to the Nimitz house.

**Next Actions/Meeting:**

- The next Interagency Meeting with the City of San Francisco and Caltrans will be April 27, 1998 at 1:00 p.m. at Treasure Island, Building 1, Conference Room 215.
- The next PDT meeting will be April 7, 1998 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. at the Caltrans District 4 offices at 111 Grand Avenue, in the Parkview Room on the 15th Floor.
- Caltrans will send Annemarie Conroy copies of the bridge concept pictures from the slide show.
- Mara Melandry will provide Annemarie Conroy with a drawing of the environmental footprint (the area around the construction site that may be susceptible to construction impacts).
- Chuck Swanson, Ken Jong and Steven Hulsebus will meet to discuss electric and water lines for YBI and TI on the bridge.
- Suzana Montana and Mike Davis will meet to discuss a more detailed redevelopment concept of YBI so that Caltrans may finalize their technical studies for the East Span Project.
- The Navy will be included in future ramp discussions.
April 2, 1998

Mr. Kenneth Y. Parsons
Base Conversion Commander
Naval Station, Treasure Island
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-5066

Dear Mr. Parsons:

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

Attached for your use are five draft plan sheets that you requested during our meeting with the city of San Francisco on March 30, 1998. The plans include a proposed new alignment to the north of the existing bridge, two detour concepts on Yerba Buena Island, and two concepts for possible future new ramp connections from Yerba Buena Island to the Bay Bridge.

If you have any questions, please contact Steven Hulsebus, Assistant Project Manager at (510) 286-5085.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

by Steven Hulsebus

BRIAN MARONEY
Project Manager
Toll Bridge Program

Attachments

cc: BMaroney
    MMelandry
    SHulsebus/PChongchaikit
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Project Development Team Meeting
April 7, 1998 - 9:00 a.m.
Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, Park View Room, 15th Floor

Attendees:
Government, Agency and Municipal Staff
Bill Wong, FHWA
Dan Harris, FHWA
Marina Carlson, Office of Mayor Harris
Norman Hooks, Oakland Landmarks Board
Rick Wiederhorn, Port of Oakland
Paul Rosetter, San Francisco Planning Department
Nelson Wong, San Francisco Department of Public Works
Susan Yee, San Francisco Department of Public Works
Maria Lombardo, San Francisco Transportation Authority
Morise Russ, Navy, Engineering Field Activity West
Andrea Ouse, Bay Bridge Coalition & American Planning Association
Mark Barholomew, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Jerry Olmes, U.S. Coast Guard
Lt. Bonnie Stanton, California Highway Patrol - San Francisco
Sgt. Steve Howard, California Highway Patrol – Oakland
Victoria Eisen, ABAG/Bay Trail
Steve Parry, AC Transit
Rube Warren, BART
Robert Mitroff, BART
Liz Calderon, RIDES
Bob McCleary, Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Frank Furger, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Dennis Fay, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Jerry Brown, East Bay Municipal Utility District
T.Y. Lin, Lin Tung Yen China

Caltrans Staff
Denis Mulligan, District 4 Deputy Director
Brian Maroney, Toll Bridge Program
Steve Hulsebus, Toll Bridge Program
Ade Akinsanya, Structures
Mara Melandry, Environmental

Please note: the next SFOBB PDT meeting has been changed to Monday July 6, at 1:00 p.m. in the Park View Room at the Caltrans District 4 offices at 111 Grand Avenue in Oakland.
Caltrans Staff (continued)
Janet Pape, Environmental
Pochana Chongchaikit, Toll Bridge Program
Greg Bayol, Public Information Office
Colin Jones, Public Information Office
Clive Endress, Landscape Architectures
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental
Cindy Adams, HQ Environmental

Consultant Team
Ken Jong, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Tim Dougherty, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Rafael Manzanerez, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol, Joint Venture
David Goodyear, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol, Joint Venture
Daryle Bailey, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol, Joint Venture
Donald MacDonald, MacDonald Architects
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Surlene Grant, Public Affairs Management
Molly Bowden, Public Affairs Management
Meeting Summary:

Welcome/Introductions: Denis Mulligan, Caltrans
Denis Mulligan welcomed everyone. The attendees introduced themselves and their agency/organization.

Schedule for MTC Decision-Making Process: Denis Mulligan
The next MTC Engineering and Design Advisory Panel (EDAP) meeting will be April 15, 1998. This is an opportunity for the public to comment on the bridge design selection process. MTC makes a recommendation to Caltrans on bridge design, Transbay Transit Terminal relocation, and a pedestrian/bicycle path at the end of June, 1998. Both Caltrans and MTC encourage the public to attend these meetings and provide input.

Caltrans oversees bridge design, environmental review and permitting for the project. MTC will be making recommendations on bridge design to Caltrans. MTC will recommend a locally desired option to Caltrans based on 30% design. Caltrans will then work with the team to develop a detailed design, which will be considered in the project's environmental review.

Alignment Alternatives & Pedestrian/Bicycle Path Update: Steven Hulsebus, Caltrans

Alignment Alternatives
At the last PDT meeting, Caltrans stated that it is studying two alignments north of the existing bridge and two alignments south of the existing bridge. Since that meeting, Caltrans has done extensive studies on these alignments as well as on additional alignments. Caltrans is studying a range of alternatives to satisfy the NEPA process. MTC is considering a northern alignment for their recommendation to Caltrans.

Alignments Considered and Withdrawn
Caltrans has decided to withdraw some of the original alternatives from consideration and add new alternatives. Caltrans will continue to analyze two northern alignments (N2 and N6). Some alignment possibilities (N1 and N3-N5) were withdrawn for operational and safety reasons, or because they required the towers to be placed where bedrock is deeper. N6 is receiving the most focus of the northern alignments. It tries to balance the needs of the structure (where to put the tower) and operational safety of the roadway. Caltrans is continuing to study one southern alignment (S2) but has withdrawn the other (S1) because of its impacts to the East Bay Municipal Utility District's (EBMUD) sewer outfall.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee
MTC has the option of extending tolls for up to 2 years to fund additional amenities including a bicycle path. Caltrans has been meeting with a pedestrian/bicycle advisory committee to gain input. Their concerns include noise, pollution, safety, visual experience, and cost. The path will be a Class I path that has a barrier between it and the roadway. The path is only considered for the East Span.

The project will not include improvements of roads on Yerba Buena Island (YBI) for bicyclists. It would include access to the bridge along the Oakland Spit. A parallel path along the maintenance road has already been planned as a permit condition for a separate project.
Caltrans and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee have made four recommendations to the structural team to study further. These include:
- A 12-foot wide path on the outer edge of the southern deck
- A 12-foot wide path on the outer edge of the southern deck with the path located two feet below the roadway
- Two 10-foot wide paths on the outer edge of each deck
- Two 10-foot wide paths on the outer edge of each deck with the path located two feet below the roadway

Did the committee consider connecting to a path on the West Span in the future? Yes. This project will not preclude connection to the West Span. Denis Mulligan stated that Caltrans previously conducted a cost estimate of a path on the West Span that they presented at the May 8, 1997 Task Force Meeting. Caltrans would construct a path on the West Span as a separate project if funding was secured.

Why are you studying a path two feet below the roadway? There will be a barrier between the path and traffic and a rail on the outside of the path. If the path is placed two feet below deck, the rail would be the same level as the barrier. Some members of the committee had a desire to drop the path even lower. This would improve motorist’ views of the Bay. It would also reduce noise levels on the path, but the path might be perceived as less safe. Victor Zeuzum is conducting additional studies and noise on the path will be addressed in the EIS.

Bridge Aesthetics: Brian Maroney, Caltrans
The design team is looking at a self-anchored suspension bridge and a cable-stayed bridge. The goals of the design team are:
- Increase seismic safety
- Develop optimum design structurally
- Complete work in a tight schedule for design and construction
- Integrate Caltrans and MTC input/guidelines
- Receive input from cities, and different groups and agencies
- Be sensitive to cost.

On March 2, 1998, the team presented three main concepts for each type of bridge. EDAP evaluated ideas based on aesthetic, structural performance and cost. They directed the team to proceed with a single tower and double portal concept. Caltrans’ value analysis team is reviewing designs and costs of each bridge design.

Rafael Manzanarez presented the group with a slide show of the cable-stayed and self-anchored suspension bridge concepts. The team is evaluating single and double portal towers for the suspension and cable-stayed concepts. He noted that in each case, there will be two decks, separated by approximately 50 feet. They are evaluating using steel or concrete for the skyway structure. The bridge designs may be used on either a northern or southern alignment.
The design life of the replacement bridge is 150 years. Vertical clearance of the new bridge will be 54 meters and the main tower will be no higher than the West Span towers (530 feet).

Initial reaction from the public includes a preference for a single tower cable-stayed bridge or a double portal suspension bridge. There has been a preference for a pedestrian/bicycle path.

**Do any of the designs change traffic capacity?**
Each design maintains 10 lanes of traffic (5 in each direction). The new bridge however would have shoulders. The capacity of the bridge is controlled by the size of the tunnel.

**How do the designs relate to the West Span?**
The West Span is a double-deck bridge and is two suspension bridges linked together. The design team provides a choice with the two bridge design types. The self-anchored suspension bridge looks similar to the design of the West Span and the cable-stayed bridge is a unique look for the East Span.

**Why is Caltrans not considering a double-deck bridge for the East Span?**
Two decks are more reliable seismically and less expensive than a double-deck structure. The EDAP also recommended pursing two separate decks for a better visual experience.

**What distance from the tower will overlap of the decks start to occur?**
The decks will be at the same level at the main span. Most of the transition to the double deck structure of the tunnel will occur on the island, away from the main span.

**What consideration is being paid to the skyway portion of the bridge?**
The structure teams are looking at different skyway variations with the designs for the main span. Both teams are also looking at a gateway concept in the area of the Oakland touchdown. Preliminary designs will be presented at the next EDAP meeting.

**Is Caltrans carrying the southern alignment forward because they need to for NEPA?**
The southern alignment has several benefits and is continuing to be studied as an alignment alternative. Geologists prefer the southern alignment due to soil conditions. It has a shorter distance and has potential for economy.

**Environmental Process Update: Mara Melandry**

**Status of Technical Studies**
The technical studies are in progress.
- Jurisdictional wetlands map
- Biological assessment
- Special status species
- Air quality: the study finds no exceedences in air quality for the East Span Project.
- Noise
- Water Quality
- Flood plain analysis
- Visual: Visual simulations of driver’s views and views of the bridge will be produced.
Historic resources
Archaeology: A site has been discovered near YB3. Caltrans will prepare a treatment plan for use during construction.
Land use/community impacts: Caltrans has met with San Francisco about YBI redevelopment and has met with the Port of Oakland about the Oakland Touchdown area.
Pedestrian/non-motorized: Caltrans has met regularly with the Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee.
Traffic and circulation study
Hazardous materials
Energy
Geotechnical

Caltrans has received concurrence letters from permitting agencies on the Purpose and Need for the project. Caltrans is expecting to receive concurrence letters on the Range of Alternatives soon.

General Discussion
Are Peregrine Falcons living on the East Span?
Yes, there is a pair of Peregrine Falcons living on the West and East Spans. For the interim retrofit, Caltrans has hired the Santa Cruz Predatory Bird Research Group, who will monitor when the falcons lay eggs and will remove the hatched chicks. Caltrans has asked the designers to consider integrating habitat for the falcons into the bridge designs.

Is there a recycling plan for the existing bridge?
The existing bridge cannot be left in place because it would need to be retrofitted. In addition, there are navigational issues and it would have to be maintained. The bridge may be demolished and sold as scrap. Brian Maroney noted that Caltrans is also contacting bridge brokers and will pursue that option of re-use of the bridge. Off-shore ocean disposal does not appear to be an option.

What is the status of other Bay Bridge projects?
By the end of the year, all contracts for the West Span will be awarded. Caltrans is not expecting construction on the West Approach until 1999.

When will Caltrans start releasing draft environmental study reports?
Caltrans will not release reports in draft form. All technical studies will be completed before the Draft EIS which has a target release date of September, 1998. Anyone interested in receiving a final version of a technical study may contact Mara Melandry at 510-286-5582. The public can respond to the DEIS which will contain a summary of the results of the studies.

When will Caltrans be looking at traffic closures?
10 lanes of traffic will remain open during peak hours. Closures might occur during the last 9 months to 1 year of the project which is targeted for early 2002 to early 2003. It is anticipated that any bridge closures would occur at non-peak hours but Caltrans is not far enough along in
the design to give exact data. Caltrans will conduct extensive public outreach to the community if bridge closures are necessary.

Caltrans is planning to handle traffic with detour structures and is currently looking at various alternatives. The team is considering alternatives for detour structures in order to maintain traffic flows while replacing the existing bridge section near the YBI tunnel. The alternatives include an option with both detour decks on the north side of the existing bridge, an option with one deck on the north side and one on the south side, and an option with both decks on the south side. The team is analyzing the construction feasibility of each of these alternatives. The detour structures will be in place for 9 months to 1 year.

What is the status of YBI ramps?
Caltrans will reconstruct the eastbound on-ramp. The improvement of the other YBI ramps is not part of the East Span Project and is currently not funded. The San Francisco reuse plan also does not include modifying the ramps. If funding is found, the ramps would be subject to a separate environmental analysis. Caltrans is designing the new bridge to not preclude improvements to the ramps. Steve Heminger stated that MTC is concerned about the ramps and that MTC is working to find a funding source so that Caltrans can complete an environmental document and then ideally combine the ramps project and the East Span project into one construction contract.

Steve Hulsebus noted that there is a desire to make the ramps standard and that will have impacts to land use on YBI.

Next Actions/Next Meeting:
Denis Mulligan thanked everyone for coming. He reiterated that Caltrans and MTC would like people to participate in the upcoming MTC meetings and provide input.

The meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 6, 1998 at 1:00 p.m. at Caltrans District 4 offices in the Park View room. The group will discuss MTC's bridge design recommendation to Caltrans.
Distribution:
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Elihu Harris, Mayor, City of Oakland
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San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Meeting with the U.S. Navy
April 17, 1998 – 2:00 p.m.
900 Commodore Drive, Building 107, Command Conference Room

Attendees:
Capt. Ernest Hunter, EFA West
Kenn Parsons, EFA West
Frank Ruccolo, EFA West
Cdr. Larry Linn, EFA West
Domenic A. Zigant, EFA West
Dennis Driennan, EFA West
Morise Russ, EFA West
Doug Pomeroy, EFA West
James Sullivan, EFA West

Caltrans Staff:
Denis Mulligan, Program Manager, Toll Bridge Program
Steven Hulsebus, Toll Bridge Program
Ade Akinsanya, Structures
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental

Consultant Team:
Ken Jong, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Rafael Manzanerez, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Molly Bowden, Public Affairs Management
Meeting Summary:

**Introductions/Meeting Purpose: Denis Mulligan, Caltrans**

Denis Mulligan welcomed everyone. The attendees introduced themselves and their agency/organization. Denis gave a short overview of the project history as follows.

Since the Loma Prieta earthquake, Caltrans has been assessing toll bridges in the Bay Area for seismic safety. In assessing the East Span of the Bay Bridge, Caltrans has found that the cost of a replacement bridge is commensurate with the cost of retrofitting the existing span when looking at the life cycle of the bridge.

Caltrans is the lead agency for the project and the owner and operator of the Bay Bridge. FHWA is the lead agency under NEPA. Caltrans is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the East Span Project. The EIS will analyze a no-build alternative, a retrofit alternative, and three alignment alternatives – two north of the existing bridge and one south of the bridge.

Caltrans selected three engineering consulting teams to provide technical expertise on the project. The joint venture team of TY Lin International/Moffatt & Nichol Engineers is developing the bridge concepts. Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. is working on highway design and environmental studies. Fugro West, Inc. and Earth Mechanics, Inc. are conducting geotechnical and seismic studies.

Construction is targeted to take place from 2000 to 2003. Caltrans has adopted this aggressive schedule due to public safety concerns during earthquakes. After completion of the new bridge, demolition of the existing bridge is expected to take one year.

**Alignments Considered and Withdrawn: Steven Hulsebus, Caltrans**

Caltrans has decided to withdraw some of the original alternatives from consideration and add new alternatives. Caltrans will continue to analyze two northern alignments (N2 and N6). Some alignment possibilities (N1, N3-N5) were withdrawn for operational and safety reasons, or because they required the towers be placed where the bedrock is deeper. N6 is receiving the most focus of the northern alignments. It tries to balance the needs of structure (where to put the tower) and operational safety. Caltrans is continuing to study one southern alignment (S2) but has withdrawn the other (S1) because of its impacts to the East Bay Municipal Utility District’s (EBMUD) sewer outfall.

The new East Span would replace the existing double-deck structure with two side-by-side structures. These two side-by-side decks would go through a transition area on YBI to the double-deck tunnel.

The cable-supported main span will span across the navigational channel next to Yerba Buena Island (YBI). One reason the main span is being designed close to YBI is because of the geology beneath the bay. The structural designers want to take advantage of the shallow bedrock next to the island. On the Oakland shore, there is approximately 500 feet of bay mud, sand and clay above the bedrock.
Any alignment south of the existing bridge has fewer impacts to Navy property but more impacts to Coast Guard facilities. Southern alignments also have impacts on the Port of Oakland.

**Bridge Concepts and Aesthetics**

Rafael Manzanarez presented the group with a slide show of the bridge concepts. The main span of the bridge designs will be built over the navigational channel close to YBI. The team is pursuing 2 bridge types: cable-stayed and self-anchored suspension. The team is evaluating single and double portal towers for the suspension and cable-stayed concepts. He noted that in each case there will be two decks separated by approximately 50 feet. They are evaluating various designs for the skyway structure on the rest of the bridge, including a tapered skyway and lighting options creating a boulevard effect. One of the designs includes an elevator in the main tower for sight-seeing.

The team is developing designs for a pedestrian/bicycle path two feet below the bridge deck and at deck level. They are evaluating placing one path on the south side of the bridge or two paths, one on each side of the bridge. They are also developing concepts without the pedestrian/bicycle path to facilitate the decision-making process.

The team will present cost estimates for each design on May 18, 1998 to the MTC Engineering and Design Advisory Panel (EDAP). MTC will make recommendations on bridge design and amenities including improvements to the Transbay Transit Terminal and a possible pedestrian/bicycle path to Caltrans in June 1998.

**Environmental Process Update**

Caltrans is preparing environmental studies for the Draft EIS. Mike Davis distributed handouts including the targeted schedule for the EIS. The Draft EIS is targeted for release in August 1998 and the target date for the Record of Decision is June 1999. The EIS will assess three alignment alternatives, the bridge design options with and without a pedestrian/bicycle path, and three possible profiles for a new East Span.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Fish and Game and other agencies have been consulted about the EIS. The agencies have concurred on the Purpose and Need for the project. Caltrans expects to have concurrence on the Range of Alternatives soon.

Mike Davis reported on the status of a few of the technical studies:

- The project will be consistent with the State Implementation Plan; no quantitative analysis is required because the project is not capacity increasing.
- Caltrans has conducted archaeological studies on YBI and has located a site near YB3. Caltrans will prepare a treatment plan for use during construction.
- The EIS will address impacts of bicyclists on YBI in a low/medium/high range.
• Noise analysis is in progress and includes vibration testing. Noise monitoring stations are located on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. Mitigation measures will be proposed in the EIS.
• The Hazardous Materials report will include a summary of existing information about hazardous materials located on YBI and the Oakland shore.

**General Discussion of Key Issues**

**YBI Ramps**
The eastbound on-ramp from YBI will be replaced because it will have to be removed for construction of the new bridge. Improvements to the other ramps on YBI are not part of the East Span Project and will not be evaluated in the EIS. However, the design of the bridge will accommodate future improvements to the other ramps. The City and County of San Francisco, MTC and Caltrans acknowledge that the ramps may be replaced in the future; however, at this time no funding for ramp improvements has been allocated. Caltrans has developed plans and associated costs for the other YBI ramps in anticipation of future funding. If funding is found for the ramp improvements, Caltrans will work closely with the various agencies regarding environmental review and construction of the ramps. A separate environmental document would need to be prepared for improved ramps.

Steve Hulsebus presented designs for future ramp improvements if funding is found. The designs include concepts for westbound on- and off-ramps and an eastbound off-ramp. In order to bring the ramps up to standards, the acceleration distance must be increased for the on-ramps: Ken Jong indicated that the critical operational safety issue was maintaining enough distance for the on-ramps so that vehicles could accelerate to a safe merging speed. The designs represent a compromise of Caltrans standards to be commensurate with the posted speed limit. The ramps will be elevated structures that will tie into Macalla Road.

A person from the Navy asked if Caltrans has developed a physical model of the area, YBI and ramps. Steve Hulsebus answered that Caltrans has not developed a physical model of the ramp designs, but if the ramp improvement project is funded, that it would be a good idea to build such a model.

**Temporary Detours and Structures**
The new bridge will have 5 lanes in each direction with two 10-foot shoulders on either side. During construction, Caltrans’ goal is to maintain 10 lanes of traffic on the Bay Bridge during peak hours. The team is considering alternatives for detour structures in order to maintain traffic flows while replacing the existing bridge section near the YBI tunnel. The alternatives include an option with both detour decks on the north side of the existing bridge, an option with one detour deck on the north side and one on the south side, and an option with both detours on the south side. The team is analyzing the construction feasibility of each of these alternatives. The detour structures will be in place for 9 months to 1 year.
Ken Jong noted that during construction they may need to detour traffic from Macalla Road. The Navy expressed concern that emergency vehicles still be able to access the bridge.

Barges may be used to transport equipment to YBI for bridge construction. Caltrans may build a dock for the barges.

**Interagency Coordination**
Caltrans has held several meetings with the City and County of San Francisco. The new director for the Treasure Island Redevelopment Project, Annemarie Conroy, attended the last meeting. Mayor Willie Brown has stated a preference for a northern alignment. Currently however, San Francisco staff have plans to develop land where the northern alignment would be built. Discussions with the City are on going.

The Navy noted that their interests are similar to the City's. They want the ability to transfer YBI through conveyance to the City.

**Other Bay Bridge Projects**
The West Approach and West Span will undergo a seismic upgrade. Caltrans will add steel plates to the towers of the West Span. Caltrans will close the eastbound off-ramp on the west side of the island for approximately three months. Traffic will be detoured to the eastbound off-ramp on the east side of the island.

Caltrans has started working on the East Span Interim Retrofit Project. This project provides increased safety in the interim until final seismic upgrade actions for the East Span are completed. The interim retrofit project increases the life safety provided by the bridge in the event of a lower level yet more likely event, but does not provide for a Design Event Earthquake. The interim retrofit will take 12 to 15 months to complete.

**Next Actions/Next Meeting**
The Navy would like to have regular meetings with Caltrans about the East Span Project. Caltrans should contact Kenn Parsons to set up future meetings.

Caltrans will give maps/presentation materials to Kenn Parsons to distribute to appropriate parties in the Navy.
AGENDA

San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Meeting with the U.S. Navy
Friday, April 17, 1998 – 2:00 p.m.
900 Commodore Drive, Building 107, Command Conference Room, San Bruno, CA

I. Introductions/ Meeting Purpose
   10 minutes
   Denis Mulligan

II. Alignments Considered and Withdrawn
    15 minutes
    Steven Hulsebus

III. Bridge Concepts and Aesthetics
     • Presentation of Latest Design Concepts
       Presented to MTC
     30 minutes
     Ade Akinsanya/
     Rafael Manzanarez

IV. Environmental Process Update
    • Status of Technical Studies
    • NEPA/404 Update
    • EIS Schedule
    • Cities and Agency Coordination
    10 minutes
    Marilee Mortenson/
    Mike Davis

V. General Discussion of Key Issues
   20 minutes
   Steven Hulsebus/
   Others
   A. Engineering Issues
      • YBI Ramps
      • Construction Staging Area on YBI
      • Access
      • Temporary Detours and Structures
      • Utilities
   B. Environmental Issues
      • Effects of Bicycle Path
      • Construction Noise

VI. Next Actions/Next Meeting
    10 minutes
    Steven Hulsebus
Environmental Studies Status

- Waters of the U.S.
- Special Status Species
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Water Quality
- Floodplain
- Visual
- Historic Resources
- Archaeology

- Land Use
- Community Impacts
- Pedestrian/non-motorized
- Traffic and Circulation
- Hazardous Materials
- Energy
- Geology
NEPA/404 Consultation Steps

- Purpose and Need
- Range of Alternatives
- Wetlands jurisdictional delineation
- Draft EIS / 404 Notice Coordination
- Selection of Preferred Alternative
- Final EIS / 404 Notice
- Record of Decision / Corps Permit Decision
Target Schedule

× Notice of Intent to prepare EIS ➢ 4/97
× Public information open houses ➢ 12/97
× Complete environmental studies ➢ 4/98
× Draft Environmental Impact Statement ➢ 8/98
× Public hearings/formal comment period ➢ 8-9/98
× Select Preferred Alternative ➢ 11/98
× Final Environmental Impact Statement ➢ 1/99
× Record of Decision ➢ 6/99
× Begin construction ➢ 2000
× Open new bridge ➢ 2003
Inter-Agency Coordination

- City and County of San Francisco
- City of Oakland
- Port of Oakland
- East Bay Regional Park District
- Association of Bay Area Governments (Bay Trail)
Alignment Alternatives

✓ No build
✓ Retrofit existing East Span
✓ North replacement alignments
✓ South replacement alignments

✓ N1 (North most) -- Deep young bay mud issues -- WITHDRAWN
✓ N2 (North Adjacent) -- Shortest north alignment, pushes main tower to the east
✓ N3 (West most) -- Operational and safety issues at YBI ramps -- WITHDRAWN
✓ N4 (East most) -- Pushes main tower too far east -- WITHDRAWN
✓ N5 (N4 variation) -- Pushes main tower too far east -- WITHDRAWN
✓ N6 (N3/N4 variation) -- Provides for desirable main tower location
April 24, 1998

Patricia Duff  
Department of the Navy  
Engineering Field Activity, West  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
900 Commodore Drive  
San Bruno, CA 94066-2402

Dear Ms. Duff:

Enclosed for your review is a draft copy of the Archaeological Survey Report for the proposed San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project, which includes an extended phase one report for CA-SFr-4 on Yerba Buena Island. We request that your comments be submitted to us by May 8, 1998. If we do not receive your comments by that date, we will assume that you have no comments. In the interest of your convenience and time, comments can be written on the report and returned to us. A formal letter report is not necessary. Janet Pape will be on vacation April 28-May 22, 1998; therefore, please send your comments to the attention of Mara Melandry.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA  
District Director

By Janet Pape

DENIS J. MULLIGAN  
District Division Chief  
Toll Bridge Program

Enclosure
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Interagency Coordination Meeting with the City and County of San Francisco
Treasure Island, Building 1, San Francisco, CA
June 8, 1998

Attendees:
City and County of San Francisco
Christine Tejada, Treasure Island Project
Eila Arbuckle, Treasure Island Project
Joan Rummelsburg, Treasure Island Project
Paul Rosetter, San Francisco Planning Department
Mike Quan, San Francisco Dept. of Public Works
Jack Fleck, San Francisco Dept. of Parking and Traffic
Wendy Linka, Mayor’s Office
Lori Mazzola, Mayor’s Office

Caltrans Staff
Steven Hulsebus, Toll Bridge Program
Michael Whiteside, Structures
Mara Melandry, Environmental
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental
Aaron Nicholson, Structures

U.S. Navy
Kenn Parsons, U.S. Navy, EFA West

Consultant Team
Rafael Manzanarez, T.Y. Lin/ Moffatt & Nichol Joint Venture
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Cindy Potter, Public Affairs Management
Al Ely, T.Y. Lin/ Moffatt & Nichol Joint Venture
Ken Jong, Parson Brinckerhoff

Distribution List:
All attendees
Cindy Adams, Caltrans HQ-Environmental
Debra Baker, Caltrans-Right of Way
Meeting Purpose:
- To continue project discussions between the City and County of San Francisco and Caltrans
- To provide an update on the East Span Project design concepts
- To further define the project issues of importance to the City
- To communicate the progress of the City’s Yerba Buena Island (YBI) land use plans and Caltrans’ EIS process for the East Span Project

Meeting Summary:
Welcome/Introductions: Steven Hulsebus, Caltrans
Steve Hulsebus welcomed everyone. The attendees introduced themselves and their agency/organization.

Update on Caltrans Environmental Process: Mara Melandry
Caltrans is scheduled to publish the DEIS in September 1998 with a 45-day comment period. Right now, the document is in the internal Caltrans review cycle and the DEIS will be issued to the public and all agencies at the same time in September. By 1999, Caltrans will select its preferred alternative based on the environmental evaluation of the 3 alternatives (two alignments north of the existing bridge and one alignment south of the bridge) included in the DEIS. In June, 1999 the Record of Decision will be published. The MTC recommendation made in June 1998 will be considered in the EIS. As part of the EIS process, the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA), per NEPA’s guidelines, will be determined by Caltrans and others.

Kenn Parsons noted that a request could be made to extend the comment period an additional 15 days. Mara responded that if the request is made, it will be considered.

Update on Bridge Concepts: Mike Whiteside/Rafael Manzanarez
Bridge Design
Rafael Manzanarez presented the bridge design alternative that will be recommended by EDAP to MTC on June 10, 1998. This alternative is a self-anchored, single tower bridge with a 565-meter main span with 50-meter clearance. The four-legged tower is 60-meters in height and made of steel.

EDAP is also recommending that 2 design variations for the skyway be designed to their final design. One of the designs is a variable depth skyway and the other is a constant depth skyway. Constant depth means that the distance between the top of the roadway deck and the bottom is constant throughout the skyway.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Path
EDAP is also recommending that there be a pedestrian/bicycle path on the south side of the eastbound deck. Paul Rosetter said that the impact of bicycles leaving the bridge on YBI should be considered an impact in the environmental process since YBI has no facilities for bicycles.
Update on City's Yerba Buena Island Land Uses: Paul Rosetter

Paul noted that the 11 acres of YBI would be useless to the City if a bridge with a northern alignment is built.

Update of Key Issues: Steve Hulsebus/Others

YBI Ramps

Steve stated that even though the YBI ramps are not included in the Bay Bridge project, Caltrans is still evaluating how future ramps might conform with the new bridge. Mara noted that the reason the ramps are not included in the project is because it's a seismic safety project, and that there is currently no funding for the YBI ramps. She notes that MTC might approve funds for ramps to be reconstructed in the future and that if so, the ramps' reconstruction would have to be evaluated in a separate environmental review. Joan Rummelsburg said that funds might be imminent.

Temporary Detours and Structures

Steve presented models of two bridge detour alternatives being considered for the bridge's span to YBI. The alternatives include an option with both detours on the north side of the existing bridge (North Detour) and an option with one structure on the north side, and one on the south side (North/South Detour).

- 32 months to build the main span
- 36 to 38 months to build the skyway
- 6 to 8 months to build the temporary detour structure
- 1 to 2 months to dismantle the detour structure
- Detours in place for 2 years, from start of their construction to their removal

Michael Whiteside has also estimated that it will be about 18 months from the start of construction for the detour to the end of detour construction. Mara stated that the impacts of the detour options will be evaluated through the environmental process and as the decision is narrowed, the schedule will be more precise.

Steve also presented preliminary foundation plans for the new bridge and temporary structures of the two detour alternatives. The locations of the foundations aren't exact on the plans, but they do identify the areas for the foundations. The Fire Station and historic Navy buildings will not be removed under either plan. In the North/South plan, the CG buildings on the southeast side of YBI will be removed.

Steve identified that most of the east side of YBI would be needed for contractors' use during construction, including the entire Parade Grounds and possibly the Nimitz's house and parking area. This will be necessary for the duration of the project. Traffic might have to be rerouted around the island instead of under the bridge on the east side of YBI.

Construction Effects on Utilities on the Island

The City staff stated their concerns about the loss of revenue due to construction activities and accessibility to YBI. They have events planned every weekend at the Nimitz House and other
events at the sound stages and Clipper Cove. Kenn Parsons also noted that there are plans for all the housing on YBI and Treasure Island to be rented and occupied within 6 to 9 months from now. This would be another loss of revenue for the City if residents will not stay during construction. Mara noted that the contractors will be paying rent on the portion of YBI that they will occupy.

There is a concern for night noise from construction. Mara stated that Caltrans will have 10 lanes open on the bridge during peak hours.

Wendy Linka noted that she heard Mayor Brown was no longer endorsing the northern alignment bridge alternative. Mara stated that the City of San Francisco’s official position is still the northern alignment, based on a letter from Mayor Willie Brown dated July 1997. The southern alignment, however, will still be considered in the DEIS.

**Next Actions/Next Meeting:**

- The next Interagency Meeting with the City of San Francisco and Caltrans will be determined soon after the MTC decision in June.
- Caltrans will verify that they sent copies of the alignment map and the construction staging footprint map presented at the previous meeting to Annemarie Conroy and that she received them.
- Caltrans will send Annemarie Conroy copies of the bridge concept pictures presented at the meeting on March 30, specifically including a photo that showed impacts to the point of YBI (without trees).
- Caltrans will provide Paul Rosetter with copies of the technical studies when they are complete.
- Caltrans will send copies of foundation plans for the EDAP recommended bridge alternative and temporary detour structures for the north/north and north/south detour alignments presented in the meeting to Joan Rummelsburg and Kenn Parsons.
Ms. Danielle M. Huey, Archaeologist  
Department of the Navy, Southwest Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
12220 Pacific Highway  
San Diego, CA 92132-5190  

Dear Ms. Huey:

Enclosed for your files for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project is a copy of the combined Positive Archaeological Survey Report, Extended Phase I Report for Investigations at CA-SFr-04/H, Evaluation for Historic Archaeological Resources, and Request for Determination of Eligibility for Prehistoric Component of CA-SFr-04/H. One previously recorded site, CA-SFr-04/H, is situated within the Yerba Buena Island portion of the Area of Potential Effects. The prehistoric component of CA-SFr-04/H is considered to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion D. No other prehistoric resources have been identified within the Area of Potential Effects.

The historic component of CA-SFr-04/H, the U.S. Naval Training Station, does not appear eligible based on archival and map research. However, further historical archaeological research and evaluation will be necessary to determine whether additional eligible archaeological resources representing the early American Period associated with the Army Post and Depot and Thomas Dowling, in the same location as the Naval Training Station, have been preserved.

Once an alternative is selected and if it affects CA-SFr-04/H, a treatment plan will be prepared by CALTRANS and approved by SHPO in order to mitigate impacts to the site. It will also take into account, although unlikely, any possible late discovery during construction. This treatment plan will also be submitted to you for review. Data recovery will occur prior to construction of the project. We understand that we will not need a new ARPA permit for further field investigations.

If you have any questions concerning this report, please contact Janet Pape, Associate Environmental Planner, Archaeologist, at 510-286-5615.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA  
District Director

By  
MARA MELANDRY  
Environmental Manager  
SFOBB
Enclosure

c: Patricia Duff, Department of the Navy
   Engineering field Activity, West
bc: MBuss, MMelandry/JPape
CAdams, JGoldfine/AHope-
June 24, 1998

Lou Wall, Cultural Resource Manager  
Department of the Navy  
Engineering Field Activity, West  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
900 Commodore Drive  
San Bruno, CA 94066-2402

Dear Mr. Wall:


If you have any questions on the above, please contact Janet Pape, Archaeologist, at 510/286-5615 regarding archaeology and Jared Goldfine, Senior Environmental Planner, at 510/286-6203 for the built environment. Please note that the Archaeological Survey Report contains confidential information and is not for public distribution.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA  
District Director

By  
MARA MELANDRY  
Environmental Manager  
SFOBB

Enclosure

cc:  
Susanna Montana (City and County of San Francisco)  
Annemarie Conroy (City and County of San Francisco)  
Cherilynn Widell (SHPO)  
Lieutenant Commander Jon Milkey (USCG)  

bc:  
MMelandry/MMortenson/JPap  
JGoldfine/AHope  
MBuss, CAdams  
Mike Davis, PB
July 3, 1998

Mr. Kenn Parsons
U.S. Department of Navy
Base Closure Manager
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, California 94066-5006

Dear Mr. Parsons:

Subject: Request for meeting

As you are no doubt aware, Caltrans is in the process of preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the replacement of the East Span of the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge. The DEIS will be released this September and the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will be issued in early 1999. The proposed project is likely to have an adverse effect on historic properties located on Yerba Buena Island, which is currently under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Navy.

We would like to request a meeting with you and your staff and representatives from the San Francisco Treasure Island Project. At that meeting, my staff would like to report on the status of our historic properties investigation and begin discussions regarding terms of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to be prepared pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The signatories to the MOA will include the U.S. Navy, the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer.

It is my hope that this meeting can be convened in the next several weeks. If you have any questions, please call me at 510/286-5623, or Jared Goldfine, Senior Environmental Planner at 510/286-6203.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
DISTRICT DIRECTOR

By:

Jared Goldfine

Robert Gross, Chief
Office of Environmental Planning South

cc: Annmarie Conroy, S.F. Treasure Island Project
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Project Development Team Meeting
July 6, 1998 – 1:00 p.m.
Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, Park View Room, 15th Floor

Attendees:
Caltrans Staff
Denis Mulligan, District 4 Deputy Director
Brian Maroney, Toll Bridge Program
Steve Hulsebus, Toll Bridge Program
Katja Greve, Toll Bridge Program
Ade Akinsanya, Structures
Moe Amini, Structures
Mara Melandry, Environmental
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental
Cindy Adams, HQ Environmental Division
Pochana Chongchaikit, Toll Bridge Program
Dave Casey, Right of Way
Lyle Oehler, Landscape Architecture
James Lee, Functional Support
Jay Mirza, Transportation Architecture
Debra Baker, Right of Way
Mike Thomas, HQ Design

FHWA
Bill Wong
Dan Harris
Nancy Bobb

Consultant Team
Ken Jong, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Tim Dougherty, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Gary Grunwald, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Rafael Manzanerez, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol, Joint Venture
Al Ely, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol, Joint Venture
Surlene Grant, Public Affairs Management
Anne Tobias, Public Affairs Management

City and County of San Francisco
Annemarie Conroy, Mayor's Treasure Island Project Office
City of Oakland
Diane Tannenwald, City of Oakland, Public Works Agency
Peter Woo, Oakland Department of Parking &Traffic
Norman Hooks, Oakland Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
Helaine Prentice-Kaplan, City of Oakland, CEDA
Marina Carlson, Office of the Mayor

U.S. Coast Guard
Jerry Olmes, Commander

U.S. Navy
Bob Clarke, CSO Treasure Island
Kenn Parsons, Base Conversion Manager

Agency Participants
Anne Whittington, Port of Oakland
Mandy Clayton, Bay Area Council
Eric S. Francier, California Highway Patrol - Oakland
Kin Ho, California Highway Patrol - Oakland
Thomas Galvin, Department of Defense - Oakland Army Base
Victoria Eisen, ABAG/Bay Trail
Paul Bignardi, AC Transit
Rube Warren, BART
Debra Baker, BART Deputy General Manager
Marge Blackwell, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Meeting Summary:

Welcome / Introductions: Denis Mulligan, Caltrans
Denis Mulligan welcomed everyone. The attendees introduced themselves and their agency/organization. Denis stated that the purpose of the meeting was to report on project status, identify project issues, present alternatives and design variations under consideration, summarize environmental studies, and outline opportunities for public input.

Results of MTC Decision-Making Process: Denis Mulligan
Denis restated the initial MTC recommendations with respect to finance, design process, planning and bridge design. Denis highlighted the four recent MTC recommendations from the Task Force and EDAP meetings held on June 22 and June 24:
1. The new eastern span should be a single-tower self anchored suspension bridge
2. The skyway should be constructed of concrete with a variable depth profile
3. The new eastern span should have a single bicycle/pedestrian path on the south side of the eastbound deck
4. The pile caps for the piers should be placed above the water

Denis emphasized that Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration are leading the environmental review process. Caltrans is proceeding with “risk design” for a replacement span based on MTC recommendations. If the environmental process results in conclusions other than those assumed for “risk design”, then Caltrans will direct the team to respond appropriate to the findings of the environmental document.

Alignment Alternatives & Pedestrian/Bicycle Path Update: Steven Hulsebus, Caltrans
Alignment Alternatives Under Consideration
Caltrans is studying a range of alternatives to satisfy the NEPA process. These include the No Build; Retrofit Existing East Span; N2 (North Replacement Alignment); N6 (North Replacement Alignment), S2 (South Replacement Alignment). MTC has recommended a northern alignment to Caltrans.

Criteria for Selecting Range of Alternatives
Steve reviewed the criteria for selecting a range of alternatives as follows:
- Meets lifeline criteria
- Meets current standards for operations and safety to the greatest extent possible
- Does not preclude a pedestrian/bike path
- Does not preclude future improvements to YBI access ramps
- Minimizes impacts to environmental resources
- Maintains existing number of traffic lanes during and after construction
Detour Options
There are two options under consideration that will be implemented as part of the construction process:
North-South calls for detours to go north and south of the structure while it is under construction.
North-North requires the detours in each direction to be north of the structure while it's under construction.

Bridge Design Overview: Brian Maroney, Caltrans
Caltrans has adopted and is moving forward with the MTC Task Force recommendation to pursue detailed design for the single-tower self-anchored suspension bridge. Brian restated the goals of the design team:
• Increase seismic safety
• Develop optimum design structurally
• Complete work in a tight schedule for design and construction
• Integrate Caltrans and MTC input/guidelines
• Receive input from cities, public interest groups and agencies
• Remain sensitive to cost.

Bridge Design Issues: Ade Akinsanya, Caltrans
Ade reviewed the key elements of the bridge design. He noted that the bridge is being designed according to the 150-year design life standard, which provides maximum strength in case of a seismic event in the pier foundation system, accessibility, reduced maintenance, and repair and visual consistency.

There are several factors that are incorporated into the design review process:
• Value engineering analysis
• Seismic safety peer review
• Caltrans review and oversight
• Ground motion review panel
• Internal review panel
• Independent design check

He reviewed the single-tower suspension bridge alternative including span arrangement, cable suspender arrangement, and other features. Details of the steel box with orthotropic deck configuration were discussed.

He reviewed the skyway bridge elements including concrete viaduct options, haunched concrete box girders, skyway foundations and pile caps. He also explained the lightweight concrete material that will be used on the skyway structure. Marine construction access is a key aspect of the project and he outlined the various modes that will be used for construction of the skyway, suspension span and the Oakland Mole/YBI structure.

The soil profile of the bridge is a critical element that will be used to guide the construction process. Various foundation types on the skyway were presented. Ade explained the two types of piles to be used: battered piles, which fan out into the soil, and tubular steel piles, which vary in
diameter and width. He noted that Caltrans is in the process of developing a testing program for pile driveability. Proposed pier elevation and columns were presented.

He reviewed the construction sequence and methods. The deck is a critical path element; therefore, the tower and deck will be erected simultaneously. The deck is a “floating deck” which allows the structure to move and not stress the piers with additional load. The motion of the tower does not affect the deck. It was noted that there will be no interval between finishing the cable and completion of the deck erection.

Bridge Design Comments
What are the proposed methods for separation between traffic and the bike path?
The bike path design will be elevated 1 foot above the deck and will be 15 feet wide. There is a concrete barrier, along with fencing and railing to separate pedestrians and bicycles.

How will the bike path be designed to ensure maximum comfort and safety for bicyclists?
Caltrans is working with bicycle interest groups to ensure that the allotted space is used wisely. Caltrans will commence risk design and continue with MTC's recommendation.

Is there a form of materials or a method such as base isolation to address the fact that there is large quantity of mud near the bridge structure?
In order to isolate the structure in a seismic event, a soft structure should not be placed on a soft site, but rather the opposite: a stiff structure should be placed on a soft site. For retrofit work Caltrans utilizes isolators but these are not as effective for new construction. Battered piles are good in these soil conditions and recommended by EDAP.

Will the bike path have a railing?
A railing will be included. Caltrans is not contemplating a suicide barrier at this time.

Will the bridge accommodate mass transit? Is this in accordance with long-term planning for the Bay Area?
The bridge project is not a capacity increasing project. There are constraints posed by YBI and the tunnel. MTC's initial recommendations stated that the bridge should be designed to accommodate the possibility of future rail service. The replacement bridge will not preclude future light rail service. At this time, the bridge is not being designed to accommodate heavy rail.

Confirm the preferred alignment as recommended by MTC.
MTC has recommended the near north alignment to Caltrans.

Why are the piers on the skyway structure proposed to be designed in concrete? The "lightness" of the features on the signature structure are visually more appealing.
The piers are proposed to be designed in concrete, as they will withstand a seismic event, while piers designed from other materials cannot withstand a seismic event.
Environmental Process Update: Mara Melandry

Status of DEIS/Technical Studies

Mara reported that the technical team has made significant progress. Studies have been completed on range of areas including:

- Waters of the U.S.
- Special Status Species
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Water Quality
- Floodplain
- Visual
- Historical Resources
- Archaeology

Mara highlighted preliminary results from some of the key issue areas:

- No long-term air quality impacts are anticipated.
- It was noted that noise levels are expected to decrease. The existing double-deck bridge causes an echo, which results in higher noise levels. The proposed single-deck structure will alleviate this issue.
- Visual assessment results indicate that distant views will not be substantially changed.
- There are eligible historic structures on Yerba Buena Island and the Oakland Touchdown. At this time there will be no demolition of historic structures and Caltrans is coordinating closely with the appropriate parties. It was noted that some detours will span the Nimitz House on Yerba Buena Island.

EIS Schedule

The Administrative Draft EIS was submitted to Caltrans for review on June 8. Following review and comments from Caltrans and FHWA the document will be finalized and resubmitted for final approval. The target date for circulation of the Draft EIS is mid-September. Public meetings will be held in San Francisco, Contra Costa, Alameda and Solano Counties. The Draft EIS will also be placed on the Caltrans website.

Coordination with Cities and Agencies

As part of the ongoing project process, Caltrans will continue to meet with permitting agencies as part of the NEPA/404 consultation steps, other interest groups, and the cities of Oakland and San Francisco to understand their issues and work collaboratively on implementing the project within the target schedule.

Project Schedule: Steve Hulsebus

Currently there is a 48-month construction schedule. Detour ramps will be up approximately 20 months. Steve highlighted the key milestones on the project schedule:

- Environmental Studies Complete
  - August 1998
- Draft EIS
  - September 1998
- Public Hearings/Formal Comment Period
  - October 1998
General Discussion
Annemarie Conroy, Mayor's Treasure Island Project Office

- Raised concerns about the bridge alignment as it relates to the City of San Francisco's base reuse plan.
- Reported that the City and County of San Francisco had submitted concerns to Caltrans and MTC in March 1998 outlining their concerns regarding the base reuse plan and requested copies of documentation.
- Expressed concerns about the excavation planned for Yerba Buena Island and the number of piles from the temporary structure.
- Emphasized that Yerba Buena Island impacts was not discussed at the March 1998 meeting, nor was information or a schematic presented for review.
- Noted plans for the ramps need to be addressed by Caltrans.
- Utility issues including agreements and roles and responsibilities need to be coordinated with the U.S. Navy.
- Noted that Mayor Brown is not moving forward on negotiations for Yerba Buena Island until issues for the San Francisco’s base re-use plan have been resolved with Caltrans.

It was noted that the Navy is working with the City of San Francisco on a joint EIS CEQA/NEPA document to be completed late next year.

With respect to the bridge alignment, Denis responded that Caltrans will evaluate all of the project alternatives in the EIS and that a final decision cannot be made until the EIS process is completed.

City of Oakland

- Requested a more integrated bridge design that would include input from the community at large; whereby people could submit their designs in writing to Caltrans.

A comment was raised about the bike lane perimeters. Denis noted that Caltrans will be coordinating with the bicycle/pedestrian/disabled interest group to further explore these issues.

Next Actions/Next Meeting:
Denis Mulligan thanked everyone for coming. He reiterated that Caltrans and MTC would like people to participate in the upcoming meetings and provide input.

The next PDT meeting is scheduled for September 29, 1998 at 9:00 a.m. at Caltrans District 4 offices in the Park View room.
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Meeting Summary:

Meeting Purpose
Kenn Parsons, U.S. Navy, said that he had requested the meeting to discuss the appropriate level of environmental documentation required for Caltrans to conduct drilling and test borings on Treasure Island. The U.S. Navy needs to issue a license to permit the borings and that action is subject to NEPA. Kenn indicated that the U.S. Navy required more information on the scope of the drilling effort and more environmental data than what was contained in the checklist which Caltrans had sent the Navy. Kenn indicated that the proposed area of drilling activity includes an area leased to the City and County of San Francisco, in proximity to some buildings occupied by residents, historic properties and the historic district on the island, and potential soil contamination issues.

Caltrans said it wanted to clarify several points. Caltrans explained that the letter it sent to the Navy had a typo in it and that the boring diameters were proposed to be 3 to 4 inches, not 3 to 4 feet. Secondly, Caltrans said the proposed detour alignments have been revised. The north-north detour had been dropped and Caltrans is now only pursuing the north-south detour. Caltrans further explained that the checklist detail and format had been adequate for previous Coast Guard approvals for similar activities.

Discussion of Proposed Drilling Activity
Caltrans indicated that the precise location of the drilling holes has not been finalized. Caltrans elaborated on the general plans for the proposed activity. The location of the borings will vary depending on bedrock. Some borings already exist. In referring to a map, Caltrans indicated that in one area the drilling will be 5 - 15 meters below top of bedrock and in another area 25-75 meters below top of bedrock. The holes will be 3 to 4 inches in diameter, and 40 to 50 holes are proposed. The equipment will be truck mounted rigs, and accompanied by pick up and water trucks. Caltrans is not likely to drill between the parade grounds and the curve on Macalla Road.

The Navy reaffirmed that it needs to know exactly where the borings will be and that proximity to the Nimitz House is a key concern. Kenn Parsons said the proposed borings are controversial locally for the City and County of San Francisco and the Navy must take a thorough look at potential environmental impacts.

Navy representatives clarified several other points: East of Building 75 there has been prior removal of underground tanks and fuel leaks; north of Building 270 the potential for ground water contamination exists; potential impacts on the aquifer with 75 meter drilling need to be addressed; and the Merritt sands may potentially be contaminated through exposure during drilling activities. The Navy will provide Caltrans the final map regarding transfer of certain property to the Coast Guard.

Prior Agreements
Tony Anziano, Caltrans legal staff, referred to a 1962 agreement, which Caltrans says conveys an entitlement and interest and prior authorization for such activities as the drilling. Tony and Navy legal counsel agreed to further discuss this issue.
Caltrans also noted that the Navy had done a Categorical Exclusion for its recent utility work.

**Environmental Requirements of U.S. Navy**

John H. Kennedy, U.S. Navy, elaborated on the Navy requirements for a NEPA document for the proposed drilling. He said, until the impacts are known, he does not know if a Categorical Exclusion or Environmental Assessment is needed. He said key issues are impact on cultural resources, issues of drilling in contaminated soil, and agency consultation with SHPO, BCDC, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, and others.

John Kennedy clarified that the Navy does not have staff available to do the environmental analysis and that it will get done much quicker if Caltrans or its consultants do the work. Caltrans agreed to prepare the necessary documents for Navy review. John Kennedy provided Caltrans an information package outlining the Navy environmental requirements.

Cherie Waldear highlighted the potential cultural resource issues including: potential impact on Building 1 and the historic district; potential impact on Zone 1, an archaeologically sensitive area; and the need for full coordination with SHPO and the Advisory Council.

**Next Actions**

Caltrans to explicitly define the scope of the project.
Caltrans to conduct environmental analysis and initiate agency consultations.
Caltrans to prepare environmental documentation for the proposed action on behalf of the Navy, and coordinate with Navy environmental staff for review and approval.

Caltrans concluded the meeting with saying that its goal is to do the drilling work beginning August 31, 1998. If there are no impacts and a Categorical Exclusion can be processed, this schedule may work.
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July 22, 1998

4-SF-80
04-02100K
Yerba Buena Island

Beverly Freitas
Engineering Field Activity West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Attn: Code 2412 (BF)
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-5006

Dear Ms. Freitas:

Enclosed please find two signed originals of the proposed License Agreement to allow surveying on a portion of Yerba Buena Island.

Please execute and return one of the originals as soon as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

By

NICK FIORENTINOS
Right of Way Agent
Local Public Agency Services

Attachment

cc: Steve Hulsebus, CT Asst. Project Manager
LICENSE FOR NONFEDERAL USE OF REAL PROPERTY

LICENSE NUMBER
THIS LICENSE TO USE THE U.S. GOVERNMENT PROPERTY HEREIN DESCRIBED IS ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY TO THE LICENSEE NAMED BELOW FOR THE PURPOSE HEREIN SPECIFIED UPON THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS SET FORTH BELOW AND THE GENERAL PROVISIONS ATTACHED. BY THE EXECUTION HEREOF THE LICENSEE AGrees TO COMPLY WITH ALL SUCH TERMS, CONDITIONS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS.

1. NAVAL ACTIVITY
06-8800
Naval Station, Treasure Island
San Francisco, CA

2. DATES COVERED
FROM 1 August 1998 TO 31 December 1998

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY
Use of property described on Yerba Buena Island as shown on the attached drawing labeled Exhibit A.

4. PURPOSE OF LICENSE
Search and survey property boundary monuments, survey existing improvements, utilities, topography, etc. in connection with design of the new San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

5. LICensor
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

5a. LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE, DEPARTMENT OF NAVY OFFICIAL
COMMANDING OFFICER, ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY-WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE, SAN BRUNO, CA 94066-5006

6. LICENSEE
State of California
Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 23440
Oakland, CA 94623-0440

6a. LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE
Mr. Nick Florentinos (510) 286-5346
Same As Item 6

7. CASH PAYMENT BY LICENSEE (Payable in advance)
a. AMOUNT
Cash payment waived. The State of California is performing work that is beneficial to the public.

b. FREQUENCY PAYMENTS DUE

c. FIRST DUE DATE

d. TO

8. DEPOSIT FOR UTILITIES AND SERVICES (Payable in advance)
a. AMOUNT
No utilities will be provided.

b. FREQUENCY PAYMENTS DUE

c. FIRST DUE DATE

d. TO

9. INSURANCE REQUIRED AT EXPENSE OF LICENSEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MINIMUM AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. FIRE AND EXTENDED COVERAGE</td>
<td>$0 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. THIRD PARTY PROPERTY DAMAGE</td>
<td>$1,000,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. THIRD PARTY PERSONAL INJURY PER PERSON</td>
<td>$1,000,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. THIRD PARTY PERSONAL INJURY PER ACCIDENT</td>
<td>$1,000,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. GENERAL PROVISIONS
SEE SPECIAL PROVISIONS ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF. IN THE EVENT OF ANY CONFLICT WITH THE GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE LICENSE, THE SPECIAL PROVISIONS SHALL PREVAIL AND OVERRIDE THE GENERAL PROVISIONS.

II. EXECUTION OF LICENSE FOR

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

LICENSEE
State of California
STEVEN HULSEBUS
Asst. Project Manager

APPROVED: STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NICK D. FIORENTINOS
Right of Way Agent

JOHN A. HIBEL
District Office Chief
RAW Acquisition/IPA Services
10. GENERAL PROVISIONS

a. The Licensor hereby grants to the Licensee the right to use the premises or facilities described in item 3, together with the necessary rights of ingress and egress.

b. This License shall be effective for the period stated in item 2 and is revocable at any time without notice at the option and discretion of the Licensor or its duly authorized representative.

c. The use shall be limited to the purposes specified herein.

d. This License shall be neither assignable nor transferable by the Licensee.

e. If utilities and services are furnished the Licensee for its use of the premises the Licensee shall reimburse the Licensor for the cost thereof as determined by the Licensor in accordance with applicable statutes and regulations.

f. The Licensee, at its own cost and expense, shall protect, maintain, and keep in good order, the premises or facilities licensed hereby. At the discretion of the Licensor this obligation shall include, but not be limited to, contribution toward the expense of long-term maintenance of the premises or facilities, the necessity for which accrued during the period of Licensee's use. The amount of expense to be borne by the Licensee shall be determined by prorating the total expense of the item of long-term maintenance on the basis of fractional use by the Licensee. This fractional part of the total expense shall be prorated further if the item of long-term maintenance did not accrue in its entirety during the Licensee's use. Upon a determination by the Licensor that the necessity exists for an expenditure of funds for maintenance, protection, preservation or repair, the Licensee shall pay to the Licensor its proportionate share, on demand.

g. No additions to, or alterations of, the premises or facilities shall be made without the prior consent of the Licensor. Upon revocation or surrender of this License, to the extent directed by the Licensor, the Licensee shall remove all alterations, additions, betterments and improvements made, or installed, and restore the premises or facilities to the same, or as good condition as existed on the date of entry under this License, reasonable wear and tear excepted.

h. The Licensee shall be liable for any loss of, or damage to, the premises or facilities incurred as a result of its use and shall make such restoration or repair, or monetary compensation as may be directed by the Licensor. The Licensee's liability for loss or damage to the premises resulting from risks expressly required to be insured hereunder shall not exceed the amount of insurance so required. The Licensee shall not be liable for loss of, or damage to, the premises arising from causes beyond the control of the Licensee and occasioned by a risk not in fact covered by insurance and not customarily covered by insurance in the locality in which the premises are situated. Nothing contained herein, however, shall relieve the Licensee of liability with respect to any loss or damage to the premises, not fully compensated for by Insurance, which results from willful misconduct, lack of good faith, or failure to exercise due diligence, on the part of the Licensee. All Insurance required of the Licensee on the premises shall be for the protection of the Licensor and the Licensee against their respective risks and liabilities in connection with the premises. Each policy of insurance against loss or damage to Government property shall name the Licensee and the United States of America, Department of the Navy, as the insured and shall contain a loss payable clause reading substantially as follows:

"Loss, if any, under this policy shall be adjusted with (Name of Licensee) and the proceeds, at the direction of the Government, shall be payable to (Name of Licensee), and proceeds not paid to (Name of Licensee) shall be payable to the Treasurer of the United States of America."

In the event that any item or part of the premises or facilities shall require repair, rebuilding or replacement resulting from loss or damage, the risk of which is assumed under this paragraph h, the Licensee shall promptly give notice thereof to the Licensor and, to the extent of its liability as provided in this paragraph, shall, upon demand, either compensate the Government for such loss or damage, or rebuild, replace or repair the item or items of the premises or facilities so lost or damaged, as the Licensor may elect. If the cost of such repair, rebuilding, or replacement exceeds the liability of the Licensee for such loss or damage, the Licensee shall effect such repair, rebuilding or replacement if required so to do by the Licensor, and such excess of cost shall be reimbursed to the Licensee by the Licensor. In the event the Licensee shall have effected any repair, rebuilding or replacement which the Licensee is required to effect pursuant to this paragraph, the Licensor shall direct payment to the Licensee of so much of the proceeds of any insurance carried by the Licensee and made available to the Government on account of loss of or damage to any item or part of the premises or facilities as may be necessary to enable the Licensee to effect such repair, rebuilding or replacement. In event the Licensee shall not have been required to effect such repair, rebuilding, or replacement, and the insurance proceeds allocable to the loss or damage which has created the need for such repair, rebuilding or replacement have been paid to the Licensee, the Licensee shall promptly refund to the Licensor the amount of such proceeds.

i. The Licensee shall indemnify and save harmless the Government, its officers, agents, servants and employees from all liability under the Federal Tort Claims Act (62 Stat. 869,982; 28 U.S.C. Sec 2671,2680) or otherwise, for death or injury to all persons, or loss or damage to the property of all persons resulting from the use of the premises by the Licensee, and shall furnish the insurance specified in item 9. Each policy of insurance required in item 9 covering bodily injuries and third party property damage shall contain an endorsement reading substantially as follows:

"The insurer waives any right of subrogation against the United States of America which might arise by reason of any payment made under this policy."

j. All insurance required by this License shall be such form, for such periods of time, and with such insurers as the Licensor may require or approve. A certificate of insurance or a certified copy of each policy of insurance taken out hereunder shall be deposited with the Licensor's local representative prior to use of the premises and facilities. The Licensee agrees that not less
than thirty (30) days prior to the expiration of any insurance required by this License, it will deliver to the Licensor's local representative a certificate of insurance or a certified copy of each renewal policy to cover the same risks.

k. No member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner shall be admitted to any share or part of this License or to any benefit that may arise therefrom; but this provision shall not be construed to extend to this License if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

l. The Licensee warrants that it has not employed any person to solicit or secure this License upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to annul this License or in its discretion to recover from the Licensee the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee in addition to the consideration herein set forth. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by the Licensee upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the Licensee for the purpose of securing business.

m. In connection with the performance of work under this License, the Licensee agrees not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, religion, color, or national origin. The aforesaid provision shall include, but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The Licensee agrees to post hereafter in conspicuous places available for employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the Licensor setting forth the provisions of the nondiscrimination clause. The Licensee further agrees to insert the foregoing provisions in all subcontracts hereunder, except subcontracts for standard commercial supplies or raw materials.

n. All activities authorized hereunder shall be subject to such rules and regulations as regards supervision or otherwise, as may, from time to time, be prescribe by the local representative of the Licensor as designated in Item 5a.
SPECIAL PROVISIONS

1. Licensee will at all times during the use of this license promptly observe and comply, at its sole cost and expense, with the provisions of all applicable Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and standards concerning environmental quality and pollution control and abatement, with respect to its occupancy and use of the Premises. Licensee covenants that it will not improperly generate, use, or store hazardous substances or hazardous waste on the Premises. Licensee shall promptly notify the Government and supply copies of any notices, reports, correspondence, and submissions made by Licensee to any Federal, State, or local authority, or received by Licensee from said authority, concerning environmental matters or hazardous substances or hazardous waste on, about, or pertaining to the Premises. Licensee shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the Government from and against all claims, liabilities, losses, damages and costs, foreseen or unforeseen, which the Government may incur by the reason of Licensee's action or non-action with regard to obligations under this paragraph, and this provision shall survive the expiration or termination of the license.

2. Licensee is required to provide their own traffic control and security.

3. Licensee or its Sublicensee shall be allowed ingress and egress to the licensed premises. Licensee or its Sublicensee shall not interfere with normal daily functional operations.

4. Licensee is prohibited from using the licensed property for the treatment or disposal of toxic or hazardous material, which includes material of a flammable, explosive or pyrotechnic nature.

5. In lieu of any policy of insurance required hereunder, Licensee and Licensor understand and agree that Licensee shall maintain a program of self-insurance fully adequate to cover Licensee's liability for loss or damage to the premises resulting from risks expressly required to be insured hereunder. Licensor acknowledges that Licensee shall not be required to deposit a certificate of insurance or certified copy of a policy of insurance with Licensor's local representative.

6. Licensee shall provide the Navy with copies of all survey reports generated as a result of this License.

7. Licensee shall ensure that no trimming of landscaping or marking of trees, buildings or roads is done without prior written approval from the Officer in Charge, Caretaker Site Office (OIC CSO), Lieutenant Commander Clarke at (415) 743-4720.

8. Licensee shall coordinate with Chuck Swanson, Utilities Project Manager, 415 274-0333, at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, prior to removal/lifting manhole covers or other utility related equipment.

9. Licensee shall coordinate with the San Francisco Police Department prior to surveying on public roads and will take necessary safety precautions such as flagmen, etc.

10. Licensee shall provide written notification to the San Francisco Police Department, OIC CSO and San Francisco Mayor's Treasure Island Project Office as to the schedule and location of survey areas at least seven (7) days in advance of anticipated work. This is necessary in order to notify Treasure Island residents and tenants.

11. The Navy reserves the right to deny or alter work scheduled in certain areas, permission not unreasonably withheld.

12. Licensee shall ensure that no contractor office trailer is established or located on any of the licensed area.

13. Licensee is prohibited from storing equipment or vehicles overnight on the licensed area.

[Signature]
Licensee

7/23/98
Date

STEVEN HULSEBUS
ASST. PROJECT MANAGER
SFOBB EAST SPAN
August 4, 1998

Lou Wall, Cultural Resource Manager
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-2402

Dear Mr. Wall:

Enclosed for your information is one copy each of the Finding of Effect reports for archaeological and historic properties for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project in San Francisco and Alameda counties. These reports were sent to FHWA on August 3, 1998 and FHWA will send them to SHPO. We have requested to receive SHPO’s review on effects by September 1, 1998.

If you have any questions concerning archaeology, please contact Mara Melandry at 510/286-5582 and for the built environment, contact Jared Goldfine at 510/286-6203.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

by:          

MARA MELANDRY
SFOBB Environmental Manager

Enclosures

c: Kenn Parsons, Dept. of the Navy
   Patricia Duff, Dept. of the Navy
   SHPO - Ref. #FHWA980717A
   Annemarie Conroy, TI, SF
   Danielle Huey, Naval Facilities
   Engineering Command (enc.)
bc:    MDavis (Parsons-Brinckerhoff)
       CAdams (HQ Env. Program)
       MMelandry/MMortenson
       SHulsebus
Mr. Kenn Parsons
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-2402

Dear Mr. Parsons:

Enclosed is a copy of the Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project.

Our target schedule for the release of the DEIS is September 17, 1998, with a 45 day circulation period. We hope that providing you with the administrative DEIS now will facilitate preparation of your comments during the formal review period. Your agency will also be provided the DEIS as approved by FHWA and Caltrans.

We look forward to working closely with the Navy on this critical public safety project.

Please address any questions to Mara Melandry at (510) 286-5582.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

By

MARA MELANDRY
Environmental Manager
Toll Bridge Program

Enclosure
bc: MDavis (Parsons-Brinckerhoff)
CAAdams (HQ Env. Program)
MMelandry/MMortenson
SHulsebus
San Francisco - Oakland Bay Bridge
East Span Seismic Safety Project

Release of Draft EIS and Public Hearings

Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration have released the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Statutory Exemption for the San Francisco - Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project for public review. The public comment period will end on Nov. 9, 1998. The document may be viewed at the following locations: Caltrans District 4 Public Information Office, Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill, John F. Kennedy Library in Vallejo, Metropolitan Transportation Commission in Oakland, Oakland Main Library and San Francisco Main Library.

Four public hearings have been scheduled to provide information on the project and to take public comments on the Draft EIS. An open house format for the public hearing is planned to allow you to drop in anytime during the designated hours to provide your comments. The document is also on the Caltrans Website (www.dot.ca.gov/dist4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Wednesday, Oct. 14</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tuesday, Oct. 20</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101 - 8th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Thursday, Oct. 15</td>
<td>Noon to 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>One Market Plaza</td>
<td>Tuesday, Oct. 20</td>
<td>5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One Market Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek</td>
<td>Tuesday, Oct. 20</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Thursday, Oct. 22</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Christian High</td>
<td></td>
<td>to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2721 Larkey Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walnut Creek, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo</td>
<td>Thursday, Oct. 22</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>505 Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street, Vallejo, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To submit written comments on the Draft EIS, mail comments to:

Mara Melandry, Environmental Manager, SFOBB, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA, 94623-0660

For more information about the project, contact:

Caltrans Public Information Office, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA, 94623-0660, (510) 286-4444

e-mail address: sfobb.Dist04@dot.ca.gov  web site address: www.dot.ca.gov/dist4

TDD users may contact the California Relay Service TDD line at 1-800-735-2929 or Voice Line at 1-800-735-2922

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duvlin Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td>700 Allston Way, Berkeley, CA 94710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Velton</td>
<td>Department of Rehabilitation</td>
<td>1936 University Avenue, #150, Berkeley, CA 94704-1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Bordelon</td>
<td>Dillingham Construction Corp</td>
<td>5960 Inglewood Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Patterson</td>
<td>De Anza Enabler Program</td>
<td>21250 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Cupertino, CA 95014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Linda Kratochull</td>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
<td>900 Commodore Drive, San Bruno, CA 94066-5006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council of Painters</td>
<td></td>
<td>1916-G Old Middlefield Way, Mountain View, CA 94043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Marvin Norman</td>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
<td>900 Commodore Drive, San Bruno, CA 94066-5006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Cody</td>
<td>Div. of Mass Transportation</td>
<td>P. O. Box 942874, Sacramento, CA 94274-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Anza Mountaineering Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>21250 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Cupertino, CA 95014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kenn Parsons</td>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
<td>900 Commodore Drive, San Bruno, CA 94066-5006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon District Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>201 South First Street, Dixon, CA 95620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Coto Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>525 H Street, Union City, CA 94587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kenn Parsons</td>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
<td>900 Commodore Drive, San Bruno, CA 94066-5006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon District Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>201 South First Street, Dixon, CA 95620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Iacobacci</td>
<td></td>
<td>139 Berendoas Avenue, Pacifica, CA 94044-3109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D McKey</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>1301 Clay Street, Room 1770-N, Oakland, CA 94612-5209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Storey</td>
<td>DKS</td>
<td>5036 Diamond Heights Blvd, San Francisco, CA 94131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information:

Duvlin Paint
700 Allston Way
Berkeley, CA 94710

John Velton
Department of Rehabilitation
1936 University Avenue, #150
Berkeley, CA 94704-1024

Gloria Bordelon
Dillingham Construction Corp
5960 Inglewood Drive
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Dennis Patterson
De Anza Enabler Program
21250 Stevens Creek Boulevard
Cupertino, CA 95014

Ms. Linda Kratochull
Department of the Navy
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-5006

District Council of Painters #33
1916-G Old Middlefield Way
Mountain View, CA 94043

Mr. Marvin Norman
Department of the Navy
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-5006

Mark Cody
Div. of Mass Transportation
P. O. Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

De Anza Mountaineering Club
21250 Stevens Creek Boulevard
Cupertino, CA 95014

Mr. Kenn Parsons
Department of the Navy
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-5006

D Dixon District Chamber of Commerce
201 South First Street
Dixon, CA 95620

Bert Iacobacci
139 Berendoas Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044-3109

D McKey
Department of Veterans Affairs
1301 Clay Street, Room 1770-N
Oakland, CA 94612-5209

Joe Storey
DKS
5036 Diamond Heights Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94131
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Project Development Team Meeting
September 29, 1998
Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, Park View Room, 15th Floor

Attendees:
Caltrans Staff
Denis Mulligan, District 4 Deputy Director
Steve Hulsebus, Toll Bridge Program
Katja Greve, Toll Bridge Program
Mara Melandry, Environmental Planning
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental Planning
Janet Pape, Environmental Planning
Pochana Chongchaikit, Toll Bridge Program
Debra Baker, Right of Way
Rachel Falsetti, HQ Specifications
Chris Inouye, HQ Specifications
Michael Whiteside, HQ Structures
Bob Zandipour, Design
Clive Endress, Landscape Architecture
Colin Jones, Public Information

FHWA
Dan Harris
John Schultz

Consultant Team
Tim Dougherty, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Kraman, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol, Joint Venture
Al Ely, T.Y. Lin/Moffatt & Nichol, Joint Venture
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management

City and County of San Francisco
Jack Fleck, Department of Parking and Traffic
Joan Rummelsburg, Mayor's Office
Paul Rosetter, Planning Department

City of Oakland
Diane Tannenwald, Public Works Agency
Marina Carlson, Mayor's Office

U.S. Coast Guard
Jerry Olmes

U.S. Navy
Morise Russ, EFA West
James Sullivan, EFA West

Agency Participants
Rick Wiederhorn, Port of Oakland
Kin Ho, California Highway Patrol – Oakland
Bonnie Stanton, California Highway Patrol – San Francisco
John Nichols, California Highway Patrol – Oakland
Brian Wiese, EBRPD
Bill Hein, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Tom Clansen, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Bob McCleary, Contra Costa Transit Authority
Tom Galvin, Department of Defense
Meeting Summary:

I. Welcome / Introductions: Denis Mulligan, Caltrans
Denis Mulligan welcomed everyone and asked for self-introductions. Denis announced the Draft EIS was released September 24th for public review. Denis said that Caltrans and FHWA will be the parties responsible for identifying a preferred alternative. He explained that MTC has had a role with respect to design recommendations and decisions on amenities and that the DEIS evaluated MTC's recommendations and other alternatives as well.

II. MTC Process Update
Bill Hein, MTC, provided a summary of the MTC process. He recapped the previous work of the EDAP. On October 9th, EDAP will meet again to review the East Span design issues. MTC acts as the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA).

Bill Hein explained that BATA is also reviewing the Transbay Transit Terminal project and is in process of hiring a consultant to assist with that project.

The U.S. Coast Guard representative inquired about the West Span bike path. The costs and feasibility of a west span bike path will need to be evaluated and BATA will decide if it is an appropriate use of funds. It would be a separate project and is not part of the East Span Project.

III. Status of Risk Design
Denis Mulligan explained the current bridge is vulnerable. Caltrans is currently doing an interim retrofit on the East Span to help reduce risk while the major seismic improvements are studied and decided as part of the East Span project.

Recognizing the risk, Caltrans has embarked on risk design. Risk design is being done on the N6 alignment with the suspension bridge design recommended by MTC. If the NEPA process selects a different alternative, then Caltrans will have to redo the detailed design on the selected alternative.

It was clarified that the design is past 30% but not to 60%. Denis Mulligan explained that Phase II of the design contract is not signed yet.

IV. Status of DEIS
Mara Melandry indicated that Caltrans is pleased to have released the DEIS produced in the expedited 18 month period. The comment period ends November 9, 1998. The DEIS is on the Web and Caltrans will take comments by e-mail as well as regular correspondence.

Mara discussed the impacts and proposed mitigation measures for the following topics: waters of the U.S.; special status species; air quality; noise; water quality; floodplain; visual impacts; historic resources; archeology; land use and community impacts; pedestrian/nonmotorized traffic; vehicular traffic and circulation; hazardous materials; energy; and geology.

* Since the PDT meeting, the comment period has been extended to November 23, 1998.
Mara noted that the visual impact assessment report includes an interactive CD-ROM.

Mara mentioned that management of the traffic during construction is a key issue and that Caltrans will be addressing traffic handling through a public awareness campaign.

V. Schedule for Identification of the Preferred Alternative
Mara Melandry reviewed the selection criteria for the preferred alternative. The criteria were developed as part of the NEPA/404 process.

Denis Mulligan clarified the alternative analyses required by the NEPA/404 process. The selection criteria for the preferred alternative are as follows:
- Meets lifeline criteria
- Meets current standards for operations and safety to the greatest extent possible
- Does not preclude a pedestrian/bike path
- Does not preclude future improvements to YBI access ramps
- Minimizes impacts to environmental resources
- Maintains existing number of traffic lanes during and after construction

Denis reviewed the replacement alternatives.

Caltrans and FHWA will identify a preferred alternative after review of public comments on the Draft. Caltrans plans to identify the preferred alternatives in November 1998. The Final EIS is scheduled for publication in Spring 1999.

The U.S. Navy representative asked how the preferred alternative will be selected. Denis clarified that Caltrans and FHWA will make that decision.

V. General Discussion of Key Issues
The following general discussion occurred.

A question was asked about the rail ballot initiative. It was clarified it is an advisory ballot in four cities (San Francisco, Oakland, Emeryville, Berkeley).

Does the EIS address rail on the bridge? Yes, rail issues are discussed in the multi-modal section of the DEIS.

Someone noted that if the project is for seismic retrofit, it appears the rail issue is in conflict with the project purpose of public safety.

With respect to detour structures, is mitigation proposed for the removal of the detour structures? Caltrans said yes.

Is it possible to satisfy both Oakland and San Francisco on the alignments? Caltrans looks forward to working with and hearing more from both cities to see if a mutually acceptable alignment can be achieved.
The U.S. Navy expressed concerns about the impacts to historic structures on YBI. Caltrans explained that the DEIS N2 and N6 affect the Torpedo Building and the retrofit alternative affects the Nimitz House. Caltrans is working with the State Historic Preservation Office to determine appropriate mitigation. Caltrans clarified all of the alternatives affect the existing historic bridge.

The City of Oakland stated its views will be affected because Oakland will lose its view of the current historic structure and because the City has concerns about the proposed design of the new bridge.

The City and County of San Francisco said the environmental document focuses on 4 primary view sites including Treasure Island and Richmond. They questioned why YBI was not a view site. Caltrans referred them to the detailed Visual Impact Assessment Report, which has view analysis from many locations.

The City and County of San Francisco reemphasized bicycle safety and bicycle impacts on YBI as key issues to the City.

The City and County of San Francisco asked if there is a mitigation fund? Caltrans clarified specific mitigation measures are provided for but there is no budget for mitigation.

Does the west span retrofit include a bike path? No, Caltrans has not been authorized to build a bike path. MTC must first make a decision to approve this amenity. The west span bicycle legislation does not become effective until January 1999.

Caltrans explained that enlarging the tunnel for a bike path would be very costly. An alternative would be go around the island with a bike path.

Next Actions/Next Meeting:
The next PDT meeting is scheduled for December 2, 1998 at 9:00 a.m. at Caltrans District 4 offices in the Park View room.
Distribution:
All attendees
Cynthia Adams, California Department of Transportation
Brian Maroney, California Department of Transportation
Elihu Harris, Mayor, City of Oakland
Terry Roberts, Oakland Public Works Director
Andrew Altman, Oakland Planning Department
Charles Bryant, Oakland Planning Department
Paul Nahm, Oakland Base Reuse Authority
Helaine Kaplan Prentice, Landmarks Preservation Board, City of Oakland
Anne Whittington, Port of Oakland
Douglas Wong, Port of San Francisco
Willie Brown, Mayor, City of San Francisco
Annemarie Conroy, Mayor Brown’s Office
Kofi Bonner, Mayor Brown’s Office
Stuart Sunshine, San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic
Bond Yee, San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic
Mark Primeau, San Francisco Public Works Director
Gerald Green, San Francisco Planning Director
Charles Rivasplata, San Francisco Planning Department
Hillary Gitelman, San Francisco Planning Department
Carmen Clark, San Francisco Transportation Authority
Bill Wong, FHWA
Jeff Weiman, FHWA
Nancy Bob, FHWA
Kathy Hoffman, Congressman Miller’s Office
Will Travis, Bay Conservation & Development Commission
Russell Hancock, Bay Area Council
Sharon Banks, AC Transit
Cathy Wasikowski, RIDES
Thomas Margro, BART
Debra Baker, BART
Robert Jacobvitz, American Institute of Architects
Com. Robert Hocker, Jr., Department of the Navy
Kenn Parsons, Department of the Navy
Wayne Till, U.S. Coast Guard
LCDR John Milkey, U.S. Coast Guard
Leo Lozano, U.S. Coast Guard
Carol Meyer, U.S. Coast Guard
Helise Cohn, Parson Brinckerhoff
Martin Vitz, East Bay Regional Parks District
Ed McCormick, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Dennis Diemer, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Steve Heminger, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Marj Blackwell, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
TO: Paul M. Ward  
Resident Engineer  
State of California  
Dept. of Transportation  
District 4 - Construction  
840 Brannan Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

FROM: Steve Sakthivel  
Navy Caretaker site office  
Treasure Island, SF. CA  
415-743-4716  
415-743-4700 Fax

Mr. Ward,

There is no approved digging permit or schedule information in our file regarding the off-shore boring currently undertaking near Yerba buena island by Caltrans. Our concerns are that there are existing Navy utility lines runs from Yerba buena island to Treasure Island.

We really appreciate if you or someone give me a call or fax some information regarding this.

Thank you very much.

Steve Sakthivel
Here is more info from John. Everything is O.K.

John -

I talked with the Navy guy yesterday PM and all is fine with the issue. He was happy with my explanation of what we have done to see that we do not disturb the submarine utilities, and he does not need any further submittal from us.

Tim
Here are the responses from John Thorne. Everything appears to be O.K. now.

Nick, Fugro is making the necessary contacts.

John

John I did receive. Our action is described below.
Tim - as discussed since you are up there today, you will call Navy caretaker & if necessary take him a copy of anchor plans
John fyi - some details (including this contact request & phone number) weren't totally legible in tiny print of provisions on faxed copy of permit

From: John Thorne
To: tmcneilan@fugro.com
Subject: Navy permit for off-shore drilling
Date: Thursday, October 15, 1998 11:31AM

Tom,
Please call me to confirm receipt of this e-mail @ 916-227-7205.
Thanks,
John
To: Reid Buell/HQ/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
Hulsebus/D04/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT, Katja Greve/D04/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT,
Debra L Baker/D04/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
Subject: Navy permit for off-shore drilling

Reid, please be advised that I have been contacted by the Navy, Caretaker Site Office regarding the current off-shore drilling near Yerba Buena Island. They are concerned about the existing Navy utility lines that cross from Yerba Buena Island to Treasure Island.

Please remind Fugro of the Special provisions of our off-shore drilling license from the Navy. In particular, Special Provision #6 states that the Licensee shall coordinate with Chuck Swanson, Utilities Project Manager, 415-274-0333, at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. According to the Caretaker Site Office, Chuck Swanson has not yet been contacted by anyone.

Also, please remind them of Special Provision #7 which states that Licensee shall ensure that borings do not disturb any utility lines running beneath the Bay.

Can you please call me or email me to let me know that this information gets passed on to Fugro. Thanks Reid.

Nick
Mr. Harry Y. Yahata, District Director  
State of California  
Department of Transportation  
Business, Transportation and Housing Agency  
Attn: N. Fiorentinos  
P.O. Box 23440  
Oakland, California 94623-0440

Dear Mr. Yahata:

Enclosed please find a fully executed duplicate original of License Agreement N6247499RP00P01 to allow geotechnical investigations off-shore of Yerba Buena Island.

If you have any questions, please contact Linda Kratochvil at (650) 244-3808.

Sincerely,

BEVERLY FREITAS  
BRAC Team West  
Real Estate Leader

Enclosure

Steve,  
here is the final version of the license from the Navy for the off-shore drilling.  
Please make sure Fugro gets one of these via R. Buell or J. Thorne.  
Thanks,  
Nick
LICENSE FOR NONFEDERAL USE OF REAL PROPERTY

1. NAVAL ACTIVITY
06-8600
Naval Station, Treasure Island
San Francisco, CA

2. DATES COVERED
FROM 28 SEPTEMBER 1998 TO 30 NOVEMBER 1998

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY
Use of off-shore property adjacent to Yerba Buena Island as shown on the attached drawing labeled Exhibit A.

4. PURPOSE OF LICENSE
Geotechnical investigations in connection with the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project.

5. LICENSOR
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

5a. LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE, DEPARTMENT OF NAVY OFFICIAL
COMMANDING OFFICER, ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY-WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE, SAN BRUNO, CA  94066-5006

6. LICENSEE
State of California
Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 23440
Oakland, CA 94623-0440

6a. LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE
Mr. Nick Fiorentinos (510) 286-5346
Same As Item 6

7. CASH PAYMENT BY LICENSEE (Payable in advance)
a. AMOUNT
b. FREQUENCY PAYMENTS DUE c. FIRST DUE DATE
d. TO
Cash payment waived. The State of California is performing work that is beneficial to the public.

8. DEPOSIT FOR UTILITIES AND SERVICES (Payable in advance)
a. AMOUNT
b. FREQUENCY PAYMENTS DUE c. FIRST DUE DATE
d. TO
No utilities will be provided.

9. INSURANCE REQUIRED AT EXPENSE OF LICENSEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MINIMUM AMOUNT</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MINIMUM AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. FIRE AND EXTENDED COVERAGE</td>
<td>$0*</td>
<td>c. THIRD PARTY PERSONAL INJURY PER PERSON</td>
<td>$1,000,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. THIRD PARTY PROPERTY DAMAGE</td>
<td>$1,000,000*</td>
<td>d. THIRD PARTY PERSONAL INJURY PER ACCIDENT</td>
<td>$1,000,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. GENERAL PROVISIONS

II. EXECUTION OF LICENSE
FOR

NAME AND TITLE
BEVERLY FREITAS
BRAC REAL ESTATE
REAL ESTATE CONTRACTING OFFICIAL

BY
SIGNATURE
DATE
Beverly Freitas 10/8/98

LICENSEE
State of California
STEVEN HULSEBUS
Asst. Project Manager

APPROVED: STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

JOHN A. HIBE
District Office Chief
R/V Acquisition/IPA Services
10. GENERAL PROVISIONS

a. The Licensor hereby grants to the Licensee the right to use the premises or facilities described in item 3, together with the necessary rights of ingress and egress.

b. This License shall be effective for the period stated in item 2 and is revocable at any time without notice at the option and discretion of the Licensor or its duly authorized representative.

c. The use shall be limited to the purposes specified herein.

d. This License shall be neither assignable nor transferable by the Licensee.

e. If utilities and services are furnished the Licensee for its use of the premises the Licensee shall reimburse the Licensor for the cost thereof as determined by the Licensor in accordance with applicable statutes and regulations.

f. The Licensee, at its own cost and expense, shall protect, maintain, and keep in good order, the premises or facilities licensed hereby. At the discretion of the Licensor this obligation shall include, but not be limited to, contribution toward the expense of long-term maintenance of the premises or facilities, the necessity for which accrued during the period of Licensee’s use. The amount of expense to be borne by the Licensee shall be determined by prorating the total expense of the item of long-term maintenance on the basis of fractional use by the Licensee. This fractional part of the total expense shall be prorated further if the item of long-term maintenance did not accrue in its entirety during the Licensee’s use. Upon a determination by the Licensor that the necessity exists for an expenditure of funds for maintenance, protection, preservation or repair, the Licensee shall pay to the Licensor its proportionate share, on demand.

g. No additions to, or alterations of, the premises or facilities shall be made without the prior consent of the Licensor. Upon revocation or surrender of this License, to the extent directed by the Licensor, the Licensee shall remove all alterations, additions, betterments and improvements made, or installed, and restore the premises or facilities to the same, or as good condition as existed on the date of entry under this License, reasonable wear and tear excepted.

h. The Licensee shall be liable for any loss of, or damage to, the premises or facilities incurred as a result of its use and shall make such restoration or repair, or monetary compensation as may be directed by the Licensor. The Licensee’s liability for loss or damage to the premises resulting from risks expressly required to be insured hereunder shall not exceed the amount of insurance so required. The Licensee shall not be liable for loss of, or damage to, the premises arising from causes beyond the control of the Licensee and occasioned by a risk not in fact covered by insurance and not customarily covered by insurance in the locality in which the premises are situated. Nothing contained herein, however, shall relieve the Licensee of liability with respect to any loss or damage to the premises, not fully compensated for by insurance, which results from willful misconduct, lack of good faith, or failure to exercise due diligence, on the part of the Licensee. All insurance required of the Licensee on the premises shall be for the protection of the Licensor and the Licensee against their respective risks and liabilities in connection with the premises. Each policy of insurance against loss or damage to Government property shall name the Licensee and the United States of America, Department of the Navy, as the insured and shall contain a loss payable clause reading substantially as follows:

"Loss, if any, under this policy shall be adjusted with (Name of Licensee) and the proceeds, at the direction of the Government, shall be payable to (Name of Licensee), and proceeds not paid to (Name of Licensee) shall be payable to the Treasurer of the United States of America."

In the event that any item or part of the premises or facilities shall require repair, rebuilding or replacement resulting from loss or damage, the risk of which is assumed under this paragraph h, the Licensee shall promptly give notice thereof to the Licensor and, to the extent of its liability as provided in this paragraph, shall, upon demand, either compensate the Government for such loss or damage, or rebuild, replace or repair the item or items of the premises or facilities so lost or damaged, as the Licensor may elect. If the cost of such repair, rebuilding, or replacement exceeds the liability of the Licensee for such loss or damage, the Licensee shall effect such repair, rebuilding or replacement if required so to do by the Licensor, and such excess of cost shall be reimbursed to the Licensee by the Licensor. In the event the Licensee shall have effected any repair, rebuilding or replacement which the Licensee is required to effect pursuant to this paragraph, the Licensor shall direct payment to the Licensee of so much of the proceeds of any insurance carried by the Licensee and made available to the Government on account of loss of or damage to any item or part of the premises or facilities as may be necessary to enable the Licensee to effect such repair, rebuilding or replacement. In event the Licensee shall not have been required to effect such repair, rebuilding, or replacement, and the Insurance proceeds allocable to the loss or damage which has created the need for such repair, rebuilding or replacement have been paid to the Licensee, the Licensee shall promptly refund to the Licensor the amount of such proceeds.

i. The Licensee shall indemnify and save harmless the Government, its officers, agents, servants and employees from all liability under the Federal Tort Claims Act (62 Stat. 869, 982; 28 U.S.C. Sec. 2671, 2680) or otherwise, for death or injury to all persons, or loss or damage to the property of all persons resulting from the use of the premises by the Licensee, and shall furnish the insurance specified in item 9. Each policy of insurance required in item 9 covering bodily injuries and third party property damage shall contain an endorsement reading substantially as follows:

"The insurer waives any right of subrogation against the United States of America which might arise by reason of any payment made under this policy."
j. All insurance required by this License shall be such form, for such periods of time, and with such insurers as the Licensor may require or approve. A certificate of insurance or a certified copy of each policy of insurance taken out hereunder shall be deposited with the Licensor's local representative prior to use of the premises and facilities. The Licensee agrees that not less than thirty (30) days prior to the expiration of any insurance required by this License, it will deliver to the Licensor's local representative a certificate of insurance or a certified copy of each renewal policy to cover the same risks.

k. No member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner shall be admitted to any share or part of this License or to any benefit that may arise therefrom; but this provision shall not be construed to extend to this License if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

l. The Licensee warrants that it has not employed any person to solicit or secure this License upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to annul this License or in its discretion to recover from the Licensee the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee in addition to the consideration herein set forth. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by the Licensee upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the Licensee for the purpose of securing business.

m. In connection with the performance of work under this License, the Licensee agrees not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, religion, color, or national origin. The aforesaid provision shall include, but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The Licensee agrees to post hereafter in conspicuous places available for employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the Licensor setting forth the provisions of the nondiscrimination clause. The Licensee further agrees to insert the foregoing provisions in all subcontracts hereunder, except subcontracts for standard commercial supplies or raw materials.

n. All activities authorized hereunder shall be subject to such rules and regulations as regards supervision or otherwise, as may, from time to time, be prescribe by the local representative of the Licensor as designated in Item 5a.
SPECIAL PROVISIONS

1. Licensee will at all times during the use of this license promptly observe and comply, at its sole cost and expense, with the provisions of all applicable Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and standards concerning environmental quality and pollution control and abatement, with respect to its occupancy and use of the Premises. Licensee covenants that it will not improperly generate, use, or store hazardous substances or hazardous waste on the Premises. Licensee shall promptly notify the Government and supply copies of any notices, reports, correspondence, and submissions made by Licensee to any Federal, State, or local authority, or received by Licensee from said authority, concerning environmental matters or hazardous substances or hazardous waste on, about, or pertaining to the Premises. Licensee shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the Government from and against all claims, liabilities, losses, damages and costs, foreseen or unforeseen, which the Government may incur by the reason of Licensee's action or non-action with regard to obligations under this paragraph, and this provision shall survive the expiration or termination of the license.

2. Licensee or its Sublicensee shall be allowed ingress and egress to the licensed premises. Licensee or its Sublicensee shall not interfere with normal daily functional operations.

3. Licensee is prohibited from using the licensed property for the treatment or disposal of toxic or hazardous material, which includes material of a flammable, explosive or pyrotechnic nature.

4. In lieu of any policy of insurance required hereunder, Licensee and Licensor understand and agree that Licensee shall maintain a program of self-insurance fully adequate to cover Licensee's liability for loss or damage to the premises resulting from risks expressly required to be insured hereunder. Licensor acknowledges that Licensee shall not be required to deposit a certificate of insurance or certified copy of a policy of insurance with Licensor's local representative.

5. Licensee shall provide the Navy with copies of all survey reports generated as a result of this License.

6. Licensee shall coordinate with Chuck Swanson, Utilities Project Manager, 415 274-0333, at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

7. Licensee shall ensure that borings do not disturb any utility lines running beneath the bay.

8. Licensee shall obtain all necessary permits required prior to any studies being performed. This includes, but is not limited to permits required by the Department of Army, Corps of Engineers.

Steven Hulsebus  
Licensee  

Date  
10/1/98  

STEVEN HULSEBUS  
ASST. PROJECT MANAGER  
SFOBB EAST SPAN
Former Naval Station Treasure Island

LEGEND
- PROPOSED BORE LOCATION
- BOUNDARY OF FORMER NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

United States Navy
Categorical Exclusion
Marine Test Borings
Former Naval Station Treasure Island

EXHIBIT "A"
Mr. Kenn Parsons, Base Closure Manager  
U.S. Department of the Navy  
900 Commodore Drive  
San Bruno, California 94066-5006

Dear Mr. Parsons:

SUBJECT: SFOBB-EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

It is our understanding that you met with the Caltrans staff on August 25, 1998, to discuss the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB)-East Span Seismic Safety Project. During that meeting, you and your staff commented that you were in disagreement with the effect determinations made for particular properties in the Finding of Adverse Effect which was sent to your office on August 4, 1998.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the SFOBB was approved for public availability on September 21, 1998. Because of the urgency of this seismic safety project, it is anticipated that the Final EIS will be issued in early 1999. Accordingly, we would appreciate receiving written comments from you so we can proceed with the Section 106 process. If you wish, Caltrans and the FHWA staff can meet with you to address your concerns.

If you have any questions, please contact Bill Wong at 916-498-5042.

Sincerely,

/s/ John R. Schultz

For
Jeffrey A. Lindley
Division Administrator

cc:
Jared Goldfine, CT, Dist. 04
Mara Melandry, CT, Dist. 04
Hi Steve,

1. As discussed in our phone conversation of 10/23, please complete and submit attached Excavation Permit Request prior to starting additional off-shore boring/drilling work. It is the same form we require for all planned, land-based excavation work. I faxed a copy to Mr. Thom also.

2. Please check with Navy Real Estate Office, Ms. Beverly Freitas, 650-244-3804, regarding planned additional borings near SFOBB Pier E2 (per John Thom of Caltrans on 11/5) and determination if subject work is covered under existing Navy License Agreement N6247499RP00P01 or if a new agreement is necessary.

3. I'm interested in learning specific methods utilized by your contractor to avoid disturbing existing active off-shore (submarine) utility lines. I'd appreciate a call from anyone that could brief me with specifics.

4. Also, a reminder: Mr. Kenn Parsons, the Navy's Base Conversion Manager for Treasure Island, is the Navy's key POC for any and all issues that require interface with the Navy at TI/YBI. He can be reached at (415) 743-4701 or (650) 244-3004.

Respectfully,
Bruce Petrie
NAVY CARETAKER SITE OFFICE TREASURE ISLAND

REQUEST NO. (entered by Navy CSO)  DATE:

ONE-TIME EXCAVATION PERMIT REQUEST  
(Revised April 30, 1998)

PART I, DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED WORK  (To be completed by Requestor)

1. Purpose of Excavation:  

Attachments (Drawings, sketches, etc.):

2. Location of Excavation:  

3. Extent of Excavation:  

4. Building/Utility/Traffic Affected by Excavation:

5. Disposition of Debris:

6. Disposition of Soil:

7. Disposition of Groundwater:

8. Disposition of Hazardous Waste:

9. Location and Marking of Utilities:  
   a. USA Chit Number (to be provided by applicant when received, prior to excavation):

10. Additional Information:

11. Requested by (name):  
   a. Company & Address:  
   b. Contractor's License No:  
   c. Phone:  
   d. FAX:

12. Proposed Start Date:  
   Proposed Completion Date:

Please note: For all contractors performing work at TI/YBI (does not apply to SFPUC performing O & M related work): A License For Nonfederal Use of Real Property is required prior to processing of excavation permit. Has subject license been issued? Yes  No  If Yes, License No:

PART II, AUTHORIZATION  (To be completed by Navy CSO Treasure Island)

1. Request Received by Navy CSO Utilities Manager: Date:

2. Notification/Concurrences:  
   a. Caretaker Utilities Manager:  
      Comment:  
      Date:
   b. Caretaker Facilities Manager:  
      Comment:  
      Date:
   c. Caretaker Notification to Lessee/Licensee/Tenant:  
      Comment:  
      Date:
   d. Navy Environmental Compliance Manager:  
      Comment:  
      Date:

3. Request Disposition:  
   Approved  Disapproved:  
   Date:

4. Reason if Disapproved:

5. Navy CSO Signature:  
   Print Name & Title:  
   Date:

6. Requestor Notified Via:  
   Phone  FAX  Letter  In Person:  
   Date:

Distribution: Requestor, Navy CSO File, EFA-West Envir, Caretaker Facilities, Caretaker Utilities, Other:

File: EXCAV498.DOC, 30 April 98
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DATE: 01/19/98

ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CA 94066-5006

Facsimile Number: (650) 244-2006 - DSN: 494-2006

FROM:

Captain Ernest Hunter Code 00 (650) 244-2000

Commander Gene Hubbard Code 09 (650) 244-2002

Mary Ellen Kearney Code 00S (650) 244-2000

Rita Ramos Code 09S (650) 244-2002

To:  Ms. Marc McLanney, CALTRANS


Telephone Number: 510-286-6374

Number of Pages including transmittal sheet: 2

REMARKS

Please review attached request for extension of the comment period.

Thanks,

[Signature]
Ms. Mara Melandry  
California Department of Transportation  
District 4  
111 Grand Avenue (P. O. Box 23660)  
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Mr. John R. Schultz  
Chief, District Operations North  
Federal Highway Administration  
980 Ninth Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2724

Dear Ms. Melandry & Mr. Schultz:

The Department of the Navy hereby requests a 15-day extension from your deadline of November 23, 1998, so that we can complete and provide to you our comments on the draft EIS for San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project. We will appreciate your expeditious response to this request.

We look forward to continuing to work with you to assure compatibility with Navy missions and goals.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Kenn Parsons, our Treasure Island Base Conversion Manager, at Engineering Field Activity West in San Bruno, California, at (650) 244-3004.

Sincerely,

E. F. HUBBARD  
Commander, CEC, USN  
Acting Commanding Officer

Copy to:  
City and County of San Francisco Planning Department
November 23, 1998

Commander Hubbard, Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, California 94066-5006

Dear Commander Hubbard:

SUBJECT: TIME EXTENSION REQUEST FOR SAN FRANCISCO - OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE

Thank you for your fax of November 19, 1998, in which you requested that the public comment period of the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge, East Span Seismic Safety Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) be extended for an additional fifteen days beyond the close of comment period on November 23, 1998.

The DEIS was available to the public beginning September 24, 1998, in libraries in Oakland, San Francisco, Pleasant Hill and Vallejo, and at the Caltrans Public Information Office in Caltrans District 04 Oakland Office. It was also available on the Internet on September 24, 1998. The Notice of Availability of the DEIS was published in the Federal Register on October 9, 1998, and the close of public comment period was extended to reflect the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. The public comment period will therefore close on November 23, 1998, as noted in the Federal Register. This provides a comment period that is 60 days from the date it was available in libraries, on the Internet and at Caltrans’ District 04 office in Oakland.

Due to the urgency nature of this project and the extended commenting period (60 days) that were made available for accepting comments from the interested agencies and the public, both Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regrets that we cannot honor your request for additional time extension. However, as discussed with members of your staff, the FHWA and Caltrans will consider the comments provided by you as related to the SFOBB, East Span Seismic Safety Project.

Thank you for your interest in this important seismic safety project. If you have any questions, please contact John Schultz at (916)498-5041 or Mara Melandry of Caltrans at (510)286-5582.

Sincerely,

/s/ John R. Schultz

For
Jeffrey A. Lindley
Division Administrator
cc:
Mara Melandry, Caltrans Dist. 04

cc: (e-mail)
John Schultz, HA-CA
Bill Wong, HA-CA

gpwong:lw
December 2, 1998

Mr. Harry Y. Yahata
District Director
State of California
Department of Transportation
Post Office Box 23440
Oakland, CA 94623-0440

Dear Mr. Yahata:

I am writing in response to your letter of November 24, 1998, requesting an extension of License Agreement N6247499RP00P01, that would allow the California Department of Transportation to conduct geotechnical investigations on Navy property associated with Yerba Buena Island.

As you know, the Department of the Navy recently submitted comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed East Span of the Oakland Bay Bridge. In those comments, Robert B. Pirie, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations And Environment), stated that the Navy opposed the proposed northern alignments of the East Span because of the substantial adverse impact on Yerba Buena's historic and environmental resources and on the City of San Francisco's ability to redevelop Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island.

The investigations that you wish to conduct support construction of the northern alignments that would harm Navy property. As stated in Mr. Pirie's letter of November 23, 1998, to Mara Melandry, the Department of the Navy opposes those alignments. Accordingly, we will not grant an extension of the license to permit the investigations you wish to conduct on Navy property.

Sincerely

Ernest R. Hunter
Captain, CBC, USN
Commanding Officer
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Project Development Team Meeting
December 2, 1998
Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, Park View Room, 15th Floor

Attendees:
City and County of San Francisco
Jerry Robbins, Department of Parking and Traffic
Joan Rummelsburg, Mayor’s Office
Paul Rosetter, Planning Department
Nelson Wong, Department of Public Works
Annamarie Conroy, Mayor’s Treasure Island Project Office

City of Oakland
Diane Tannenwald, Public Works Agency
Marina Carlson, Mayor’s Office
Lynn Warner, Planning
Helaine Kaplan-Prentice, staff to Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
George Lythcott, member of Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board

FHWA
Dan Harris
John Schultz

U.S. Coast Guard
Jerry Olmes, Bridge Administrator

U.S. Navy
Morise Russ, EFA West
Kenn Parsons, EFA West
Agency Participants
Rick Wiederhorn, Port of Oakland
Lt. Bonnie Stanton, California Highway Patrol – San Francisco
Sgt. G. Rafferty, California Highway Patrol – Oakland
Brian Wiese, East Bay Regional Park District
Marj Blackwell, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Tom Clausen, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Tom Galvin, Department of Defense
K.A. Duron, Bay Area Rapid Transit
Richard Harris, East Bay Municipal Utilities District
Sanna Garcia, East Bay Municipal Utilities District
Alex Zuckernann, Regional Bicycle Advisory Committee
Steve Perry, AC Transit
Art Duffy, BCDC

Caltrans Staff
Denis Mulligan, District 4 Deputy Director
Brian Maroney, Project Manager
Steve Hulsebus, Assistant Project Manager
Mara Melandry, Environmental Planning
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental Planning
Pochana Chongchaikit, Toll Bridge Program
Ade Akinsanya, Structures
James Fong
Chris Inouye, HQ Specifications
Cindy Adams, HQ Environmental Division

Consultant Team
Ken Jong, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Tim Dougherty, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Mike Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Rebecca Morgenstern, Public Affairs Management
Meeting Summary:

I. Welcome/Introductions: Denis Mulligan, Caltrans
Denis Mulligan welcomed everyone and asked for self-introductions. Denis announced that the comment period on the Draft EIS closed on November 23, 1998 and that Caltrans is reviewing and considering all comments.

II. MTC Process Update
Marj Blackwell from MTC said there was no new information to present and that EDAP would meet in January, 1999.

III. Status of Risk Design
Brian Maroney discussed the status of the risk design. He explained that the bridge design is proceeding with full Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PSE). He also reported that the marine-based drilling has been completed, except for several holes within Navy jurisdiction at Yerba Buena Island. The architectural elements of the bridge including lighting are being developed.

IV. Status of Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Statutory Exemption
Mara Melandry announced the DEIS was published on September 24, 1998 and distributed to 160 recipients and made available in 6 Bay Area locations. Mara expressed appreciation for the timely submission of the comments. Caltrans received over 400 comments from 83 comment letters, 10 electronic mail responses and 30 verbal comments at the recent public hearings. In summary, the comments focused on the following topics: requests for more detailed mitigation measures, questions regarding dredging and dredged materials reuse and disposal, land use development and impacts, rail on the bridge, the breadth of the purpose and need, additional alternatives for the study, and bike lane configurations.

Mara discussed the Impacts and Mitigation Measures that cover the following areas; socio-economics and land use, transportation, visual, hazardous waste, water quality, natural resources, special status species and cultural resources.

Mara mentioned that there is ongoing coordinating effort to develop a new park at the touchdown point in Oakland and an upcoming meeting with various interested parties such as Oakland Heritage Alliance and others to discuss mitigation measures for affected historic resources.

V. Schedule for Identification of the Preferred Alternative
Denis Mulligan reviewed the selection criteria for the preferred alternative. The criteria were developed as part of the NEPA/404 process. Denis explained the need to identify the preferred alternative soon, since the Final EIS is due March 1999. He also stated that Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration will be the final decision-makers to identify the preferred alternative and will notify the public when the preferred alternative has been identified.
The selection criteria for the preferred alternative are as follows:

- Meets lifeline criteria
- Meets current standards for operations and safety to the greatest extent possible
- Does not preclude a pedestrian/bike path
- Does not preclude future improvements to YBI access ramps
- Minimizes impacts to environmental resources
- Maintains existing number of traffic lanes during and after construction

VI. General Discussion of Key Issues
The following general discussion occurred.

The Oakland Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board stated that the loss of the existing historic bridge is a significant issue and that the replacement bridge should meet the grandiose aesthetics of the current bridge. The Oakland Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board said that they feared that the Caltrans' aggressive timeline might overlook aesthetics. Someone asked when there would be an opportunity to discuss the timeline for the Section 106 process. Caltrans responded that there would be an opportunity for discussion in a mitigation meeting on December 10, 1998 from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

There was a suggestion to recycle the old bridge into the new bridge or send extra materials to Honduras.

Someone asked how Caltrans will achieve a CEQA Statutory Exemption for the project. Caltrans said statutory exemptions for seismic projects have met compliance with CEQA.

Caltrans clarified the NEPA/404 process and affirmed that signatory agencies needed to agree at each step of the project. The NEPA/404 signatories have agreed with the project purpose and need, the range of alternatives and the selection criteria. Caltrans discussed the next step, which is to determine the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA). The City of Oakland asked who decided the selection criteria. Caltrans responded that the NEPA/404 signatories developed the selection criteria. There was further discussion concerning the completeness of both the preferred alternative and the selection criteria.

The City of Oakland stated that they feel that the local concerns and comments were not being considered. The U.S. Navy said they have specific concerns about the northern alignment. Caltrans indicated all comments will be considered.

Caltrans discussed the conflict between the views of two federal agencies, the Navy and the Coast Guard, regarding the alignment of the replacement alternatives.

There was concern expressed about dredging and disposal of dredged material. The U.S. Navy said they would expect a supplemental DEIS would be required based on the EPA's comments. Caltrans said that they were coordinating with EPA to try to address their issues.
A representative of Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) expressed discontentment with the bicycle lane's elevation. However, BPAC recommended the bicycle lane's placement to MTC and this recommendation was adopted by MTC.

There was a request for copies of conflicting comments received by Caltrans.

There was discussion on alternatives to the bridge alignment. Annemarie Conroy stated that the City and County of San Francisco does not feel it is being listened to and that Caltrans is not considering all viable alignments, specifically the City's S-1 modified alignment. The City and County of San Francisco oppose the N-6 alignment.

Someone asked how does the bridge design address the geology of the bay? Brian Maroney said that the bridge designers are the best in the world and that seismic safety was being held at the highest level of importance.

The Oakland Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board questioned the status of the architectural design of the bridge. Another Oakland City representative said that it feels the bridge design is minimalistic.

Participants expressed interest in allowing all participating agencies to revisit the aesthetics of the bridge design. On January 4, 1999, the bridge design will be discussed at an EDAP meeting.

The City of Oakland inquired about the status of a rail study in response to the ballot measures. Caltrans responded that the cities which passed the ballot measure are submitting a request to MTC and Caltrans on what their intent and desires are and MTC will decide the next course of action. The City of Oakland stated that the letter would be sent the following week.

Annmarie Conroy requested a copy of all slides presented in the meeting. It was agreed to distribute the slides with the minutes.

Next Actions/Next Meeting:
The next PDT meeting is scheduled for April 8, 1999 at 9:00 a.m. at Caltrans District 4 offices in the Park View room. PLEASE NOTE THE DATE CHANGE!
Distribution:
All attendees
Elihu Harris, Mayor, City of Oakland
Terry Roberts, Oakland Public Works Director
Andrew Altman, Oakland Planning Department
Charles Bryant, Oakland Planning Department
Paul Nahm, Oakland Base Reuse Authority
Anne Whittington, Port of Oakland
Douglas Wong, Port of San Francisco
Willie Brown, Mayor, City of San Francisco
Stuart Sunshine, San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic
Bond Yee, San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic
Mark Primeau, San Francisco Public Works Director
Gerald Green, San Francisco Planning Director
Charles Rivasplata, San Francisco Planning Department
Hillary Gitelman, San Francisco Planning Department
Carmen Clark, San Francisco Transportation Authority
Bill Wong, FHWA
Jeff Weiman, FHWA
Kathy Hoffman, Congressman Miller’s Office
Will Travis, Bay Conservation & Development Commission
Russell Hancock, Bay Area Council
Sharon Banks, AC Transit
Cathy Wasikowski, RIDES
Thomas Margro, BART
Rube Warren, BART
Robert Jacobvitz, American Institute of Architects
Com. Robert Hocker, Jr., Department of the Navy
Wayne Till, U.S. Coast Guard
LCDR John Milkey, U.S. Coast Guard
Leo Lozano, U.S. Coast Guard
Carol Meyer, U.S. Coast Guard
Ed McCormick, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Dennis Diemer, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Steve Heminger, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Debra Baker, California Department of Transportation Right-of-Way
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Historic Resource Mitigation Meeting
December 10, 1998, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland
Mountain View Room, 15th Floor

Attendees:
City of Oakland
Diane Tannenwald, Public Works
Marina Carlson, Mayor’s Office
Helaine Kaplan-Prentice, Secretary, Landmarks Board
George Lythcott, President, Landmarks Board
Betty Marvin, Cultural Heritage Survey

National Park Service
Kimball Koch

Port of Oakland
Kate Nichol

Oakland Heritage Alliance
Shawna Brekke-Read

Consultant Team
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Rebecca Morgenstern, Public Affairs Management

Caltrans Staff
Jared Goldfine, Environmental Planning
Andy Hope, Environmental Planning
Mara Melandry, Environmental Planning
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental Planning
John Snyder, HQ, Environmental Program
Gloria Scott, HQ, Environmental Program
Meeting Summary (not intended as verbatim minutes)

I. Welcome/Introductions: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

Jared Goldfine welcomed everyone and asked participants to introduce themselves. Jared stated that some invitees would not be able to attend due to schedule conflicts. All participants and invitees will be sent meeting minutes. Those who could not attend will have an opportunity to comment.

II. Meeting Purpose/Format/Guidelines: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

Jared reviewed the agenda. The group then reviewed the meeting guidelines and discussed the format of the meeting. Jared explained that all mitigation measures that had been suggested heretofore were listed on the flip chart sheets on the wall. Jared explained that all measures should be reviewed by the group and further developed, and the group was encouraged to make additional mitigation suggestions. The group decided that after the overview they would review the mitigation measures and discuss them in the order listed.

III. Overview of Project and Review of Historic Resources and Section 106 Process: Andrew Hope, Caltrans

Andrew Hope discussed the purpose of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project. He then explained the Section 106 Process in relation to the project, and described each of the historic properties that could be affected by the project. Copies of two Caltrans reports, Historic Property Survey Report and Finding of Adverse Effect: Buildings and Structures were available to the meeting participants. The historic properties are as follows:

San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge

Yerba Buena Island:

Navy Building 262 (Torpedo Building)
Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District
(including NR-listed Quarters 1)
Officers’ Quarters 8, 9 and 10
Caltrans Garage, contributor to the bridge-not individually eligible
Caltrans Electrical Substation, contributor to the bridge-
not individually eligible
Archaeological site, on land owned by the Navy and the Coast Guard

Oakland:

Caltrans Electrical Substation, contributor to the bridge-
not individually eligible
Key Pier Substation
One participant questioned why buildings on Treasure Island that were built for the World's Fair were not included in the discussion. Jared responded that these buildings were outside the Area of Potential Effect as defined for this project.

IV. Considerations for Selection of Mitigation Measures

Caltrans presented some considerations for determining the mitigation measures:

- A nexus between the mitigation measures and the historic property affected should be strong.
- The extent of mitigation for a historic property should be consistent with the severity of the project's effect on that property.
- Mitigation measures must be a worthwhile use of public funds and benefit the public.

The group elaborated on several other factors they felt are important in any mitigation:

- The mitigation should reflect size, scale and significance of the historic resource.
- Accessibility to the public is important; the mitigation should generate enthusiasm about the history of the properties.
- Historic properties that will be lost should be documented in permanent forms.

V. Discussion of Mitigation Measures

A. Salvage components for reuse and circulation/display

Someone suggested that recycling goals be established. There was a request to distinguish between salvage vs. curation of historical memorabilia. There is a need to identify potential places for reuse and ensure that those materials are appropriately reused, recycled or displayed. There was further discussion regarding recovering bridge pilings for display or reuse.

John Snyder noted that there are bridge brokers, such as Bridge Masters, who find new locations for bridges. However, these are typically pin-connected bridges that can be taken apart and reassembled at the new site. The Bay Bridge is a riveted structure that cannot easily be disassembled.

There was discussion of reusing components of the existing bridge as a gateway feature at the Oakland touchdown and reusing parts of the bridge in the construction of the new bridge. There was discussion about reusing steel from the old Bay Bridge; however, the new bridge will be constructed primarily of concrete. Helaine Kaplan-Prentice remarked that steel could be considered an endangered American resource.
B. Museum exhibits on big bridges of the Bay Area

There was a request that the exhibit includes information about other bridges of San Francisco Bay. Also, the display should ensure permanence for the public benefit, rather than only a temporary exhibit. Both the permanent and temporary exhibits need greater definition. The feasibility of both temporary and permanent exhibits needs to be explored.

The size of the exhibit should reflect the grandiose nature of the bridge. There is an historic sign near the bridge at the Oakland touchdown that could be included in the exhibit.

C. Establish a permanent interpretive center

The site of the exhibit should be easily accessible to the public. The design of the center should accommodate hands-on experience. Some considerations in developing an interpretative center would include staffing, long term funding, and maintenance.

Suggested sites for an interpretive center include the Key Pier Substation, downtown Oakland, or the former 16th Street train station. Someone asked what the connection was between the 16th Street station and the bridge. John Snyder responded that there is an historic connection, since the Key System trains stopped at the station and then continued to the bridge and across the structure to San Francisco. It was suggested that a TEA-21 grant is a potential funding source for an interpretive center located at the station.

D. Publication based on HAER documentation

The HAER documentation explains the design, construction, and history of the bridge. George Lythcott asked whether it was reader-friendly or mostly technical in nature, and John Snyder responded that a well-written HAER document can be clear and interesting to the non-technical reader.

There was a request that the HAER document be made available now, to help in assessing the significance of the bridge. Jared explained that it is in draft form at this point, and therefore not available for distribution.

Gloria Scott suggested that the HAER documentation, as well as other visual information, could be made available on CD-ROM.

E. Testing and analysis of the existing bridge

Case studies should be conducted (using both engineering and metallurgical analysis) in order to learn all we can from the bridge, particularly about the effects of age and use on the steel structure.
F. Artwork in Oakland commemorating the bridge

Helaine Kaplan-Prentice recommended a representational oil painting of large scale, in the tradition of the noted California landscape painters. Several participants suggested that this is a traditional form of documentation that would capture the essence of the old bridge. There was a suggestion to explore other media and styles as well. The artwork should be displayed in a location where the public can see it.

G. Design of the new bridge

A representative of the City of Oakland stated that an element reflecting the old bridge needs to be incorporated into the new bridge. The City of Oakland and the Oakland Heritage Alliance stressed that the design of the new bridge needs to be equal or better than the quality of the old bridge and that there needs to be a unique design. This is the City of Oakland's most important mitigation measure. Jared stated that this meeting could only focus on mitigation measures apart from the design of the new bridge, but that the minutes would reflect the high level of importance placed on the design of the new bridge to the City of Oakland.

H. Historical Markers

The group agreed that historical markers at the Oakland touchdown park and on Yerba Buena Island were a good idea. It was suggested that the markers could include information about the new bridge as well.

I. Include a gateway feature to signal arrival in Oakland

The gateway feature would signify arrival in Oakland for eastbound bridge traffic. It was suggested that lighting be incorporated into the gateway feature to be a dramatic element at night as well as during the day. The Bay Bridge Coalition with the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art has offered to sponsor competition to design the park at the Oakland Touchdown, which could include a gateway feature.

J. Contribute to the rehabilitation of the Key Pier Substation in Oakland

It was proposed that Caltrans contribute to the rehabilitation of the Key Pier Substation in Oakland. Someone suggested adding the term reuse to rehabilitation. Potential new uses for the building should be considered.
K. Rehabilitate and donate the toll plaza clock

The clock (about 9' diameter) was originally mounted on the roof of the toll plaza canopy. It currently resides in the electric substation and is not in working order. It was proposed that the clock be rehabilitated and installed in a public place, such as the proposed Oakland touchdown park, or given to a museum. It was suggested that the clock be incorporated into the Toll Plaza redesign project.

L. Documentation of existing bridge

It was suggested that a bibliography be compiled of the Bay Bridge on film. Other suggestions included a professional monograph on the design and construction of the bridge, construction of a model depicting engineering considerations. Other forms of documentation could include videotaping the experience of driving on the bridge and passing under it in a boat.

The documentation should include an oral history and include stories of people involved in the design and construction of the bridge. The role of the bridge in regional development could be further explained. This effort could incorporate old movies and newsreels. The documentation should be in a media other than paper. The image of the damaged bridge following the Loma Prieta earthquake should be included.

M. Protect historic properties during construction

A plan needs to be implemented to enforce and monitor the protection of historic properties. It was explained that Caltrans has experience with construction projects in which the protection of historic properties has been successfully implemented.

N. Events associated with the opening of the new bridge

In association with Bay Area newspapers, issue a souvenir edition upon the opening of the new bridge. Include a replica of the souvenir edition produced in 1936 to commemorate the opening of the original bridge. The group agreed that this was a good idea.

O. Torpedo Building

Concern was expressed that the Torpedo Building be protected from damage during construction, and that any inadvertent damage be repaired. To address the impacts to the building (if the northern alignment were selected) it was proposed that Caltrans would contribute to the rehabilitation of the building.

There needs to be photo documentation of the building and its surrounding landscape, to assist in carrying out restoration. Kimball Koch recommended that HABS documentation be done as well. Someone suggested that the
Torpedo Building is a possible site for an interpretive center. Jared noted that specific uses for the building would be identified in the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Reuse Plan.

P. Naval Officers' Quarters
As with the Torpedo Building, it was requested that the Naval Officers' Quarters be protected from damage during construction and that any inadvertent damage be repaired. Also, HABS documentation should be done for the buildings.

The landscape surrounding the Naval Officers' Quarters should be documented prior to construction, to assist in restoration. Kimball Koch suggested that the landscape be restored to its appearance during the historic district's period of significance, rather than just to its current appearance.

Q. Archaeological Sites
Caltrans staff stated that a treatment and data recovery plan for archaeological sites on Yerba Buena Island and possible submerged ships is being developed. One prehistoric site which is eligible for National Register listing has been identified on Yerba Buena Island, and important historic sites may be present as well. Mitigation of archaeological sites would include a public interpretation element, including, where appropriate, the public display of artifacts.

Someone asked if any Native American groups have been consulted. It was explained that monitoring by a Native American during excavation of prehistoric sites is standard practice and if Native American remains are encountered, consultation with a "most likely descendant" will be initiated.
"Bin" Items

Bin items are topics that came up throughout the course of the group discussion. These are ideas that, although pertinent to the project, are not directly related to the task of historic property mitigation. These are items that the group wanted to be reflected in the minutes and would like to have addressed at some point in the East Span Seismic Safety Project decision process.

- Alignment of the new bridge
- Quality of steel (this issue was discussed in part under mitigation proposal E, "Testing and analysis of the existing bridge.")
- Retain old bridge as an operating element in addition to the construction of a new bridge. (It was explained that this idea was evaluated in the DEIS and was rejected for a number of reasons.)
- A suggestion to retain the existing bridge and use the lower deck for housing and the upper deck for recreation.
- New bridge design should incorporate old bridge's significance

VI. Next Steps

Caltrans staff thanked the group for their participation. Caltrans noted that many comments on design and alignment were received in the DEIS comments, and that these issues will be addressed as a part of the NEPA process. Caltrans summarized the next steps as follows:

- Comments will be attained from invitees who could not attend
- Caltrans will be developing a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Federal Highway Administration.
- The next meeting should move from brainstorming to priority setting based on funding and feasibility of the suggested mitigation measures.
- Future meetings will focus on specific mitigation measures and have individuals with expertise in those areas in attendance.
- Some parties noted that Caltrans will need to determine the alignment for the new bridge before finalizing the MOA.

The next historic properties mitigation meeting is suggested for early 1999. Caltrans will schedule the meeting with the intent of accommodating those individuals and organizations that could not attend the December 10 meeting.
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January 27, 1999

Mr. Kenn Parsons
U.S. Department of Navy
Base Conversion Manager
Engineering Field Activity West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, California 94066-5006

Dear Mr. Parsons:

Subject: Memorandum of Agreement-East Span Seismic Safety Project

Enclosed please find a copy of a Draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) prepared pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the East Span Seismic Safety Project. The stipulations included in the Draft MOA address the effects to architectural resources and archaeological resources for all of the build alternatives considered in the DEIS. The signatories to the MOA will be the U.S. Navy, U.S. Coast Guard, Federal Highway Administration, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer. Caltrans will be a concurring party to the MOA.

We request your written comments on the Draft MOA by February 11, 1999. Should you desire a meeting on this matter, we would be pleased to meet with you at your convenience prior February 11.

If you have any questions, please call me at 510/286-5623, or Jared Goldfine, Senior Environmental Planner at 510/286-6203.

Sincerely,

Harry Y. Yahata
District Director

By:

Robert Gross, Chief
Office of Environmental Planning South

cc: Annmarie Conroy, S.F. Treasure Island Project
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project
Historic Resource Mitigation Meeting
February 2, 1999, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland
Mountain View Room, 15th Floor

Attendees:
National Park Service
Michael Crowe
Kimball Koch
U.S. Coast Guard
Jerry Olmes
City and County of San Francisco
Tim Kelly, Landmarks Board
Joan Rummelsburg, Mayor's Treasure Island Office
California State Historic Preservation Office
Hans Kreutzberg
U.S. Navy
Lou Wall
Federal Highway Administration
Joan Bollman
Bill Wong
JRP Consultants
Steve Mikesell
California Preservation Foundation
Carolyn Douthat
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
MaryAnn Naber
Caltrans Staff
Jared Goldfine, Environmental Planning
Andy Hope, Environmental Planning
Mara Melandry, Environmental Planning
Marilee Mortenson, Environmental Planning
Janet Pape, Environmental Planning
Tony Anziano, Legal Division
Cindy Adams, HQ, Environmental Program
Margaret Buss, HQ, Environmental Program
Consultant Team
Kay Wilson, Public Affairs Management
Cindy Potter, Public Affairs Management
Meeting Summary (not intended as verbatim minutes)

I. Welcome/Introductions: Jared Goldfine, Caltrans

Jared Goldfine welcomed everyone and asked participants to introduce themselves. He stated that all participants and invitees will receive a meeting summary.

II. Comments from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: MaryAnn Naber

MaryAnn Naber of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), explained the Council's involvement in the Section 106 process, and stated that the Council would comment on project effects on historic properties as well as mitigation measures. The focus of Advisory Council consultation is to avoid or minimize adverse effects to historic properties.

III. Meeting Purpose/Format/Guidelines

Jared reviewed the agenda. The group then reviewed the meeting guidelines and discussed the format of the meeting.

Jared outlined the mitigation measures as written in the Draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Jared explained that the group should review all of the measures, and the group was then encouraged to make additional mitigation suggestions.

IV. Overview of Project and Review of Historic Resources and Section 106 Process and Update on Memorandum of Agreement

Andrew Hope provided an additional overview of the historical resources that are potentially impacted by this project. Participants stated that it seems as if Caltrans is assuming that the northern alignment will be the selected alignment alternative; Jared explained that the Draft MOA addresses all of the alignment alternatives. Jared acknowledged that design of the proposed touchdown park is determined in part by the selected alignment. Parties asked how the preferred alternative was identified and announced. Caltrans representatives explained that all comments are considered prior to identifying a preferred alternative. Caltrans held a press conference to announce the preferred alternative.

V. Discussion of Draft Stipulations/Mitigation Measures

There was a general discussion about the proposed stipulations and mitigation measures outlined in the Draft MOA. Participants noted that the mitigation measures were not sufficient for the magnitude of historic resource that will be lost by the removal of the East Span. The magnitude of the project merits more appropriate mitigation measures than those stated in the Draft MOA. Participants said the mitigation measures were not creative enough to compensate the loss.

It was noted that some ideas generated from the December Historic Resource Mitigation Meeting were not included in the Draft MOA; such as reuse of the Key Pier Substation or the inclusion of components of the historic bridge at the Gateway Park Entrance. Participants stated that they would like the MOA to consider the rehabilitation and maintenance of the Key Pier Substation.
ACHP noted that the consultation process needs to 1) look at the significance of the resources; 2) determine the geographic area of impact; 3) define public interest, and 4) evaluate how the mitigation measures relate to public interest. MaryAnn Naber noted that the loss of the bridge will have a significant regional impact on the historic environment of the Bay Area.

Participants noted the historical significance of the structural engineering involved with the bridge project and suggested an educational scholarship to study historic bridges as one mitigation measure. Participants supported the proposal for a museum exhibit, but expressed concern that it would be temporary.

Someone stated that the northern alignment would adversely impact San Francisco's Economic Development Plan on Yerba Buena Island (YBI). A participant asked how the roads on YBI would be affected by the project and if historical structures on YBI would be disturbed by the northern alignment more than by an alternative alignment. Caltrans stated that the S-4 alignment does not directly impact Building 262. Caltrans also noted that there would not be an increase in noise levels from traffic on the new bridge, but there would be construction-related noise. It was suggested that historic buildings may need more protective measures during construction.

The U.S. Navy representative said the Navy will not sign the MOA in its current state. The Navy does not agree with the northern alignment as the preferred alternative. The Navy also does not agree with Caltrans about archaeological resources on Yerba Buena Island, and would issue a permit for archaeological investigations until the larger issue of the alignment is resolved.

The U.S. Navy representative stated that authority over Quarters 8 has been transferred to the US Coast Guard.

Participants asked for more clarification in regards to mitigation measures for archaeological properties. A participant asked if there have been archaeological remains already found.

VI. Next Steps
Revisit measures based on comments
Issue a revised draft MOA
Send minutes of the Oakland meeting to San Francisco participants
Send minutes of this meeting to all participants

VII. Adjournment
Caltrans staff thanked the group for their participation
Mr. Harry Yahata  
District Director  
State of California  
Department of Transportation  
Post Office Box 23660  
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Re: Memorandum of Agreement Concerning The  
Proposed San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East  
Span Seismic Safety Project

Dear Mr. Yahata:

I am writing in response to your letter of January 27, 1999, forwarding a Draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) dated January 22, 1999, that addressed historic preservation issues arising out of your Department's proposal to proceed with a northern alignment of the proposed East Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

As you know, the Department of the Navy reviewed the Draft MOA, which assumes implementation of the northern alignment, and provided its response at the meeting you hosted on February 2, 1999. Navy is opposed to the northern alignment and thus believes that it is inappropriate to enter into the proposed MOA.

Navy opposes the northern alignment of the proposed East Span for the reasons set forth in Assistant Secretary Robert B. Pirie's letter to your Department dated November 23, 1998. The proposed northern alignment would have a devastating impact on the historic and natural resources on Yerba Buena Island and would deprive the City of San Francisco of the opportunity to redevelop the Island. Additionally, in light of the opposition to the northern alignment expressed by other affected parties, we believe that it is premature to discuss any mitigation that would be responsive to this proposal.
I request that you address any additional consultations regarding historic preservation issues to Mr. Kenn Parsons. He may be reached at (650) 244-3004.

Sincerely,

E. R. HUNTER
CAPTAIN, CEC, USN
COMMANDING OFFICER

Copy to:
Federal Highway Administration
Treasure Island Development Authority

Copies to
Cindy Adams (HA)
Mark, Jared
Goldfine, Maroney
Hulsebus
San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Seismic Safety Project

Meeting with CCSF & Navy
Utilities on YBI
Monday, March 1, 1999
9:00 – 11:30 A.M.

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Conflict map of the utilities on YBI
3. Strategy for the relocation of CCSF utilities impacted by the SFOBB East Span Seismic project
4. Existing backup water line to TI from the Oakland shore
5. Other issues
6. Summary (Action items)
CCSF Utility Services

1. Pochana Chongschaikij, CT, (510) 286-5057
2. Steven Hulsebos, CT, (510) 286-5085
3. Mario Revilla, CT, (510) 286-6968
4. Bruce A. Petrie, Navy Caretaker Site Office, Treasure Island, Voice (415) 743-4708, Fax 4700
5. Chuck Stanford, (415) 274-0333, Fax 574-5277
7. Rudy Ryan, CT, Util, 510-286-5335
8. Gene Lusherovitch, JWA (PB Team), (510) 452-0807
To: Bruce A. Petrie, Utilities Manager, Engineering Field Activity West  
cc: Pochana Chongchaikit  
Subject: One-Time Excavation Permit Request, YBI Island

The attached insurance certificate from Miller Pipeline Corp. was faxed to Linda Kratochvil today. Upon granting of the potholing permit please notify Pochana Chongchaikit at (510) 286-5057. If the approval occurs after March 15, 1999 you might call Rudy Ryan at (510) 286-5335.

Your earliest attention to this matter would be appreciated.

Rudy Ryan
REQUEST NO. _________ (entered by Navy CSO)  DATE: __________

ONE-TIME EXCAVATION PERMIT REQUEST  
(Revised April 30, 1998)

PART I, DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED WORK  (To be completed by Requestor)

1. Purpose of Excavation: 
   Utilities potholing, for electrical & gas lines located along Macallan Road, close to Quarter 10 and Building 213.

   Attachments (Drawings, sketches, etc.): Included.

2. Location of Excavation: on YBI, Macallan Road, Close to Quarters 10 and Building 213

3. Extent of Excavation: To the depth of the utility line.


5. Disposition of Debris: Not anticipated. Paving will be replaced.

6. Disposition of Soil: Not expected.


9. Location and Marking of Utilities: Will be identified in the field. Pavement markings will notify USA visible.

   a. USA Chit Number (to be provided by applicant when received, prior to excavation): _______

10. Additional Information: ______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

11. Requested by (name): Rudy Ryan RW CALTRANS, Tom McKinley (Miller Pipeline) 
   a. Company & Address: MILLER PIPELINE CORP, 8577 RAILROAD AVE, OAKLAND, CA 94621
   b. Contractor's License No: (34) 730 984 Phone: (510) 382-2170 Fax: (510) 562-0929.

12. Proposed Start Date: 03/17/99 Proposed Completion Date: 03/31/99

Please note: For all contractors performing work at TI/YBI (does not apply to SFPUC performing O & M related work): A License For Nonfederal Use of Real Property is required prior to processing of excavation permit. 

Has subject license been issued? Yes X No.  If Yes, License No: n624744g4996poob03

PART II, AUTHORIZATION  (To be completed by Navy CSO Treasure Island)

1. Request Received by Navy CSO Utilities Manager: ______________________ Date: __________

2. Notification/Concurrences:
   a. Caretaker Utilities Manager: ______________________ Date: __________ Comment: ______________________

   b. Caretaker Facilities Manager: ______________________ Date: __________ Comment: ______________________

   c. Caretaker Notification to Lessee/Licensee/Tenant: ______________________ Date: __________ Comment: ______________________

   d. Navy Environmental Compliance Manager: ______________________ Date: __________ Comment: ______________________

3. Request Disposition: Approved __________ Disapproved __________ Date: __________

4. Reason if Disapproved: ______________________

5. Navy CSO Signature: ______________________ Date: __________ Print Name & Title: ______________________

6. Requestor Notified Via: Phone ______ Fax ______ Letter ______ In Person ______ Date: __________

Distribution: Requestor, Navy CSO File, EFA-West Envr, Caretaker Facilities, Caretaker Utilities, Other.

File: EXCAV498.DOC, 30 April 98
**ACORD CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE**

**ISSUE DATE:** 07/15/98

**PRODUCER**
AON RISK SERVICES, INC.,
251 N. ILLINOIS ST., STE 1500
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

**INSURED**
MILLER PIPELINE CORPORATION
P. O. BOX 36141
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46234

**COMPANIES AFFORDING COVERAGE**
- **COMPANY A**
  - LETTER: NATIONAL UNION FIRE INS. CO.
- **COMPANY B**
  - LETTER: LUMBERMEN'S UNION ALLIANCE
- **COMPANY C**
  - LETTER: ASSOC' ELEC & GAS SERVICE LTD
- **COMPANY D**
- **COMPANY E**

**COVERAGES**

This is to certify that the policies of insurance listed below have been issued to the insured named above for the policy period indicated. Notwithstanding any requirement, term or condition of any contract or other document with respect to which this certificate may be issued or may pertain, the insurance afforded by the policies described herein is subject to all the terms, exclusions and conditions of such policies—limits shown may have been reduced by paid claims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO</th>
<th>TYPE OF INSURANCE</th>
<th>POLICY NUMBER</th>
<th>POLICY EFFECTIVE DATE</th>
<th>POLICY EXPIRATION DATE</th>
<th>LIMITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAIMS MADE X OCCUR.</td>
<td>GL 5440049</td>
<td>04/01/98</td>
<td>04/01/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OWNER'S &amp; CONTRACTOR'S PROT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANY AUTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL OWNED AUTOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCHEDULED AUTOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIRED AUTOS</td>
<td>CA 7201865</td>
<td>04/01/98</td>
<td>04/01/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON-OWNED AUTOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARAGE LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>EXCESS LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMBRELLA FORM</td>
<td>AD16041A98</td>
<td>03/01/98</td>
<td>03/01/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER THAN UMBRELLA FORM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>WORKER'S COMPENSATION</td>
<td>270611</td>
<td>04/01/98</td>
<td>04/01/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMPLOYER'S LIABILITY</td>
<td>270612 - NJ</td>
<td>04/01/98</td>
<td>04/01/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York Work Comp</td>
<td>WC5654258</td>
<td>04/01/98</td>
<td>04/01/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS/LOCATIONS/VEHICLES/SPECIAL ITEMS**

(SEE REVERSE)

**CANCELLATION**

Should any of the above described policies be cancelled before the expiration date thereof, the issuing company will endeavor to mail, 30 days written notice to the certificate holder named to the left, but failure to mail such notice shall impose no obligation or liability of any kind upon the company, its agents or representatives.

**AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE**

[Signature]

ACORD CORPORATION 1990

ACORD 25-S (7/90)
DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS/LOCATIONS/VEHICLES/SPECIAL ITEMS

CERTIFICATE (CONTINUED)

INSURED: MILLER PIPELINE CORPORATION

HOLDER: US DEPARTMENT OF NAVY
ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY - WEST
NAVY FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DR.
SAN BRUNO, CA  94066

May 3, 1999

Supervisor Mary King
Chairperson, Bay Bridge Design Task Force
Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700

Dear Supervisor King:

Attached for your information and use, as requested during the joint Bay Bridge Design Task Force/Engineering and Design Advisory Panel meeting held on February 24, 1999, is a compilation of correspondence between Caltrans and the Department of Navy concerning the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (510) 286-6293.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

By

DENIS MULLIGAN
Program Manager
Toll Bridge Program

Attachment

CC: Steve Heminger – MTC
Captain Hunter – U.S. Navy
Box 2, Folder 17

Item 1

ACCNO_000083