

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS - JUNE 2015

No.	COMMENTS	Responses
1	<p>1. Install a surveillance camera on one of the straightaways where illegal passing is common, like on the MM 5.0 to MM 6.0 stretch. Capture a week's worth of data to determine the approximate number of illegal passes occurring between 3PM and 7PM on a weekday. (My estimate for illegal passing on that stretch is between 10 and 20, every weekday). Then install a 'Do Not Pass' sign on that stretch and repeat the data collection for a few days. This would provide data as to the effectiveness of additional signage.</p> <p>2. Get a commitment from the CHP to enforce the traffic regulations at least 3 days per week. Two days per month is not enough to change driver behavior.</p> <p>3. How about considering a Special Enforcement Zone, where the fines are doubled for illegal passing or speeding more than 10 mph above the limit?</p> <p>4. Add signs that say "Minimum Fine for Passing - \$545". Those might be more effective than the existing "Do Not Pass" signs.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. Additional signage will be evaluated.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. The County is not authorized to establish double fine zones.</p> <p>4. Signage has been included as a countermeasure in this study. Additional signage will be evaluated.</p>
1 (cont.)	<p>5. I have observed an increase in 18 wheelers (primarily container trucks from the Port of Oakland) using Tesla to avoid the weigh station on I-580 at the Greenville exit. Having large trucks use Tesla is a disaster just waiting to occur. How about a "No Through Traffic for Trucks over 5 tons" sign?</p> <p>6. Install centerline rumble strips that are significantly more noisome than the regular ones. Or install small concrete blocks on the centerline that are sufficiently high to deter passing without incurring undercarriage damage.</p> <p>7. When there is an accident on I-580 that causes commuter traffic to divert to Tesla (causing a huge 5+ mile backup on Tesla), a CHP officer should be dispatched to direct traffic at the Greenville intersection.</p>	<p>5. Comment noted. Truck restrictions were not identified as a countermeasure in this study. Roadway usage will continue to be monitored following the study.</p> <p>6. Rumble strips have been included as a countermeasures in this study.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p>

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS - JUNE 2015

No.	COMMENTS	Responses
1 (cont.)	<p>8. As an avid cyclist who commuted to work via bicycle, I find that the narrow road shoulders on most of Tesla makes riding a bike very hazardous. It used to be tolerable when there was less traffic, but the traffic volume these days makes Tesla pretty much unrideable during the weekday commute hours. Widening the shoulder by even a foot or two would significantly reduce that hazard. And I didn't see any mention of the new law that requires drivers who pass cyclists from behind to keep their vehicles at least 3 feet away from the cyclist, without crossing the centerline. But if traffic or roadway conditions prevent motorists from giving cyclists 3 feet of clearance, drivers must "slow to a speed that is reasonable and prudent" and only pass when the cyclist will not be endangered. Will the CHP be ticketing motorists on Tesla that cross the centerline to safely pass a cyclist? Or will traffic stack up behind some poor cyclist who is trying his best to not get run over? I can foresee some really bad situations coming up.</p>	<p>8. Shoulder improvements have been included as countermeasures in this study.</p>
2	<p>We do not want more traffic of bikes/vehicles/atv, etc on Tesla Road. We have had many dangerous situations due to their carelessness and it is especially difficult to get in and out of my driveway and/or drive on Tesla Road on a daily basis.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
3	<p>Main traffic corridors should be kept and improved where they are, that is in this case, the 580 freeway. Tesla Road is a peaceful road through a rural area. It is currently be used and abused as a short-cut for single passenger out of the area commuters to beat the backup on the highway. Leave the peaceful areas peaceful. In fact, the county government should be looking for ways to protect the surface, residential streets and *dissaude* out of town commuters from using country roads as their own personal freeway!</p>	<p>Comment noted. The scope of this study is to evaluate the current roadway conditions and identify the roadway safety needs. This safety study does not address capacity issues or traffic circulation.</p>

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS - JUNE 2015

No.	COMMENTS	Responses
4	<p>The preponderance of the respondents expressed concerns relative to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding widening of the road • Potential right of way / eminent domain acquisitions • Disruption of the rural quality of Tesla Road and the surrounding environs. <p>Solutions proposed by residents included increased enforcement, regional planning, stop sign/ stop light or other traffic calming measures were not addressed other than being 'noted' in the final study.</p> <p>After the initial informational meeting the public concern prompted special mailing from Supervisor Scott Haggerty and Daniel Woldensenbet, Director of Public Works, April 12, 2013 which attempted to placate residents' concerns. In their letter Haggerty and Woldensenbet were explicitly ruled out the widening of Tesla road: Specifically they stated; "staff emphasized that there are no plans to widen any of these roadways... and "I want to reiterate that there are no plans to widen ... Tesla Road."</p>	<p>There are no plans to widen Tesla Road.</p> <p>The purpose of the Safety Study is to identify safety concerns along Tesla Road and countermeasures to address those issues. The study focused on safety issues and not issues related to circulation, capacity, or regional transportation planning.</p> <p>Many issues and solutions proposed by residents were included in the report (i.e. enforcement areas to assist enforcement, traffic calming measures such as speed display signs and rumble strips). Some residents proposed wider shoulders and bike lanes.</p> <p>There are no plans to widen Tesla Road.</p>
4 (cont.)	<p>However the final report presented by county staff on June 4th 2015 , clearly recommends widening and paving shoulders of Tesla Rd from Greenville Road to the San Joaquin county line to a width of 8 feet.</p> <p>This represents widening the paved area of the road by ≈70% (i.e. 8ft (shoulder) /11ft (lane width). When questioned about the proposed 8-foot paved shoulders, staff responded that shoulders weren't really widening the road.</p> <p>Moreover when asked if there were any right of way acquisitions identified, staff stated that there was only ONE right of way acquisition.</p>	<p>The safety study report identified the recurrence of run off road collisions. Various countermeasures are identified in the report to reduce the incidents of this type of collision. Shoulder widening was identified among the countermeasures that reduce run off road collisions, as shoulder area provides improved recovery ability for motorists.</p> <p>No right of way has been identified to be acquired.</p>

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS - JUNE 2015

No.	COMMENTS	Responses
4 (cont.)	<p>Below I have excerpted highlights from the plan. Please read the final draft report for additional facts. The recently published Final Tesla Safety project continues and quoted below (emphasis added by me) :</p> <p>Near term measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree trimming/removal – Specifically the study identifies at least 45 trees and shrubs for removal that obstruct line of sight from drive ways. Locations are shown in Exhibit 5. <p>Long term- measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening Tesla Rd by more than 70% pg 10. As stated in the report this will include: “As a long-term countermeasure, it is recommended that eight-foot shoulders be constructed throughout the project limits. ...It is anticipated that construction of 8-foot shoulder requires right of way acquisition and slope easements. “ 	<p>Shoulder widening was identified among the countermeasures that reduce run off road collisions, as shoulder area provides improved recovery ability for motorists.</p>
4 (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening Tesla Rd by more than 70% pg 10. As stated in the report this will include: “As a long-term countermeasure, it is recommended that eight-foot shoulders be constructed throughout the project limits. ...It is anticipated that construction of 8-foot shoulder requires right of way acquisition and slope easements. “ Pg 37. <p>“However, constructing eight-foot wide paved shoulders requires relocation of drainage inlets and utility poles, removing trees, extension of existing drainage culverts, relocation of existing guard rails, moderate to significant earthwork, construction of retaining walls and potential right of way acquisitions and slope easements. Pg 41</p>	<p>Shoulder widening was identified among the countermeasures that reduce run off road collisions, as shoulder area provides improved recovery ability for motorists.</p>

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS - JUNE 2015

No.	COMMENTS	Responses
4 (cont.)	<p>• Right of way acquisition throughout the path of the roadway is clearly anticipated; specifically as noted in the report: "...could have substantial environmental impacts and require the acquisition of right of way and construction easements prior to implementation." Pg 22</p> <p>"Mid-term countermeasures could have some right of way and environmental impacts and mitigation costs, and would likely require a funding source. Pg 22</p> <p>"Long-term countermeasures are typically larger projects with a higher construction cost. ... These projects could have substantial environmental impacts and require the acquisition of right of way and construction easements prior to implementation." Pg 22</p> <p>In summary, I am disappointed that the county has ignored the concerns of many Tesla Rd residents. The content of the report is clearly at odds with what was verbally stated at the community meeting and is contrary to the assurances that were given earlier by Supervisor Haggerty and Public Works Director Woldensenbet. Given this I ask the county for a public meeting as originally promised to allow a public discussion of this 'final' safety plan.</p>	<p>No projects have been developed; no right of way has been identified to be acquired.</p>