CHAPTER 5

Response to Comments

This chapter includes a reproduction of and responses to each letter received during the public review period. Each letter is reproduced in its entirety, and is immediately followed by responses to the comments in it. Letters are categorized by type of commentor, with State agencies first, followed by regional and then County agencies, and private organizations and individuals. Responses to comments made at meetings about the Draft EIR, which were held on August 9, 2005 and August 13, 2005, are also included. Each comment and response is labeled with a reference number in the margin.

Where comments have been made more than once, a response may direct the reader to another numbered comment and response. Where a response requires revisions to the Draft EIR, the revision is referenced in the response and the revised text is included in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.
September 22, 2005

Victoria Walker
City of Walnut Creek
1666 N. Main St
P.O. Box 8039
Walnut, CA 94596

Subject: City of Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 - Draft EIR
SCH#: 2004022042

Dear Victoria Walker:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on September 21, 2005, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

“A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation.”

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
**Document Details Report**
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LETTER 1
Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse.
State of California, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. September 22, 2005.

1-1: This comment states that the Draft EIR complies with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents. No response is required.
September 21, 2005

Ms. Victoria Walker
Assistant Planning Manager
City of Walnut Creek
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Ms. Walker:

City of Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 – Draft Environmental Impact Report

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Department) in the environmental review process for the proposed City of Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 (General Plan). The following comments are based on our review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR):

Please provide a minimum of 4 – 6 meters horizontal clearance between elevated highway structures, such as freeway viaducts and ramps, and adjoining buildings or other structures for future development.

Since the DEIR determines that the General Plan will have major impact to the freeway facility, more specific mitigation measures should be provided.

Additional comments may be forthcoming when our offices of Environmental Engineering and Highway Operations complete their review of the DEIR.

Encroachment Permit

Work that encroaches onto the State ROW requires an encroachment permit that is issued by the Department. Traffic-related mitigation measures will be incorporated into the construction plans during the encroachment permit process. See the following website link for more information:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits/

To apply for an encroachment permit, submit a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans (in metric units) which clearly indicate State ROW to the address at the top of this letterhead, marked ATTN: Sean Nozzari, Office of Permits.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Should you require further information or have any questions regarding this letter, please call Lisa Carboni of my staff at (510) 622-5491.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

TIMOTHY C. SABLE
District Branch Chief
IGR/CEQA

c: State Clearinghouse
LETTER 2
Timothy Sable, District Branch Chief, California Department of Transportation. September 21, 2005.

2-1: Comment noted. No response required.

2-2: The DEIR finding is that the General Plan 2025 Buildout would contribute to freeway speeds of less than 30 miles per hour during the peak hour along I-680. The congestion along the freeway can be attributed to regional growth in Contra Costa County, of which Walnut Creek is only a small percentage. Since specific mitigation measures would require coordination with other local and regional agencies, which is supported by General Plan Policies 1.1 and 1.2, the DEIR conclusion was a finding of significant and unavoidable.

2-3: If additional comments are made after the closing of the comment period they may be responded to by the City as a courtesy but would not be published as part of the Final EIR or made available to the public.

2-4: Comment noted that an Encroachment Permit will be required for work within a State right-of-way. No response is required.
Victoria Walker  
Assistant Planning Manager  
City of Walnut Creek  
1666 North Main Street  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Subject: Walnut Creek General Plan

Dear Ms. Walker:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (District) staff have reviewed your agency’s Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Walnut Creek General Plan (plan). The plan outlines a comprehensive, long-range statement of the City’s development and preservation policies that will act as a guide for development within the City over the next 20 years. The DEIR notes that plan implementation will result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. We have the following comments on the plan and the DEIR that could benefit air quality and public health in Walnut Creek and throughout the region.

We commend the City for including policies and actions in the plan that are designed to improve local and regional air quality. While the impacts on air quality may not be able to be fully mitigated, we believe that all feasible steps should be taken to reduce the impacts to the greatest extent possible. District staff recommend that the plan include an Air Quality Element that provides readers with a more detailed background on air quality issues, emphasizes the importance of air quality to public health and welfare, and outlines policies and programs to minimize air pollutant emissions associated with City growth. The DEIR provides useful background information on air quality that could be readily transferred to an Air Quality Element, such as the discussion on the health effects of air pollution, the region’s attainment status with regard to ambient air quality standards, and the contribution of mobile and stationary sources to air pollution emissions. District staff are also available to assist with the timely development of an Air Quality Element.

To further mitigate the significant impact on air quality, we recommend strengthening the language of policies and actions in the plan that encourage alternative forms of transportation, as well as including additional measures that can further reduce transportation-related emissions. For example, Action 29.1.1 could be amended to state, “Require all future development to implement feasible local transportation control measures (TCMs) and other strategies identified in the latest Bay Area Clean Air Plan.” We also recommend amending Action 7.5.2 to state that safety and convenience for transit riders will be given preference over roadway and traffic flow when working with CCCTA on determining the appropriate location of transit stops. Under Policy 29.2, we recommend adding a separate action that would encourage incorporating neighborhood-serving commercial uses in large residential developments so as to reduce the need to drive
for some shopping trips. District staff also recommend adding a sentence to Action 6.4.1 that would ensure that new parking lots in commercial and multifamily developments provide safe and direct pathways for pedestrians accessing building entrances from both adjacent sidewalks and on-site parking areas. These feasible additions to the plan may not reduce the significant impact on air quality to less-than-significant levels, but could further reduce emissions while advancing the City’s long-term goals.

An over-supply of parking is one of the reasons why people do not consider alternatives to driving alone. Requiring more parking to satisfy the demand for free or under-priced parking can also spread out land uses and increase development costs. Spreading out land uses encourages driving alone, which increases vehicle emissions. Goal 12 in the plan calls for the provision of convenient and adequate parking in Downtown Walnut Creek. This goal, however, does not include a discussion on the potential of parking prices to moderate parking demand. Charging for parking can encourage employees, patrons and visitors to carpool, take transit, bike or walk—all of which have air quality benefits compared to driving alone. We recommend that the plan include actions under Policy 12.1 and Policy 12.4 that would allow consideration of parking prices to moderate parking demand. District staff also recommend adding a policy to the plan that allows for reducing parking requirements and using these savings to implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures that can reduce the demand for driving. These measures could include subsidizing transit passes, implementing a carsharing program, and/or providing increased transit or shuttle service. These measures can help decrease development costs, reduce the demand for parking, increase the use of alternative transportation modes, and reduce the amount of air pollutant emissions generated by the project. Financial assistance for these efforts may also be available through grant opportunities. Please refer to the District’s website for more information about our available grant funding: http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/grants_and_incentives/index.htm.

The District recommends that the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) address the plan’s potential to increase the demand for energy. Increasing the demand for electricity, natural gas, and gasoline may result in an increase of criteria air pollutant emissions from combustion, as well as an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, which can impact regional air quality. We recommend that the FEIR discuss energy demand of Walnut Creek’s anticipated growth. We commend the City for including a green building goal and recommend adding an action to Policy 25.1 that would set a percentage reduction goal below Title 24 energy standards for all new construction. We also recommend including all feasible measures for both commercial and residential uses that will reduce energy consumption, including but not limited to the use of: super-efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems; light-colored and reflective roofing materials, pavement treatments and other energy efficient building materials; shade trees adjacent to buildings; photovoltaic panels on buildings; and natural or energy-efficient lighting.

The District commends the City for including Action 29.3.2 “Consider adopting a wood smoke ordinance” in the General Plan. Due to the Bay Area’s existing nonattainment designation for State particulate matter standards, the District is concerned about the amount of particulate matter that could be produced from wood-burning stoves and fireplaces from both residential and commercial uses. We encourage the City to adopt a wood smoke ordinance to limit wood-burning fireplaces and stoves in order to reduce particulate pollution throughout the
City. We recommend that the City add a policy to the plan that requires all new development to install only natural gas fireplaces, pellet-fueled stoves, or EPA-certified wood-burning appliances, and that these requirements be included in the proposed wood smoke ordinance. District staff are available to assist the City in the development of a local wood smoke ordinance. For more information on our wood-burning program, please contact Public Information Officer Emily Hopkins at (415) 749-4976.

For more details on our agency’s guidance regarding environmental review, we recommend that the City refer to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. This document provides information on best practices for assessing and mitigating air quality impacts related to projects and plans, including construction emissions, land use/design measures, project operations, motor vehicles, and nuisance impacts. If you do not already have a copy of our BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, we recommend that you obtain a copy by calling our Public Information Division at (415) 749-4900 or downloading the online version from the District’s web site at http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/ceqa/index.asp. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Douglas Kolozsvari, Environmental Planner, at (415) 749-4602.

Sincerely,

Jean Roggenkamp
Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer

JR:DK

cc: BAAQMD Director Mark DeSaulnier
    BAAQMD Director Mark Ross
    BAAQMD Director Michael Shimansky
    BAAQMD Director Gayle Uilkema
LETTER 3
Jean Roggenkamp, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. September 15, 2005.

3-1: This comment recommends that the General Plan include an Air Quality Element that provides background on air quality issues and includes some of the information found in the EIR. It also commends the City for policies and actions in the Plan to improve air quality. The Plan is meant to provide policy guidelines, and is not meant to be an exhaustive explanatory document for all issues facing the City. The City believes that the policies and actions included in the Plan, as noted, adequately address the topic of air quality and therefore no individual Air Quality Element is needed at this time. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no action is necessary.

3-2: This comment recommends that Chapter 4, Action 29.1.1 on page 4-42 be amended from “Support local transportation control measures (TCMs) and other ideas in the latest Bay Area Clean Air Plan” to “Require all future development to implement feasible local transportation control measures (TCMs) and other strategies identified in the latest Bay Area Clean Air Plan” in order to further mitigate the significant impact on air quality. The City is supportive of TCMs for certain strategic projects and does not feel that implementation across-the-board for all projects is useful. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no action is necessary.

3-3: This comment recommends that Chapter 5, Action 7.5.2 on page 5-14 be amended to prioritize safety and convenience of transit riders over roadway and traffic flow. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no response is required.

3-4: This comment recommends adding a separate action item under Chapter 4, Policy 29.2 on pages 4-42 and 4-43 that would encourage incorporating neighborhood serving retail in large residential developments to reduce the need to drive. The City is largely built out. The only large-scale projects that are likely to occur in the future are multi-family projects in the downtown area. As part of the General Plan Update, the City has redesignated land for mixed-use in the downtown area to allow neighborhood-serving retail to be developed in large residential developments, as this comment suggests. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no action is necessary.

3-5: This comment recommends adding a sentence to Chapter 5, Action 6.4.1 on page 5-11 to ensure that new parking lots in commercial and multi-family housing developments provide safe and direct pathways to building entrances from sidewalks and on-site parking areas. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no response is required.

3-6: This comment recommends that Chapter 5, Policies 12.1 and 12.4 be amended to include actions to consider using parking prices to moderate parking demand. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no response is required.

3-7: This comment recommends adding a policy that would allow for reducing parking requirements and using the savings to implement TDM measures. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the
adequacy of the EIR, therefore no action is required.

3-8: This comment recommends that the EIR discuss the energy demand of Walnut Creek’s anticipated growth. It is noted that demand for energy resources will increase as the City continues to grow, however it is anticipated that most of the planned growth will occur in the identified change areas, in the form of mixed-use development with greater potential for energy efficiencies in building design and through the potential for vehicle trip reduction. Since energy resources are provided at a regional scale, the cumulative demand for increased energy services is addressed at a regional level.

3-9: This comment recommends adding an action to Chapter 4, Policy 25.1 on page 4-39 that would set a percentage reduction goal below Title 24 energy standards for all new construction. As stated in Action 25.1.1 under Policy 25.1 to “Develop incentives to use green building techniques,” the City is working towards establishing a range of methods to encourage energy conservation. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no action is necessary.

3-10: This comment recommends adding an action to Chapter 4, Policy 25.1 on page 4-39 that requires that both commercial and residential uses include all the feasible measures that could be taken for reducing energy consumption. As stated above, the City is working towards establishing methods to improve energy conservation, as noted in Action 25.1.1 under Policy 25.1 to “Develop incentives to use green building techniques.” This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no action is necessary.

3-11: This comment commends the City for including Chapter 4, Action 29.3.2 “Consider adopting a wood smoke ordinance” and urges the City to adopt it. This is noted. It further recommends adding a policy that would require all new development to have only natural gas, pellet-fueled stoves or EPA-certified wood-burning stoves. The City will consider adopting such an ordinance, which would be modeled after Contra Costa County’s Ordinance to regulate the new construction or replacement of wood-burning appliances. This comment is in regards to the General Plan update and does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no action is necessary.
September 19, 2005

Victoria Walker, Assistant Planning Manager
City of Walnut Creek
Community Development Department
P.O. Box 8039
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Re: City of Walnut Creek Draft General Plan 2025 Update
Draft Environmental Impact Report – City of Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 Update

Dear Ms. Walker:

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to review both the City of Walnut Creek (City) Draft General Plan 2025 Update (2025 Update) and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City of Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 Update. As a responsible agency, EBMUD needs to ensure that the 2025 Update and Draft EIR objectively evaluate how changes in land use and development proposed within the General Plan Area could impact EBMUD’s interests. Comments detailed in the following paragraphs apply to both documents, as noted.

WATER SERVICE

EBMUD provided comments on water service, water conservation and water recycling for the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR in correspondence dated March 19, 2004 (copy enclosed), noting that the limitations related to defining specific impacts directly relate to the general nature of the 2025 Update projections. For the most part, the 2025 Update reflects and responds to EBMUD’s comments, with exceptions or notations cited below.

General Plan 2025 Update

Page 4-43, Air and Water Quality, states that EBMUD customers in Walnut Creek used over 9 million gallons per day (mgd) in 2003. Please delete the number “9” and replace with “11”. The accurate number is 11 mgd.

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Page 25, General Plan Buildout Projections, states that a theoretical number of 5,342 units and 10,814 people could be added to the City for a total of 37,948 units and 77,314 residents by 2025. For the planning area, the comparable numbers are 8,524 new units for a total of 47,820 units and 100,422 residents by 2025. EBMUD understands that these numbers are theoretical and that actual commercial and residential development over time
is largely a function of market forces and individual projects. Depending on size and/or square footage, individual projects within the Plan Area may require a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) from EBMUD pursuant to Sections 10910-10915 of the California Water Code. Please be aware that the WSA can take up to 90 days to complete from the day the request is received.

Please note that the numerical reference actions cited in the Draft EIR on page 135 for water conservation measures do not reflect the goal numbers cited in the 2025 Update on page 4-40 (28.1.1 and 28.2.1 through 28.2.4 as opposed to 27.1.1 and 27.2.1 through 27.2.4).

WATER CONSERVATION

EBMUD acknowledges that the City has addressed water conservation concerns by developing two specific policies and related actions that promote water conservation, (Chapter 4, Built Environment, Environmental Goal 27, Policies 27.1 and 27.2, and related Actions) and coordination of conservation efforts with water utilities. EBMUD would further request that as part of the 2025 Update, the City update their water conservation guidelines to be more consistent with the States Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (AB 325), Division 2, Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 2.7, Sections 490 through 495 and the recommendations of Governors AB 2717 Landscape Taskforce (Final report due December 2005).

EBMUD staff would appreciate the opportunity to meet with City staff to discuss water conservation programs and best management practices. Key objectives of this meeting would be to explore best landscape, irrigation and building water conservation practices for new development, how best to coordinate each of our agency’s services to achieve the highest practical water use efficiencies in buildings and landscapes and state-of-the-art water conservation technology.

WATER RECYCLING

In EBMUD’s March 19, 2004 written response to the City’s Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR of the General Plan Update, EBMUD provided comments on water recycling. Since the Notice of Preparation response, the scope of the Lamorinda Recycled Water Project (LRWP) has changed as a result of changes in potential customers and recycled water demands. The City is now outside the LRWP service area boundary because further analyses indicated that it is currently not feasible to serve recycled water to any portions of the City through any of EBMUD’s planned recycled water projects.

On page 136, Water Reuse and Conservation Measures, East Bay Municipal Utility District, last sentence, second paragraph should be revised to read - In 2000, the EBMUD daily demand was 230 mgd, with 8 mgd saved through conservation and 4 mgd saved through recycling.
On page 136, Water Reuse and Conservation Measures, East Bay Municipal Utility District, third paragraph, second sentence, replace - the planning phase of three additional water recycling projects scheduled for implementation before 2010 - with - the construction phase of two additional water recycling projects scheduled for implementation by 2007.

On page 140, Water Recycling, add - EBMUD currently does not have any plans to provide recycled water to the City of Walnut Creek through the year 2025.

If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact David J. Rehnstrom, Senior Civil Engineer, Water Service Planning, at (510) 287-1365.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William R. Kirkpatrick
Manager of Water Distribution Planning

WRK:GAA:sb
sb05_241.doc

Enclosure
March 19, 2004

Janice Stern, Senior Planner  
City of Walnut Creek  
Community Development Department  
P.O. Box 8039  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Ms. Stern:

Re: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report – City of Walnut Creek General Plan Update

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to review the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City of Walnut Creek (City) General Plan Update. As a responsible agency, EBMUD wants to ensure that the EIR is of sufficient detail and quality to evaluate how development and changes in land use within the project area could impact EBMUD’s interests as detailed in the following paragraphs.

EBMUD FACILITIES – LAND USE DESIGNATION

In correspondence dated May 12, 2003 (copy attached) the District communicated its interest in ensuring that the General Plan Update recognizes the fact that the District has water supply, treatment and maintenance facilities located within the City limits. The District requested that an appropriate land-use designation be applied to its facilities. The District wishes to emphasize that this is an ongoing concern.

WATER SERVICE

The following pressure zones, at elevation ranges as shown, serve the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure Zone</th>
<th>Service Elevation Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leland</td>
<td>50-250 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorados</td>
<td>250-450 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>250-450 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookwood</td>
<td>450-650 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>450-650 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>645-845 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NOP/Initial Study Checklist does not reference specific development projects. Any development project associated with the General Plan Update will be subject to the following general requirements.

Main extensions that may be required to serve any specific development projects that will provide adequate domestic water supply, fire flows, and system redundancy will be at the project sponsor’s expense. Pipeline and fire hydrant relocations or replacements due to modifications to existing streets, and off-site pipeline improvements, also at the project sponsor’s expense, may be required depending on EBMUD metering requirements and fire flow requirements set by the local fire department. All project sponsor(s) should contact EBMUD’s New Business Office and request a water service estimate to determine costs and conditions of providing water service to the development. Engineering and installation of new and relocated pipelines and services often require substantial lead-time, which should be provided for in the project sponsor’s development schedule.

The portion of the City served by EBMUD used an average of 10.09 million gallons per day (mgd) in 1996 (13.46 mgd within Walnut Creek’s Planning area, as defined in the current General Plan). EBMUD projects that water use for the City within the EBMUD service area will increase to 11.1 mgd (14.85 mgd within the City’s Planning Area) by 2030.

Section XII (a) of the Initial Study Checklist for the subject NOP indicates that the General Plan Update will generate a potentially significant impact because it will induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. However, this growth is not quantified. EBMUD requests that the City should notify EBMUD as soon as growth estimates are generated and shall include an analysis of impacts to EBMUD’s water supply and service in the Draft EIR. The City should request a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) if the projected growth meets the requirements of Sections 10910-10915 of the California Water Code. Once the City determines that a WSA is required and a request is submitted, EBMUD will respond with a request to gather data and estimates of future water demand for the project site. Please be aware that the WSA can take up to 90 days to complete from the day the request was received.

WATER CONSERVATION

The proposed project presents an opportunity to incorporate many water conservation measures. EBMUD would request that the City include in its analysis and conditions of approval a requirement that the City and any project sponsors comply with California AB 325, Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, Division 2, Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 2.7, Sections 490 through 495. EBMUD staff would appreciate the opportunity to meet with the City to discuss water conservation programs and best management practices. A key objective of this discussion will be to explore timely opportunities to expand conservation via early consideration of EBMUD’s conservation programs and best management practices applicable to the City.
WATER RECYCLING

EBMUD suggests that the following comments be added to the Draft EIR, Environmental Impacts, Section XVI, Utilities and Service Systems:

EBMUD's Policy 73 requires "...that customers ...use non-potable water for non-domestic purposes when it is of adequate quality and quantity, available at reasonable cost, not detrimental to public health and not injurious to plant life, fish and wildlife" to offset demand on the District's limited potable water supply. Portions of the City are located within EBMUD’s Lamorinda Recycled Water Project (LRWP) service area boundary. The District anticipates supplying recycled water to the project area within the next ten years.

In June 2001, EBMUD notified the City that recycled water was expected to be available within ten years to certain portions of the City that EBMUD designated as Water Reuse Zones. Under the Water Recycling in Landscaping Act, the City was then required to adopt and enforce an ordinance, which would require the installation of dual plumbing systems for the use of recycled water in new development or redevelopment projects located within a Water Reuse Zone. Along with the notification, EBMUD also provided a project map for the LRWP. Portions of the City are located within the LRWP boundary (the LRWP service area is a Water Reuse Zone).

EBMUD will request that the City should contact EBMUD to determine if a new development or redevelopment project located within the Water Reuse Zone would be supplied with recycled water within ten years. If EBMUD plans to supply recycled water within ten years to the project site, EBMUD would then request that the City should require that the developer install dual plumbing systems for the use of recycled water.

If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact David J. Rehnstrom, Senior Civil Engineer, Water Service Planning, at (510) 287-1365.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

WILLIAM R. KIRKPATRICK
Manager of Water Distribution Planning

WRK:GAA:sb
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May 12, 2003

Janice Stern, Senior Planner
Community Development Department
P.O. Box 8039
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Ms. Stern:

Re: Update of the Walnut Creek General Plan

This letter is to formally notify the City of Walnut Creek (City) that East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) has specific interests regarding the proposed Update of the Walnut Creek General Plan.

The General Plan Update should also include a specific land use designation that recognizes EBMUD facilities in the City. EBMUD suggests that a Utility Land-Use designation be applied to the locations with EBMUD facilities, and that utility uses allowed under the new designation include water storage, treatment and transmission facilities, as well as, related maintenance facilities.

The General Plan Update should reflect the fact that EBMUD has several major water treatment, storage and transmission facilities in the City. The Plan Update should list these facilities and identify their respective locations. Per your request, a map showing the location of EBMUD facilities within the City limits is enclosed for your use; more exact property boundaries can be provided if you desire.

Please keep EBMUD informed of the progress of the Update and specifically of any proposed public meetings that are scheduled during the preparation, review and approval process for the Plan Update. If you have questions, or if EBMUD can be of further assistance, please contact Harvey P. Hanoian, Senior Civil Engineer, at (510) 287-1064.

Sincerely

WILLIAM R. KIRKPATRICK
Manager of Water Distribution Planning

WRK: GAA:sb
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Facilities Inside Walnut Creek City Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Facility Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookwood Pumping Plant</td>
<td>1480 Pleasant Hill Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Hill Pumping Plant</td>
<td>R/W E/o Rockview Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Pumping Plant</td>
<td>4022 Walnut Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Reservoir</td>
<td>Access Rd R/W - 1000' E/o Woodbury Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Pumping Plant</td>
<td>Terra Granada Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkey Pumping Plant</td>
<td>2201 Larkey Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkey Reservoir</td>
<td>2201 Larkey Ln Walnut Creek C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir Reservoir</td>
<td>E/o La Casa Via</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Hill Reservoir</td>
<td>1480 Pleasant Hill Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Reservoir</td>
<td>End of Rockview Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek Clearwell</td>
<td>Walnut Creek C 2201 Larkey Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>2201 Larkey Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Area Service Center</td>
<td>2551 N. Main St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek No. 1 &amp; 2 Raw Water Pum</td>
<td>1841 Geary Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek No. 3 Raw Water Pump</td>
<td>2841 Buena Vista Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities Outside Walnut Creek City Limits, but in Planning Area (Walnut Creek General Plan, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Facility Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crest Pumping Plant</td>
<td>Opp 167 Castle Crest Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Reservoir</td>
<td>225 Sydney Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville No. 1 &amp; 2 Pumping Plants</td>
<td>400' W/o 2055 Danville Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Mutual Pumping Plant (Press Sys)</td>
<td>225 Sydney Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Mutual Reservoir</td>
<td>225 Sydney Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Reservoir</td>
<td>2700 off Dorchester Lane, between Stonegate Drive and Barrington Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir Pumping Plant</td>
<td>324 La Casa Via at Arbor Via</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LETTER 4

4-1: This comment refers to the General Plan Update, which has been amended to reflect it. No change to the EIR is necessary.

4-2: It is noted that individual projects within the Plan Area may require a Water Supply Assessment. No change in text is necessary.

4-3: The references to the Water Conservation policies and actions of the General Plan Update 2025 found in the EIR on page 137 should refer to Goal 27 and action items 27.1.1 through 27.2.4. This text has been changed.

4-4: This comment requests that the water conservation guidelines be more consistent with the State ordinance and recommendations listed. This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

4-5: This comment asks the City for the opportunity to meet and discuss water conservation programs. No response is required.

4-6: Comment noted. No response is required.

4-7: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

4-8: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

4-9: The text noted has been added to page 140. This does not alter any conclusions.
September 6, 2005

Ms. Victoria Walker, Senior Planner
City of Walnut Creek
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Ms. Walker,

This letter responds to the Notice of Completion for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) on the General Plan Update.

The findings within the Draft EIR state that the significant impacts associated with regional and local street networks within the Planning Area from the preferred project, the General Plan 2025 buildout, will be evaluated and mitigated. It is our understanding that the findings do not mitigate all of the Project's impacts on the Traffic Service Objectives as established in the Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance. Based on our interpretation of the Draft EIR, the project is not in full compliance with the Action Plan as required by the Measure C Growth Management Program. While the mitigations do state that the project adversely affects the ability of the city to meet the Traffic Service Objectives (TSOs) the findings do not identify any actions within the project that would be implemented to allow the project to meet the TSOs. Please verify that our understanding of these findings is correct.

Should our interpretation be determined to be correct perhaps the EIR should propose that the city request its Regional Transportation Planning Committee, TRANSPAC, to amend the Action Plan. This amendment could involve revising the impacted TSOs to a level that would accommodate the Project. If agreed to by TRANSPAC, the amended TSOs would allow the city to approve the General Plan Update without violating the Measure C Growth Management Program. Amending the Action Plan is similar to the concept of mitigation measure TRAF-5, where the Draft EIR suggests revising the City's level-of-service standards and implementing certain additional actions to reduce traffic impacts at downtown intersections to a less-than-significant level. The process established by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority for updating General Plans in a manner consistent with the Measure C Growth Management Program is more fully described in their Resolution 95-06-G.

The County appreciates the opportunity to respond to this notice and comment on the Draft EIR.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Hillary Heard, Senior Planner
Transportation Planning Division

cc: S. Goetz, CDD

G:\Transportation\Hillary\Letters\Draft\WC_DEIR_letter.doc

Office Hours Monday - Friday: 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Office is closed the 1st, 3rd & 5th Fridays of each month
LETTER 5
Hillary Heard, Senior Planner, Transportation Planning Division. Contra Costa County, Community Development Department. September 6, 2005.

5-1: This commentor is correct that the proposed mitigation measures would not mitigate all of the impacts of the General Plan 2025 Buildout when evaluated based on the Traffic Service Objectives (TSOs) as established in the Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance. While Mitigation Measure TRAF-3 on page 129 does say that the City will continue working with other agencies and jurisdictions to implement regional solutions, and suggests metering traffic on Treat Boulevard, the lack of specific improvements or actions due in part to the need for regional coordination to address regional congestion result in a finding of significant and unavoidable. However, it should be noted that the delay index, which is the TSO for regional arterials, for the General Plan 2025 Buildout are based on forecasts from the CCTA model, which does not account for the metering on Oak Grove or the operations of signals.

5-2: Since the mitigation measures would not mitigate all of the impacts of the General Plan 2025 Buildout, in part due to the fact that growth in Walnut Creek represents only a small portion of the regional growth, an additional mitigation measure is that the City requests that TRANSPAC amend the Action Plan to revise the impacted TSOs so that the City could approve the General Plan Update without violating Measure C. This comment was noted and an additional mitigation measure was added to the EIR.
September 15, 2005

Victoria Walker
City of Walnut Creek
P.O. Box 8039
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Ms. Walker:

We have reviewed the City’s Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan 2025. Our comments remain the same as those found in our letter of August 26, 2005, (see enclosed copy) regarding the Public Review Draft General Plan 2025.

We appreciate the opportunity to review documents involving drainage matters and welcome continued coordination. If you have any questions, you may reach me at (925) 313-2304 or Tim Jensen at (925) 313-2396.

Very truly yours,

Tim Jensen
Civil Engineer
Flood Control Engineering

WC:ew
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c: G. Connaughton, Flood Control
    B. Farone, Flood Control
    T. Jensen, Flood Control
We have reviewed the City's Public Review Draft General Plan 2025 and submit the following comments for your consideration.

1. It appears that the land use designations for some areas within the City are changing. We recommend that the City condition new development in these areas to design and construct storm drain facilities to adequately collect and convey storm water entering or originating within the development to the nearest adequate man-made drainage facility or natural watercourse, without diversion of the watershed, per Title 9 of the County Ordinance Code. The adequacy of the downstream storm drain system should be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City, as well as the District where appropriate, on a case-by-case basis. This is especially important in areas of the City where the designated land-use is becoming denser.  

2. With regard to Goal 2 of Chapter 6 (Safety and Noise), we recommend that the City “prevent increased flood hazards in flood prone areas” by continuing to adhere to creek structure setback requirements in accordance with Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code. 

3. We recommend that the City continue to partner with regional, local, state, and federal agencies in seeking flooding solutions.

We appreciate the opportunity to review plans involving drainage matters and welcome continued coordination. If you have any questions, you may reach me at (925) 313-2304 or Tim Jensen at (925) 313-2396.

Very truly yours,

Wes Cooley
Civil Engineer
Flood Control Engineering
LETTER 6

Wes Cooley, Civil Engineer, Flood Control Engineering, Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. September 15, 2005.

6-1: This comment recommends that the City condition new development in areas where General Plan land use designations are changing such that the proposed development includes the design and construction of adequate storm drainage facilities to prevent direct diversion into the watershed. Pursuant to Goal 30 in the General Plan (Chapter 4, Built Environment), the City is committed to abiding by the C-3 standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Moreover, the City is largely built out and areas with changes in General Plan land use designation are relatively small. Each area with changes in General Plan land use designation will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis regarding the design and construction of adequate storm drainage facilities.

6-2: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

6-3: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.
September 30, 2005

Ms. Victoria Walker, Assistant Planning Manager
City of Walnut Creek
P.O. Box 8039
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Ms. Walker:

COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF WALNUT CREEK GENERAL PLAN 2025 UPDATE
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update. As the wastewater utility service provider to Walnut Creek, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (CCCSD) offers the following comments:

1. **Page 138, Paragraph 2.** CCCSD does not use pumping stations to serve Walnut Creek.  
2. **Page 138, Paragraph 4.** No seismic protection projects are planned at the WWTP in the next 10 years.  
3. **Page 138, Paragraph 7.** The holding pond capacity at the WWTP is 140 million gallons.  
4. **Page 138, Paragraph 9.** In 2000, the average dry weather flow of 40.8 mgd represented 91 percent of the then-permitted discharge level of 45 mgd. In 2004, the average dry weather flow was 39.9 mgd, which is 74 percent of the 53.8 mgd permitted discharge level approved for CCCSD in 2002.  
5. **Page 140, Paragraph 2.** The WWTP ultraviolet (UV) disinfection system was not a recent improvement - it commenced operation in 1996. While at the time CCCSD may have been the largest wastewater plant in the nation using the UV process, this is no longer the case.  
6. **Page 140, Paragraph 3.** Several of the ongoing and future improvement projects listed have been completed, including the San Ramon pumping station renovations, Lafayette renovation project Phase 4, Walnut Creek Renovation Project Phase 1 (CCCSD will soon be starting Phase 4), and the North Main Street sewer replacement.  
7. **Page 140, Paragraph 7.** The third Standard of Significance should read that the General Plan would create a significant wastewater impact if it would result in a determination by the wastewater service provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.
8. Page 141, Paragraphs 1, 2 and 6; Page 263, Paragraph 3. In 2002, to accommodate buildup of the land use plans of CCCSD's service area jurisdictions as of the year 2000, CCCSD's wastewater treatment plant's effluent discharge limit was increased from 45 to 53.8 million gallons per day (mgd) of average dry-weather flow (ADWF) with worst-case groundwater infiltration conditions. Buildout of that growth was expected to occur by the year 2035.

The proposed General Plan would allow more development than envisioned by the current General Plan. Buildout of development under the proposed General Plan would boost the ADWF from the City of Walnut Creek by about 0.4 mgd beyond that which would be generated by the level of development allowed in the approved General Plan. This additional flow represents a five percent increase over CCCSD's assumed ADWF from the Walnut Creek's year 2000 planned growth.

The proposed increase in wastewater flow beyond that expected from current planned growth would have potentially significant, direct, and cumulative adverse impacts on CCCSD's treatment plant processing capacity and effluent discharge limit.

The additional development in the proposed General Plan was not planned in the year 2000, so the additional wastewater flow from that development was not included in the 53.8 mgd limit. As such, the additional development could cause wastewater treatment demand to increase such that the permitted effluent discharge limit could be reached sooner than the year 2035.

Since sewer connections are issued on a first-come, first-served basis, there may be room under the discharge limit at the time this additional development occurs. If all other wastewater flow projections used in the most recent discharge limit increase are realized, however, the discharge limit would be reached sooner than 2035. Under worst-case groundwater conditions and taking into consideration development increases being considered in the General Plan updates of this and other service area jurisdictions, the 53.8 mgd ADWF discharge limit could be reached as early as the year 2020. The worst-case groundwater conditions are not likely to be consistently sustained for a continuous number of years, but CCCSD is required to stay below its effluent discharge limit.

If the effluent discharge limit is reached (or approached) substantially earlier than 2035, CCCSD's ability to provide wastewater treatment service to yet-to-be developed projects already allowed in local General Plans (planned pre-2000), let alone the additional growth many jurisdictions are adding, could necessitate obtaining another discharge limit increase. Such an increase would require a discretionary approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). CCCSD also may need to expand its solids handling facilities and possibly the primary treatment facilities to accommodate the additional development.

If the subsequent effluent discharge limit increase were not granted by the RWQCB, a sewer connection moratorium would be triggered. A sewer moratorium would pose a barrier to growth. This barrier would be inconsistent with the adopted General Plans of service area jurisdictions. The moratorium, however, would delay or substantially reduce growth-induced
impacts associated with the projected level of growth. In response to an indefinite sewer moratorium, it is possible that developers would seek alternative wastewater services (on-site package treatment plants, community septic systems, other wastewater agencies) to meet the needs of their projects.

If the quantity of biosolids produced exceeds the amount permitted by the BAAQMD to be processed in CCCSD’s incinerator, CCCSD could divert some biosolids to a landfill or use some other disposal option in lieu of incineration. Additional biosolids handling facilities may need to be constructed at the treatment plant to accomplish this.

Conversely, there could still be sufficient wastewater treatment and effluent disposal capacity with the additional development allowed under the proposed Walnut Creek General Plan if future wastewater flows are reduced due to 1) planned growth in other jurisdictions not building out as densely as planned, 2) more effective water conservation, and/or 3) if CCCSD’s worst-case assumption of groundwater infiltration does not occur to the extent envisioned.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at 925-229-7255.

Sincerely,

Russell B. Leavitt, AICP
Engineering Assistant III

RBL/mvp

cc:    G. Chesler, CCCSD
       A. Farrell, CCCSD
       C. Swanson, CCCSD
LETTER 7
Russell Leavitt, Engineering Assistant III.
Central Contra Costa County Sanitary District.
September 30, 2005.

7-1: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

7-2: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

7-3: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

7-4: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

7-5: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

7-6: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

7-7: The text noted has been changed. This does not alter any conclusions.

7-8: This comment states that buildout of the proposed General Plan Update 2025 would boost the ADWF by about 0.4 mgd beyond what would have been allowed under the current General Plan, an increase of five percent over CCCSD’s assumed ADWF from the current General Plan, and that increase would cause the permitted discharge limit to be reached more quickly than anticipated (by approximately 2020 rather than 2035). It also states that there could be sufficient treatment capacity under the proposed plan if future flows are reduced because of other jurisdictions not building out as densely as planned, more effective water conservation, or if worst-case assumptions of groundwater infiltration do not occur.

The Draft EIR, on page 141, notes that the proposed General Plan includes policies on water conservation. It is also applicable to note that the horizon of the General Plan is 2020. In addition, since the commentor notes that there actually could be sufficient treatment capacity, no change would be necessary to the General Plan or EIR. The City anticipates working closely with CCCSD to address future large development projects in light of the overall capacity issues of the system.
CITY OF WALNUT CREEK, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
1666 North Main Street, P.O. Box 8039, Walnut Creek, CA 94596

PROJECT REFERRAL

State Clearinghouse No. 2004022042 Date: August 8, 2005

Project Type(s): General Plan 2025 Update – Draft EIR

NAME OF PROJECT: General Plan 2025 Update – Draft Environmental Impact Report

LOCATION: City of Walnut Creek – Planning Area

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: This DEIR analyzes the potential impacts of the General Plan 2025 Update.
The draft General Plan 2025, which updates all required elements except the Housing Element (HCD certified in 2003) was sent to most public agencies for review in June 2005. The public review period for the Draft Environmental Impact report is August 5 - September 19, 2005. The Notice of Completion is attached as well.

Please return your comments no later than September 19, 2005.

To: Victoria Walker, Assistant Planning Manager
City of Walnut Creek
P.O. Box 8039
Walnut Creek, CA. 94596

If you have questions or comments please contact me at (925) 943-5829, or walker@walnut-creek.org. or by fax (925) 256-3500.

COMMENTS: □ There are no aspects of this project that concern our regulations
□ The project as shown meets or exceeds our minimum standard regulations.
□ Comments or recommended conditions will be made at a later phase of approval.
□ Comments or recommended conditions are attached.
□ Comments or recommended condition as follows: ________________________________

By: [Signature]
Name [Signature]
Agency
Date: 10/4/05

LOCATION: 925 930 5592
RX TIME 10/05 '05 15:46
LETTER 8

8-1: The commentor states that comments or recommended conditions will be made a later state of approval. No response is required.
September 26, 2005

Victoria Walker  
Planning Department  
City Hall  
Walnut Creek, Ca  94596

Re: EIR, Draft General Plan

Dear Victoria:

From the Historical Society’s perspective the EIR is defective because while it suggests City’s desire is to preserve historical values in Walnut Creek the evidence seems otherwise:

1. Veterans Hall, a historic icon identified on EIR, page 166, as # 18, is set to be demolished by the very city government that owns it?  

2. Despite a direction in City’s General Plan of 1989, and requests from a Society officer that City enact an historic preservation ordinance, it hasn’t.  

3. City has adopted the more restrictive concepts and language of Draft Plan, Chapter 4, Goal 16, p. 4 - 26 in place of 1989 Plan 2 - 52. et al., apparently in the absence of public hearing.  

4. No citizens whose sole loyalty was to their neighbors and the city - at- large were appointed to the Mt. Diablo Blvd./Locust St. Precise Plan Committee, created by Council to advise on the future development of a part of the district.  

5. At a recent meeting of Planning Commission to review Change Area # 1, Staff Presented Commissioners with a map which suggested they might want to gerrymander the area in such a way as to run a line between what may become Old and New Walnut Creek ---- right down the middle of a part of Locust St.  

6. At none of the myriad General Plan meetings called and controlled by City, so far as known to Society and its representative, was the extent of its authority to reduce building heights through use of its zoning power explained to its citizens.

We wish to recognize City’s willingness to meet with us on the afternoon of Wednesday, September 28, to discuss these objections and other matters. Unfortunately, our representative is leaving for the East early the following morning and City has ruled that all responses to the EIR must be filed no later than 5:00 p. m., September 31.

Sincerely,

Gary Ginder

Gary Ginder
LETTER 9
Gary Ginder, Walnut Creek Historical Society.
September 26, 2005.

9-1: The Veteran’s Memorial Building was evaluated for architectural or historical significance in a Historic Architectural Evaluation completed by Ward Hill, Architectural Historian on March 21, 2003. The Evaluation determined that the building and or site does not retain sufficient historical integrity from the period of primary significance and does not qualify for the California Register of Historic Resources. If this building or site were to be redeveloped/demolished in the future, it would not be a significant environmental impact under the California Environmental Quality Act.

The General Plan Update contains policies that establish a system for evaluating potentially significant historic sites and buildings. This EIR considers whether the policies of the General Plan protect historic resources in general, not whether every potentially historic building is preserved at the end of the evaluation process. The determination of environmental significance of the Veteran’s Hall does not change the adequacy of the General Plan policies or the EIR analysis.

9-2: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required. The City has begun a process to develop a Historic Preservation Ordinance.

9-3: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

9-4: The development of part of the Mt. Diablo Blvd/Locust St. Precise Plan area is not the subject of this EIR, therefore no response is required.

9-5: During preparation of the draft General Plan 2025, the Planning Commission considered a number of potential land use regulation changes for the study area known as Land Use Change Area #1 (Traditional Downtown). No land use regulation changes were recommended for this area, and it was not carried forward as a land use change area into the General Plan. The boundaries of the Traditional Downtown area are shown in the General Plan Update. This does not impact the adequacy of this EIR, and therefore, no response is required.

9-6: Whether or not the use of zoning power to mandate building heights was explained at one of the General Plan Update meetings does not impact the adequacy of the EIR, and therefore no response is required.
Woodlands Association

September 30, 2005

Victoria Walker
Assistant Planning Manager
City of Walnut Creek
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Re: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report for General Plan 2005

Dear Ms. Walker,

The Woodlands Association has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on the City of Walnut Creek General Plan 2005 (General Plan) and provides the following observations and comments.

1. The DEIR provides an assessment of the potential environmental consequences of adopting the General Plan that was published on June 3, 2005. The General Plan describes planned changes to land uses in several designated sections of Walnut Creek. The proposed land use changes under consideration include the addition of 8,115 new housing units in the city’s sphere of influence, including 5,342 new housing units within the existing city limits. Implementation of the proposed action would allow Walnut Creek to meet its fair share of housing goals established by the Association of Bay Area Governments through 2025. Approval of projects that exceed these goals would represent actions that are not covered by this tier one DEIR and would require additional environmental review.

2. The DEIR describes land use and other policy changes intended to “encourage the development of Shadelands Business Park (SBP) as a thriving business and employment center (Goal 5)”. The Woodlands Association has long held the view that land use policies related to SBP should focus on maintaining and strengthening the viability of the park for business purposes and should not include commercial or residential land uses that would compete with or dilute the viability of the business park. During initial phases of developing the General Plan, several ideas regarding land use changes in SBP, including the introduction of live-work or other residential units were suggested to the steering committee. Members of the Woodlands Association and others expressed concerns regarding potential conflicts associated with residential uses in SBP and strongly encouraged the steering committee to drop the idea from further consideration. We were pleased with the Council decision to not consider residential uses in SBP of any type in the General Plan EIR.

The Woodlands Association represents nearly 900 homes in the Woodlands neighborhood of Walnut Creek, California
3. The Draft EIR describes anticipated impacts to resource areas required by CEQA that would result from the collective implementation of all policies described in the General Plan. Impacts described in the Draft EIR are based on a specific number and distribution of the total number of possible new housing units throughout the City, as summarized in Table 2 of the DEIR. On this basis, the final EIR, when adopted, will provide environmental compliance and mitigation commitments for implementing the stated housing element, although as noted in the DEIR, second tier project-specific environmental compliance would still be needed when projects are implemented. Implementation of projects that are not consistent with the housing element, including potential housing in the SBP, would clearly not be consistent with the EIR and would require significant environmental review.

4. The Woodlands Association asserts that the Final EIR would not provide adequate CEQA compliance for future consideration of housing units in the SBP because housing in the SBP was explicitly excluded from the General Plan and the EIR. Given that the General Plan housing element was developed to meet regional requirements and that specific housing distributions were identified, it would appear that future consideration for adding housing to the SBP would only be possible under one of two potential scenarios. In one scenario, the City could choose to increase the total number of new housing units above the limits described in the General Plan, which forms the basis for environmental compliance and mitigation commitments described in the DEIR. Alternatively, the City could choose to modify the City-wide distribution of new housing units by introducing housing to the SBP. In either case, such an action would require reconsideration of the city-wide housing element and thereby triggering a requirement to revise the General Plan and prepare an updated EIR. Any approach to accomplish introduction of housing to the SBP that does not include such a thorough review would clearly be inconsistent with the EIR.

5. Traffic impacts resulting from the proposed action would result in degrading the level of service at several key intersections of importance to Woodlands residents. Mitigation Measure TRAF-4 states: “At Oak Grove and Mitchell Drive / Peachwillow Lane, a separate east-bound left-turn lane would improve the LOS to E (0.93), which would be below the LOS standard and considered a significant impact.” This statement does convey a commitment to mitigate an impact that would result from implementation of the proposed action to a level of less than significant and should be clarified before the EIR is finalized.

Sincerely,
Woodlands Association

[Signature]
James P. Tilley
President

The Woodlands Association represents nearly 900 homes in the Woodlands neighborhood of Walnut Creek, California
LETTER 10

10-1: This comment says that approval of projects that cause exceedance of the 8,115 new housing units in the SOI considered by this EIR would require additional environmental review. Comment noted. No response is required.

10-2: The commentor is pleased with the Council decision to not consider residential uses in the Shadelands Business Park. Comment noted. No response is required.

10-3: This comment points out that implementation of projects not consistent with the Housing Element would not be consistent with the EIR and would require environmental review. This is correct. Comment noted. No response is required.

10-4: This comment says that any consideration of adding housing to Shadelands should trigger reconsideration of the Housing Element and the General Plan EIR. Since adding housing to Shadelands is not part of the General Plan being considered in this EIR, no response is required.

10-5: The commentor states that the use of a mitigation measure that lessens an impact may convey that the impact has been reduced to less-than-significant levels. However, both the impact statement and mitigation measure in question, TRAF-4, state clearly that the opportunities to improve these intersections is limited. A portion of the mitigation measure, a separate eastbound left-turn lane at Oak Grove Rd. and Mitchell Drive / Peachwillow Ln., was constructed and completed in 2005. However, the impact remains significant because the LOS of the intersections is below the current standard. No change is required.
September 8, 2005

Victoria Walker
Assistant Planning Manager
City of Walnut Creek
City Hall, 1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Victoria –

I am writing to point out a couple of problems with the draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2025 General Plan that should be addressed before a final Report is issued.

1. The analysis leading to the designation of Growth Management Alternative I as the “Environmentally Superior Alternative” is clearly flawed. This conclusion is not borne out by a review of the data and analysis presented in the report.

2. The EIR does not consider a reasonable range of alternatives that could potentially reduce significant environmental impacts in the areas of traffic, noise, and air quality impacts. The determination of a true “Environmentally Superior Alternative” cannot be made because the range of alternatives is too limited. Alternatives with lower rates of commercial growth and residential caps should have been considered.

**Determination of an “Environmentally Superior Alternative”**

The draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2025 General Plan identifies Growth Management Alternative I as the “Environmentally Superior Alternative”. While some City officials may prefer Growth Management Alternative I for reasons beyond the scope of this EIR, any objective analysis of this document can only lead to the conclusion that Growth Management Alternative II would result in fewer environmental impacts. Alternative II is the Environmentally Superior choice among the alternatives presented.

Table 57 presents thirteen “Impact Factors” and ranks each alternative (relative to unregulated growth) as “Substantial Improvement”, “Insubstantial Improvement”, “Same Impact”, “Insubstantial Deterioration” and “Substantial Deterioration”. When, for example, Alternative I provides a “Substantial Improvement” over unregulated growth and Alternative II provides a “Substantial Improvement” over unregulated growth, the two alternatives are considered equal. The designation of an “Environmentally Superior Alternative” is based on the alternative that has best overall ranking in Table 57.

There are two major flaws in this approach to evaluating the alternatives:

1. The categorization of differences as “Same”, “Insubstantial”, or “Substantial” is purely subjective. As it turns out, the report’s finding hinges on what is termed a “substantial” deterioration in environmental outcomes, which, in fact, results in no significant environmental impact.
2. Just because two alternatives are assigned the same subjective ranking relative to unregulated growth does not mean that the alternatives have identical impacts. A comparison of Growth Management Alternative I with Growth Management Alternative II using the impact analysis presented in Chapters 4.1 through 4.13 reveals that there are clear qualitative and quantitative differences between the Alternatives in a number of areas. The author fails to consider these differences.

Commercial development would be more stringently metered in Alternative II. The potential commercial build out under Alternative II would be less than under Alternative I. Under build out conditions, Alternative II would produce fewer jobs than Alternative I. Both Alternatives would result in the same number of new residences. Based on these differences between the Alternatives, the following is a head-to-head comparison of the two Growth Management options using the impact factors identified in the EIR:

**Land Use and Agriculture**

- The EIR contends that growth limits could result in less “efficient” use of the Change Areas. (Growth limits may result in some parcels not building out to their maximum allowed land use within the 20-year period.) Alternative I, with less stringent growth limits, would result in better “land utilization” and thus would have a lower “environmental impact” than Alternative II. The Alternative II impact analysis (p.274) notes that Alternative II would not physically divide established communities, or result in any unmitigated land use conflicts – the standards identified in Chapter 4.1 to define a “significant” environmental impact. Nevertheless, the report classifies the difference between the unregulated General Plan and Alternative II as “substantial”. Thus, we have a “substantial” deterioration that, oddly enough, causes no “significant” environmental impacts. The report’s designation of an “Environmentally Superior Alternative” hinges on this subjective classification, while ignoring clear differences between the Alternatives in other areas, as noted below.

**Population, Employment & Housing**

- The EIR notes that Walnut Creek is “jobs rich” and that limitations on the amount of new employment-generating uses would be a positive impact (p.61). The ratio is currently 1:1.49 (as of 2002). Both Alternatives will add 5,342 housing units, or approximately 6,633 new employed residents (based on the 2002 ratio of employed residents to households). If NO jobs were added at all, the employed residents to jobs ratio would still be projected at 1:1.27. Alternative II, which results in fewer jobs being created would bring us closer to the desired 1:1 ratio than Alternative I. No significant impacts, requiring mitigation, are identified in Chapter 4.2 of the report.

---

1 As an analogy, consider the following: I recently had to go to Philadelphia on business. I would classify the distance from Philadelphia to Walnut Creek as “substantial”. I would also classify the distance from Philadelphia to Orinda as “substantial”. That doesn’t mean that if I take a taxi home from the airport on my return to the Bay Area, it makes no difference whether the cab drops me off in Orinda or Walnut Creek. In fact, it makes a big difference.
Community Services

- The lower commercial build out under Alternative II would theoretically result in less demand for services related to commercial development, thus Alternative II would result in a lower impact than Alternative I. For Community Services, no significant impacts, requiring mitigation, are listed in Chapter 4.3 of the report.

Transportation

- This is the first chapter of the report where significant environmental impacts, requiring mitigation, are cited. A clear, quantifiable difference between growth management alternatives is apparent from examining the tabular data presented in Chapter 4.4 of the EIR. Alternative II would result in a lower environmental impact than Alternative I.
  
  ➢ In Table 26, Growth Management Alternative II results in a lower daily traffic volume than Growth Management Alternative I at 16 of the 31 locations evaluated. Alternative I creates less traffic than Alternative II at only 11 locations.
  
  ➢ In Table 28, Growth Management Alternative II results in lower AM Peak Hour vehicle-to-capacity ratios at 16 of the 29 intersections evaluated. Alternative I creates less AM Peak Hour congestion at only 9 intersections.
  
  ➢ In Table 29, Growth Management Alternative II results in lower PM Peak Hour vehicle-to-capacity ratios at 19 of the 29 intersections evaluated. Alternative I creates less PM Peak Hour congestion at only 3 intersections.

Infrastructure

- The lower commercial build out under Alternative II would theoretically result in lower water demand, wastewater production, and commercial waste, thus Alternative II would result in a lower impact than Alternative I. However, no significant environmental impacts, requiring mitigation, are listed in Chapter 4.5 of the report.

Visual Quality

- The EIR does not cite any differences between the two growth management alternatives in terms of visual quality and no significant impacts, requiring mitigation, are listed in Chapter 4.6 of the report.

Cultural Resources

- The EIR does not cite any differences between the two growth management alternatives in terms of cultural resources and no significant Cultural Resource impacts, requiring mitigation, are listed in Chapter 4.7 of the report.

Geologic & Seismic Hazards

- The EIR does not cite any differences between the two growth management alternatives in terms of geologic & seismic hazards, and no significant impacts, requiring mitigation, are listed in Chapter 4.8 of the report.
Hazardous Materials

- The smaller employee population under Alternative II would have the potential of exposing fewer people to risks associated with hazardous materials use, storage and transport. The EIR notes, however, that the implementation of "existing federal, State and local regulations pertaining to safe use, storage, disposal and transportation of hazardous materials" should ensure that any impacts are less than significant.

Hydrology & Flooding

- The EIR does not cite any differences between the two growth management alternatives in terms of hydrology & flooding, and no significant impacts, requiring mitigation, are listed in Chapter 4.10 of the report.

Biological Resources

- The EIR does not cite any differences between the two growth management alternatives in terms of biological resources, and no significant Biological Resource environmental impacts, requiring mitigation, are listed in Chapter 4.11 of the report.

Air Quality

- Chapter 4.12 of the EIR states that because of the increased rate of VMT (vehicle miles traveled - i.e. "out-of-towners driving through the city), there will be significant and unavoidable environmental impacts in terms of air quality no matter which of the two growth management policies is adopted. Alternative II will contribute less to the problem, for the reasons cited below.
  ➢ Alternative II results in lower daily traffic volumes, thus lower VMT.
  ➢ To the extent the Growth Limitation policies restrict development, there will be less potential for construction dust emissions.

Noise

- Noise is the third area where significant environmental impacts are cited. Table 55 shows no quantifiable differences between the Alternatives, in terms of the average projected day/night level of noise at 31 target roadway segments. There will, however, be less projected traffic under Alternative II, and less potential construction - two of the major sources of noise cited in the Chapter 4.13 of the report.

Summary of the Head-to-Head Analysis

- In seven of the thirteen areas evaluated, (Population, Employment & Housing, Community Services, Transportation, Infrastructure, Hazardous Materials, Air Quality, and Noise), Growth Management Alternative II would create less of an environmental impact than Alternative I based on the contributing factors identified in the EIR.
Growth Management Alternative I has a lower impact than Growth Management Alternative II in only one of thirteen impact areas (Land Use & Agriculture), a category where no significant environmental impacts are cited in the report.

Significant environmental impacts are cited in three of the thirteen areas of study (Traffic, Air Quality, and Noise). These are the areas where planning decisions have a direct and significant impact on quality of life. In terms of Traffic, Growth Management Alternative II has a clear and quantifiable advantage over Growth Management Alternative I. In the other two areas of significant environmental impact, Growth Management Alternative II could be considered more desirable since it lessens the prime factors (traffic and construction) contributing to the impacts, even though that difference may not be quantifiable.

Based on this head-to-head analysis, the only objective conclusion that can be reached is that Growth Management Alternative II would result in less severe environmental impacts than Growth Management Alternative I. Growth Management Alternative II is the “Environmentally Superior Alternative” of the two options analyzed.

A Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Since the more restrictive of the two growth management alternatives analyzed results in fewer environmental impacts, it is natural to question whether even tighter limits on the rate of growth might produce an even better outcome. Unfortunately, the draft EIR doesn’t answer this question for us, nor does it include an explanation why more restrictive alternatives were not considered.

Per the CEQA provisions listed on the State of California CERES website:

The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination.

In this case, no limits on residential growth were considered, even though the EIR analysis notes (p. 6) that the proposals are not consistent with the BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance that population not exceed ABAG projections. This contributes to a significant air quality impact. The EIR does not investigate whether metering residential growth could lessen this impact.
The only Commercial Growth Management options considered project higher growth levels than have been actually been experienced for the past 12 years. As shown in the previous analysis, commercial development leads to traffic, noise and air quality impacts. It is reasonable to consider whether lowering the commercial caps could further mitigate some of these significant environmental impacts – but the EIR provides no information on this.

The City has previously indicated that more restrictive growth measures would be considered in planning analyses, but they haven’t followed through. During Community Conversations, citizen participants had asked for the elimination of roll-overs from one development cycle to the next, a lower commercial cap, and for downtown development to be stopped for a while. The staff response published in the Community Conversations report of September 19-20, 2001 notes:

_Your suggestions will be incorporated into growth development scenarios that will be reviewed by the public, commissions and eventually to be approved by the City Council. These scenarios will be considered along with other scenarios that do not include restrictions. Having a variety of growth management scenarios will certainly provide a comprehensive view that will in turn contribute to informed decisions._

While a Community Conversations Staff Report is certainly not legally binding, it does indicate that it is reasonable to consider more restrictive growth options along with the growth inducing options analyzed in the draft EIR. For the EIR to be complete, it should have analyzed alternatives with residential caps (at least down to the ABAG level), and lower commercial caps than Alternative II (at least down to the historic rate of commercial growth). Such an analysis may uncover an even more “Environmentally Superior” option.

If more restrictive growth management options have been rejected as “infeasible”, then it seems that an explanation is in order, and should be included in Chapter 5.

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]

Tom O'Brien
1981 Shuey Avenue
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

---

2 The Alternative II cap of 75,000 sqft per year is the same as our current policy, but Sandy Meyer noted at a recent City Council meeting that the average actual rate of development has only been about 60,000 sqft per year. Alternative II assumes that the full 75,000 sqft will be developed each year – a 25% increase in the rate growth.
LETTER 11
Tom O’Brien. 1981 Shuey Avenue, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. September 8, 2005.

11-1: The commenter is stating an opinion, which is discussed in subsequent comments, and no response is required.

11-2: The 2005 CEQA Guidelines states: “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.” (2005 California Environmental Quality/Act CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(f))

In developing the project alternatives, the City determined that evaluating growth management caps, similar to the one currently in effect, would provide a reasoned choice in comparing project alternatives, since buildout under Growth Management Alternatives I or II, would result in a 72 percent or 83 percent reduction in commercial development when compared to that allowed in the project (General Plan 2025). Furthermore, as shown on Table 57 of the DEIR, the growth management alternatives result in a substantial improvement over the project in transportation impacts. The City further determined that implementation of the General Plan objectives could be attained under either of the growth management alternatives, but that capping residential development would inhibit implementation of encouraging housing and commercial mixed-use development in selected locations.

11-3: Comment noted. No response required.

11-4: The evaluation of alternatives in Chapter 5 is based on a comparison of the potential impacts of the project with each alternative, as specified in the CEQA Guidelines (2005 California Environmental Quality/Act CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(d)). In this comparison, improvements are found in the areas of Population, Employment and Housing, Community Services, Transportation, and Infrastructure. A substantial deterioration is found when comparing the potential impacts of Growth Management II with the project in the area of Land Use and Agriculture, which is the reason that Growth Management Alternative I was found to be the environmentally superior alternative. The commenter provides a comparison of the two alternatives (Growth Management Alternative I and II) with each other, which is not the intent of the alternatives evaluation.

11-5: The rational for not placing a cap on residential development can be found on Page 4-11 of the Draft General Plan, which states: “The growth management policies do not restrict the rate or amount of residential development. The generally built-out character of the city’s residential areas, particularly in the lower density single-family districts on the city’s perimeter, limit housing development more severely than would a continuation of the previous controls.” Therefore, the City determined that residential caps did not need to be considered in the growth management alternatives.

Therefore, the General Plan does not include a policy placing a cap on new residential development and it was not considered in the growth management alternatives.

11-6: Comment noted. No response required.
September 25, 2005

Dear Members of the Walnut Creek City Council,

This letter is in response to the City Council’s request that comments regarding the EIR be submitted in writing. At the September 20th meeting I shared three concerns I have with the EIR: General Plan 2025’s impact on crime in Walnut Creek, its impact on school funding, and my objection to some development proposals being left out of the plan. All three are listed below along with a bit of research I did following the meeting.

While drafting this letter, I read a very informative article in October 2005’s San Francisco magazine entitled “Where Have All the Children Gone?” Author Leslie Crawford compares one hundred six incorporated communities with populations under one hundred thousand to one city, San Francisco. She produced four lists ranking these Bay Area towns in terms of percentage of children per household, home prices, school performance, and safety. At the article’s end, ten towns were selected as the Bay Area’s best for raising children. Walnut Creek was not among the ten. Should this EIR be accepted and the General Plan be approved as is written, undoubtedly Walnut Creek will become even less of a destination for families. I truly hope that is not what our elected officials wish for the future of our fine community.

Studying Crawford’s four ranking lists and the top ten was a sobering experience. The selected top communities, four of which have populations comparable to our own, have glaring differences that separate them from Walnut Creek, two of which I will point out in following paragraphs. The neighboring communities of San Ramon, Danville, Pleasanton, and Moraga made the list with descriptions such as “a sprawling former cow town with those roots still showing at a downtown tack store” and “everything a small town wants: bike trails, a bustling downtown, trees, and great old houses.” Words such as “charm”, “scenic”, and “smart development” dot these descriptions of recommended places for families to move to in the Bay Area, instead of “upscale retail,” and “high density residential,” terms we have come to hear from our Planning Commissioners and City Council members in planning Walnut Creek’s future. Much of Walnut Creek’s charm and scenic beauty will be replaced with multi-story high-density buildings in our commercial downtown area with this plan.

A closer look at two of the lists points to why Walnut Creek is not in the top ten. First of all, two thirds of the over one hundred towns listed have a better safety record than we do. Crimes from theft to homicide per 1,000 people were tallied and Walnut Creek ranked 69 out of 107 with only neighbors Pittsburg and Pleasant Hill having a higher rate of criminal incidents. Conversely, nearby Moraga, Danville, Orinda, San Ramon, Lafayette, Pleasanton, and Antioch all have better crime statistics than we do. Not surprisingly, four of these safer communities made the list of best in the Bay Area. The EIR did no comparison or projection of crime statistics. Instead the EIR states on page 75, “Since no impacts were identified, no mitigation measures are required.” Did someone miss something? With Walnut Creek already in the bottom third of comparable communities, how much
lower down the safety list will we go with an increase in taller buildings and overall higher density residential and commercial structures promised in our 2025 General Plan? I pray that Walnut Creek's City Council is not willing to find out.

While Walnut Creek is in the top half of the list based on school performance, we rank number 99 out of 107 in "households with at least one person under the age of 18." Virtually all of our neighbors rank higher with 42% to 28% of households having children. Again, our 2025 General Plan's emphasis on high density multi-family housing units and with the EIR's tacit approval of such development we will have even fewer children in our community in the future. A comment by Margaret Brodkin, a member of San Francisco's Policy Council for Children, Youth and Families states in the article that "People with kids play a different role in the community and feel a greater responsibility to the next generation. They're the ones with a vested interest in healthy libraries, public playgrounds, and, of course, schools." Such vision is needed in any general plan process and alarmingly I don't see it in Walnut Creek.

Even more alarming is the effect this decrease in households with children will have on our schools. Recently an editorial on KCBS radio spoke of the changing picture of school funding. It cited the increasing number of school districts that rely on bond measures for adequate funding for much needed programs. Five school districts serve the children of Walnut Creek and a number of bond measures have been passed successfully in these districts in the recent past. Will such success be possible in the future with an increase in higher density residences? Higher density will bring some residents who have not had children, do not have children, and do not plan to have children. I think it is highly unlikely that such residents would support school bond measures. The EIR does not address this important aspect of school funding support even though General Plan 2025 calls for building high density housing units adding approximately 10,000 more residents in the next two decades. Instead on page 86 it reads, "Since no project-level significant impacts related to schools were identified as a result of General Plan 2025, no mitigation measures are required." Again, did they miss something? Is the Walnut Creek City Council willing to support a plan that will probably negatively impact its schools' funding far into the unforeseen future? Again, I pray that this City Council is not willing to find out.

I have spoken more than once before the Council regarding how wrong it is that the possible addition of 400,000 square feet to Broadway Plaza and the proposed 800% increase in square footage in the Mt. Diablo/Locust Street Precise Plan are planning issues of major importance that are not in this draft. Both should be included in General Plan 2025 so that future development of our city can be viewed as a whole and not piecemeal. Instead, a plan will be approved that very well may be amended down the road to accommodate more and different development than Walnut Creek residents wish to see. Since these two proposals are not in the 2025 General Plan, the EIR does not address them and therefore the public can't address them either. Again, this is just plain wrong.

Many people in Walnut Creek feel as I do that General Plan 2025 doesn't fit our community. Proposed levels of development are too tall, too dense, and too urban in general for Walnut Creek. I hope the City Council makes significant changes to make them fit. These changes will take courage, foresight, and vision. I would be glad to help with the research needed to make such changes.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda McNeely
LETTER 12
Brenda McNeely. 582 Lakewood Circle, Walnut Creek, CA 94598. September 25, 2005.

12-1: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

12-2: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

12-3: The purpose of the EIR is to evaluate whether or not the growth allowed by the General Plan would have an impact on the environment. Therefore the Standard of Significance for police services asks whether the General Plan would result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities. Because there would not be a need for new or physically altered facilities, even if more police are added to the Police Department, there is no impact. The purpose of the EIR is not to address crime rates.

12-4: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

12-5: The purpose of the EIR is to evaluate whether or not the growth allowed by the General Plan would have an impact on the environment. Therefore the Standard of Significance for schools asks whether the General Plan would result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities. Page 85 of the Draft EIR explains that new facilities in fact may be needed to accommodate growth, though the actual location and other details of the new facilities are not yet known. It explains that this is not an impact because school facilities can be allowed in any of the residential land use designations, thus ensuring that the facilities could be built. It also explains that the specific environmental impacts from building a school would be addressed by the other plans (such as approval of a Specific Plan containing a new school), policies (such as Quality of Life 1.3.1 and 9.3.1) and mitigations in the General Plan and other parts of the EIR to address air or noise impacts during construction, for example. In addition, the ability of EIRs to address funding issues is severely limited by a State law, SB 50, Government Code Section 65995, so that a lack of funding for schools cannot be called out as an impact, and mandating funding cannot be used as a mitigation measure.

12-6: The expansion of commercial development potential in the Broadway Plaza shopping area was included as part of the land use study areas considered by the Planning Commission in developing the draft General Plan. This area was ultimately not considered for land use regulation changes as part of the General Plan process. However, the owners of the area have indicated that they intend to move forward, in the near future, with a proposal for commercial expansion of this area. Such a development project would require a complete and separate environmental impact report, with precise traffic analyses and consideration of other project specific impacts.

Because it was believed this that Broadway Plaza would seek approval for expansion in the near future, the General Plan EIR analysis (in particular traffic and air quality analyses) included an additional 400,000 square feet of retail development at Broadway Plaza to ensure it was considered in the overall traffic impacts. In addition, although the Locust Street/Mt. Diablo Precise Plan is still in a study phase, the General Plan EIR traffic and air quality model also included increased development potential in that location to account for likely redevelopment of a portion of that area over the next 20 year period.
September 26, 2005

Ms. Victoria Walker  
Walnut Creek City Hall  
P. O. Box 8039  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Ms. Walker:

Attached are questions and concerns regarding the proposed Draft Environmental Impact Report for the draft general plan prior to the Sept. 30 deadline.

Although I have serious concerns regarding the high density development proposed in the draft environmental impact report for the draft general plan, my seven questions and concerns will address traffic specifically. Traffic mitigation and controlled growth, while a stated priority for the citizens, are not being addressed in this draft plan.

Traffic and growth issues are not going away. Repeatedly through surveys and meetings citizens have said to tie development to levels of traffic, this is not reflected in the draft plan as written.

I understand that there will be a written response to the seven questions/concerns that have been expressed. I look forward to your response.

Cordially,

[Signature]

Janet Abbott  
77 Karen Lane  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Attachment
Abbott’s Draft EIR concerns:

**General comments:**

*High density development is contrary to consistently expressed citizen desires in numerous meetings and surveys. | 13-1

*Traffic mitigation and controlled growth are not being addressed in this draft plan. | 13-2

*Traffic and growth issues are not going away. | 13-3

*Tie development to levels of traffic. | 13-4

**Specific comments:**

Chp.2 Report Summary p. 8

Mitigation Measure TRAF-3: Ygnacio Valley Road and Treat Boulevard.

Other than attending meetings with “other jurisdictions”, what specific mitigating measures are proposed “to develop and implement regional solutions to local traffic problems created by growth outside the city.”? | 13-5

Raising the FAR at Shadelands will increase traffic; ignoring that increased building at Shadelands will adversely affect traffic at Treat and Ygnacio is irrational. | 13-6

What traffic studies support development in the Shadelands?

Chp. 2 Report Summary p. 9

Mitigation Measure TRAF-4:...”The policies of the General Plan 2025 support alternative modes to the automobile that may reduce the traffic congestion. However, this would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.”

At Olympic Blvd. and NB I-680 On/Off ramps, the heavy northbound traffic from the off-ramp is a critical movement with significant volumes coming off the ramp then continuing through the intersection to get back onto I-680. The westbound right-turn movement to access the on-ramp is also a critical movement. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.”

Why are both of these proposed “mitigation measures” that are stated to be critical by the City of Walnut Creek Draft EIR considered to have “unavoidable impact”? Does this mean the City of Walnut Creek will sit by and consider doing nothing? | 13-7
Re: Ygnacio Valley Road and Treat

The following statements are listed on page 101. "These segments of the regional routes within the city operate at acceptable levels" yet there is a "Delay Index: 2.0 with a peak hour average speed: 15 mph" and as stated in paragraph one p. 101, "peak hour traffic congestion occurs with significant delays that extend beyond the normal peak hour. This congestion results in increased traffic vehicle queues and delays."

Please clarify the incongruity of these statements.

Chp. 4 p. 113 para. 4

"...future growth in volumes along the freeway do not differ significantly among the land use alternatives. This can be attributed to the fact that the land uses growth in Walnut Creek has little effect on the regional freeways through the city."

Increased growth affects traffic. Which studies show "land uses growth in Walnut Creek has little effect on the regional freeways through the city."

Chp. 6, CEQA Conclusions p. 285

Unavoidable Significant Effects

The Draft EIR states "Implementation of General Plan 2025 would result in one significant and unavoidable air quality impact and several significant unavoidable traffic impacts...not consistent with BAAQMD thresholds and significant and unavoidable freeway operations, roadway level of service, delay index and intersection level of service impacts."

Given these stated negative effects, what is the rationale for increasing, not maintaining the current development cap?

What is the City of Walnut Creek's rationale for consistently stating the situation is "unavoidable" rather than proactively looking to possible solutions?
ETTER 13
Jane Abbott. 77 Karen Lane, Walnut Creek, CA 94598. September 26, 2005.

13-1: This is a policy comment and does not address the adequacy of the EIR. No response is required.

13-2: Traffic mitigation measures were identified where the significant impacts were identified. However, the measures could not be quantitatively evaluated or required coordination with other agencies such that a determination of less-than-significant after mitigation could not be made. The significant impacts on the regional arterials and freeways identified under General Plan 2025 Buildout conditions are due to regional growth.

13-3: Comment noted. No response is required.

13-4: This is a policy comment and does not address the adequacy of the EIR. Therefore no response is required.

13-5: Since the impact on freeways is due to regional growth, specific mitigation measures would require coordination with other agencies to reduce the impacts to less than significant levels.

13-6: The DEIR identifies the potential traffic impacts of the increased FAR at Shadelands as part of the General Plan 2025 Buildout condition, which also include regional growth outside of the city. The delay indices are based on the forecasts from the travel demand model, which is a planning tool that does not account for the metering and other potential operational improvements and traffic management techniques. The City would continue to monitor the operations along these corridors. The finding of “significant and unavoidable” is due to the need for regional coordination for improvements to Treat Boulevard and Ygnacio Valley Road, which are regional arterials, to reduce the impact to less than significant levels. The traffic studies done for the EIR includes the Shadelands changes; no other studies have been done.

13-7: The term “critical” movement applies to the vehicle movements that represent the highest total volume-to-capacity ratios for conflicting movements. At the intersection of Olympic Boulevard and the Northbound I-680 ramps, the northbound off-ramp and westbound right-turn movements represent the movements with the highest total volume-to-capacity ratios for conflicting movements and were therefore considered “critical” movements.

A mitigation measure has been added to the text of page 130 as follows: “Prohibit NB off-ramp through drivers destined for the opposite NB on-ramp (during peak period only or all times) to make that through movement. The City shall also investigate modification of the NB on-ramp and WB/NB right-turn to allow continuous right-turns to improve operations of the intersection, but this would require an operations analysis and need to account for the bike lane along Olympic and possible right-of-way constraints at the corner. These mitigations would result in LOS E (v/c: 0.93) during the AM peak hour, but would still be at LOS F during the PM peak hour for the General Plan 2025 Buildout condition.”

These impacts on Olympic Boulevard and the Northbound I-680 ramps are still considered to be “significant and unavoidable” because even though a mitigation is suggested, the mitigation would not make the impact be reduced to an acceptable level.

13-8: There are two different standards being used for measuring congestion and delay on roadways. Table 18 shows the standards that apply to different types of roads. Level of Service (LOS) A through
F, as explained on page 100 of the Draft EIR, is applied to the non-regional traffic routes. Delay Index, explained on page 101, which is used in accord with the Measure C Growth Management Program, is used to measure the level of service on regional routes. The standard which roads have to meet for Measure C is a Delay Index under 2.0. Table 20 shows that the Regional Routes of Significance all have a Delay Index under 2.0 for existing conditions, supporting the statement on page 101 that “these segments of the regional routes within the city operate at acceptable levels.” The first paragraph on page 101 refers to the existing roadway volumes and level of service, which starts on the previous page. This paragraph provides further explanation as to how the daily roadway volumes used for the roadway LOS relate to the peak hour intersection LOS that follows, particularly when congestion during the peak hours spreads beyond the one-hour peak time period. Table 19 shows that many non-regional routes have unacceptable LOS, which is why the first paragraph on page 101 says that there is a lot of congestion and delay.

13-9: The quoted sentence in this comment is from page 113, paragraph 5. This paragraph compares the proposed Growth Management Alternatives to the proposed General Plan Update Buildout scenario and concludes, based on the numbers shown in Table 24 on page 114, that there is little difference between the alternatives and the proposed plan in terms of effect on the freeway because, as the last sentence of the paragraph states (on page 116), most of the freeway traffic can be attributed to existing development and expected growth outside of Walnut Creek.

13-10: Air quality and traffic impacts are common and these impacts represent differences between previously projected levels of growth and the level of growth anticipated under the General Plan Update. The actual impacts may occur anyway. When the Growth Management Alternatives were assessed in comparison to the General Plan Update buildout scenario in Chapter 5 they were found to have the same significant and unavoidable air quality impact, though they had a slightly better impact in regard to traffic. Though Growth Management Alternative 1 was considered the “environmentally superior alternative,” the proposed General Plan Update plan is chosen because it satisfies policy concerns as well as environmental standards.

13-11: As explained in Response 13-7, impacts are considered to be “significant and unavoidable” because even though a mitigation is suggested, the mitigation would not make the impact be reduced to an acceptable level. It does not necessarily mean that nothing is being proactively done.
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Letter # 14

Walnut Creek City Council
1666 N. Main Street
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Council Members:

This letter addresses my concern, and the concern of many Walnut Creek residents, about the impact of the proposed Walnut Creek General Plan 2025, and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) which purports to address the potential environmental consequences of adopting the proposed General Plan 2025. As stated in the DEIR, page 1, the DEIR is intended to inform city decision-makers and the public of the nature of the project and its effect on the environment.

I wish initially to express my objection to the short period of time allowed the public to review and comment on the DEIR. The DEIR and the Proposed General Plan which it addresses was some two-years in the making, yet the public has less than 60 days to review and comment upon the DEIR. I am an attorney and used to reviewing complex documents, but I have had a difficult time digesting the material in the DEIR. I believe most members of the public would have an equally difficult time analyzing and commenting on this document within the time allowed.

I limit my comments to Chapter 4.6 of the DEIR, the chapter that deals with “Visual Quality.” As observed at page 143 of the DEIR, the combination of built form and natural features has created for Walnut Creek a specific “sense of place.” Unfortunately, the 2025 General Plan would sacrifice natural features, and increase “built forms” – the inevitable effect of which will be to destroy even the little that is left of Walnut Creek’s “sense of place.” Long-time residents of Walnut Creek hope the city decision makers will do everything possible to achieve goal 18 of the proposed 2025 General Plan, i.e. “Preserve and enhance the visual amenity provided by the open spaces, hills, and creeks.”

Unfortunately, our city is already filled with too many structures that violate goal 18. One recent example is the destruction of the hill and trees in the core area that now is the site of the 14-screen theater. The natural scenic beauty of this site, and its unique possibilities for a landmark, giving Walnut Creek a “sense of place”, was sacrificed for commercial $$$$. The construction of the Plaza Escola and its sister development (Olympic Place) have resulted in a massive group of non-descript structures that create “canyons of buildings” that shut off light and obscure the nearby foothills of Mt. Diablo. Another example of an earlier destruction of “place” was the building of the “Pete Stark building” at the corner of Newell and S. Main; a nine-story monstrosity that is totally out of character with the surrounding area. The City Council is on record as admonishing the public and the local newspaper that the general plan does not approve
any specific development. But is it any wonder that the citizens are in dread of any general plan that invites development proposals that would further degrade Walnut Creek’s sense of place? Hopefully, the city officials will learn from its past mistakes! But if history is prologue, we are in deep trouble with the 2005 General Plan. Yet the DEIR whitewashes these concerns and concludes, erroneously, that “Since no impacts were identified, no mitigation measures are required.” (Page 154.)

The DEIR discusses impacts on scenic vistas and views, scenic corridors, scenic resources, and overall visual character (pages 150-152.) To dismiss the impacts of the 2005 General Plan so cavalierly is a great disservice to the public. I have walked and studied the views and view corridors in many different locations of Walnut Creek. In the “historic section” there are no views of Mt. Diablo or the surrounding hills. (But at least the historic section achieves the goal of small-town ambiance with its mixture of one and two story buildings, trees, and attractive street lights – a very nice visual quality.)

If you stand at Main and Civic looking toward Mt. Diablo, views of the mountain are obscured by City Hall and the Lincoln Office Building. If you stand at Main Street and Cypress, or Main Street and Duncan, views of the mountain and hills are obscured by apartment buildings on Mt. Pisgah. Views from Main Street and Mt. Diablo are obscured by the Nordstrom building. One small view of the foothills of Mt. Diablo exists at the corner of Main and Lincoln Street – likely to be obscured if the new library structure is built. Standing at the corner of Main Street and Mt. Diablo Blvd. there remains a nice vista of the hills south of Walnut Creek – not obscured because the buildings on the west side of S. Main Street are mostly one story buildings. This would change if tall structures are allowed in Newell Ave. change #3 area. The courtyard area of the Corners development (a very pleasing development) under the oak tree gives a nice view of the hills to the west of south Walnut Creek (above the top of the Veterans Memorial Building.) A structure bigger and taller than the veterans building would obscure this view. There is also a nice view of hills looking west from Mt. Diablo Blvd and Main Street – which would be obscured if taller structures are allowed in the West Diablo Blvd change area.

The DEIR states that the General Plan 2005 would create a significant aesthetic or visual resource impact if it would “have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vista.” (Page 149) Since the 2005 General Plan contemplates a sizable amount of “in-fill” construction, and puts no limit on the amount of residential construction, there can be no choice but to fill in view corridors and further obstruct vistas with taller structures. I submit that the DEIR is defective in its evaluation of “no impact”; and that a new DEIR should be requested by the City Council. (Or better yet, take the 2005 General Plan back to the drawing board, and truly work toward the stated objective of Goal 18.)

Very truly yours,

William S. Clark
2156 Hadden Road
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

cc: Victoria Walker, Asst. Planning Mgr
LETTER 14
William Clark. 2156 Hadden Road, Walnut Creek, CA 95696. September 28, 2005.

14-1: The mandated public review period for an EIR is 60 days. This EIR had a review period of 60 days which was over on September 19th. The review period was then extended until September 30th by the City in order to give residents further time to comment.

14-2: These paragraphs give examples of how the commentor feels that Walnut Creek has destroyed its “sense of place.” The comment says that the EIR whitewashes concerns over sense of place and that it concludes erroneously that since no impacts were identified, no mitigations are required. The EIR discusses the potential change in visual character of the area and the policies in the General Plan that would encourage good design and the incorporation of natural features in the new development. It has been determined that new development which adhered to the policies would not create significant impacts according to the standards of significance. This comment has been noted. However, the comment does not offer any information that challenges the adequacy of this analysis and therefore no change is necessary.

14-3: The Draft EIR has made an evaluation that there is no impact. Since the commentor does not propose any changes, nor offer new information that would challenge the adequacy of the analysis in the EIR, no new evaluation, and no new EIR, is needed.
MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 28, 2005

TO: VICTORIA WALKER, WALNUT CREEK PLANNING DEPARTMENT

FROM: CHUCK DELEUN 440 MULLER ROAD, WALNUT CREEK 94598

SUBJECT: DEIR COMMENTS ON WALNUT CREEK GENERAL PLAN 2025

AFTER READING THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE CITY OF WALNUT CREEK GENERAL PLAN 2025 DATED AUGUST 5, 2005 PREPARED BY DESIGN COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT AND ATTENDING SEVERAL RECENT COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS, I HAVE THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS:

P. 67 (Fig. 6) - Page 67 states "Most of the City is classified as having a moderate (wildland fire) threat. Fig 6 appears to show most of the city area is classified "high" or "very high." Please explain.

P. 70 - Who pays for upgraded fire service or specialized equipment was increased travel time along the congested streets factored into the decision concluding that there would not be significant impacts to fire service. The congestion also applies to ambulance and police services.

P. 100 - Explain why the Florida DOT quality level of service manual was used for roadway links listed in Table 19 rather than some other method.

P. 101 - Please comment on why the CCTA methodology was used for intersection LOS analyses. Does the CCTA method produce more optimistic rush hour traffic mitigation?

P. 130 - Traffic mitigation: "Elevating the LOS for the core area to LOS E (high) is like using the Emperor has no clothes fable... LOS E is bad whether low or high. Is LOS high E (v/c 0.90 to 1.00) as noted or should it be 0.95 - 1.00?"
CHAPTER 4.4

Traffic Mitigation 4. Options to doing nothing and accepting the significant and unavoidable "include the following: (a) prohibit NB off-ramp thru drivers destined for the opposite NB on-ramp. This could be peak period only or all the time. (b) modify the NB on-ramp and WB/NB right-turn to allow continuous right-turns.

Traffic Mitigation 5. How long does a separate southbound right-turn lane on California at Civic/Trinity have to be to be effective enough to lower the critical V/C ratio to 0.92? Would the new separate lane be created by removing parking and restriping or will roadway widening be necessary? If widening would be necessary is this something that is or should be coordinated with the on-going development on the west side of California between Trinity and Cole?

CHAPTER 4.8

Geology & Seismic Hazards

Policy 1.2...would ensure that new development is limited in areas with high seismic risks.... Are there any examples where Policy 1.2 has or should be applied in Walnut Creek? For instance, would it be applied in the vicinity of where the North Calaveras and South Hampton and Franklin faults converge near the Mt Diablo Blvd/Oakland intersection?

An active fault is defined as "one that has moved in the last 11,000 years," p. A-6 in the General Plan 2005 states that "an active fault is one that shows evidence of movement during the last 3,000,000 years," which is right?
GENERAL COMMENT: LOS CAPACITY IS COMMONLY CALCULATED FOR PEAK HOURS. IT WOULD ALSO BE VERY INFORMATIVE TO KNOW THE DURATION OF UNSATISFACTORY TRAFFIC FLOW. FOR INSTANCE, IS THE PEAK HOURS THE ONLY HOURS OR IS IT ONLY A PORTION OF THE TIME WHEN LOS EXISTS? THIS DURATION OBVIOUSLY IS A FACTOR IN DETERMINING QUALITY OF LIFE PRODUCED BY THE GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS.

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE WRITTEN COMMENTS, I HAVE INCLUDED COPIES OF EIR REPORT PAGES WHERE I NOTED EDITORIAL COMMENTS: THE PAGES INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- p. 40 | 15-14
- p. 49 | 15-15
- p. 102 | 15-16 to 14-21
- p. 103 | 15-22 to 14-24
- p. 104 | 15-25
- p. 105 | 15-26
- p. 113 | 15-27
- p. 114 | 15-28
- p. 115 | 15-29
- p. 116 | 15-30
- p. 117 | 15-31
- p. 118 | 15-31
- p. 119 | 15-31
- p. 121 | 15-32
- p. 122 | 15-32
- p. 123 | 15-33
- p. 124 | 15-34
- p. 125 | 15-34
- p. 127 | 15-35
- p. 236 | 15-36
- p. 237 | 15-36
- p. 282 | 15-36

THANK YOU FOR EXTENDING THE REVIEW PERIOD FOR THE DEIR. PLEASE FEEL FREE TO CONTACT ME SHOULD YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE COMMENTS.

Chuck Johnson

-3-
## Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Areas</th>
<th>Area Description</th>
<th>Surrounding Land Uses</th>
<th>Major Roadways</th>
<th>Prominent Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Traditional Downtown Retail</td>
<td>Older retail area comprised of buildings that are primarily smaller in scale and of varying ages and architectural styles. In addition to retail shops, area includes many restaurants.</td>
<td>N Auto sales, offices</td>
<td>N Civic Drive</td>
<td>Highest concentration of smaller businesses and individual stores. Many alleys and pedestrian corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S Retail uses</td>
<td>S Duncan Street (not major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E Retail and offices facing South Broadway</td>
<td>E South Broadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W Retail, restaurants, Lesher Center</td>
<td>W California Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mt. Diablo/Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td>Mixture of residential, office and retail. Buildings vary in age, size and character. St. Mary's Church and School is excluded.</td>
<td>N Residential (Almond Shuey) and offices on Mt. Diablo</td>
<td>N N/A</td>
<td>Mixture of uses—small to medium-sized office buildings, apartments and duplexes, older retail area includes homes and Long’s Plaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S Offices</td>
<td>S Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E Offices</td>
<td>E I-680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W I-680</td>
<td>W North California Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 4.3, Community Services

#### Table 10

**Enrollment, Walnut Creek School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.*</th>
<th>School or Program</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buena Vista Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Indian Valley Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Murwood Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parkmead Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Walnut Heights Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Walnut Creek Intermediate (6-8)</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Options (K-8)</td>
<td>Included in above totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Alternative Education Program (PALS)</td>
<td>Included with Parkmead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,327</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As mapped on Figure 9.

Source: Personal communication with Sandy Miller, Walnut Creek School District, February 5, 2004. Capacity and projected enrollment figures are not readily available and the WCSD does not have the resources to research the information (personal communication with Donna Ackermann, WCSD, February 19, 2004).

Currently, the MDUSD collects $3.29 per square foot from both single- and multifamily residential development to compensate for growth impacts, and $0.33 per square foot from commercial development. The student generation rates per household used by the MDUSD are as follows:

- single-family attached residential: 0.6637
- single-family detached residential: 0.1808
- multifamily residential: 0.2843

### Acalanes Union High School District

The Acalanes Union High School District (AUHSD) serves the communities of Canyon, Moraga, Lafayette, Orinda and Walnut Creek. AUHSD has four high schools, a continuation school and an adult school. Las Lomas High School is located in Walnut Creek. However, students can apply through an intra-district transfer to attend any school in the district provided there is capacity.

---

45 This rate is expected to increase to $3.91 per square foot on April 7, 2004, pending Board approval.

46 Personal communication with Bob Rayborn, Director of Research and Evaluation, MDUSD, February 27, 2004.
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### Table 19

**Street Volumes, Classifications and Levels of Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Daily Volume</th>
<th>Total Lanes (Both Directions)</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL ARTERIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>Between I-680 on-ramp &amp; Oakland Blvd.</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>Between Oakland Blvd. &amp; California</td>
<td>53,300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>Between Homestead &amp; Marchbanks/ Tampaico</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>Between John Muir Medical Center &amp; San Carlos</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>East of Oak Grove Road</td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>Between Bancroft &amp; Candelero</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>Between Carriage &amp; Bancroft</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary Road</td>
<td>West of Main Street</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main Street</td>
<td>North of Geary</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main Street</td>
<td>Between San Luis &amp; Geary</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTERIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Road</td>
<td>South of Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Between Ygnacio Valley Road &amp; Civic</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Boulevard</td>
<td>Between Civic &amp; Bonanza</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Drive</td>
<td>Between Ygnacio Valley Road &amp; Broadway</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Drive</td>
<td>Between Parkside &amp; Walden</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Way</td>
<td>South of Penniman (One-Way NB)</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo Boulevard</td>
<td>Between Bonanza &amp; California</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main Street</td>
<td>South of Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell Avenue</td>
<td>Between California &amp; S. Main</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Road</td>
<td>Between Citrus &amp; Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td>West of I-680 SB Ramps</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td>Between Alpine &amp; California</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Drive</td>
<td>Between Broadway &amp; Civic</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudgear Road</td>
<td>East of Broadway</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Broadway</td>
<td>North of Newell</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Broadway</td>
<td>North of Rudgear</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Main Street</td>
<td>South of Mount Diablo</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Main Street</td>
<td>North of Lilac</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Road</td>
<td>South of Rolling Hills Drive</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLECTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Way</td>
<td>South of Mount Diablo</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Avenue</td>
<td>Between Third &amp; Geary</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo Boulevard</td>
<td>Between Mount Pispah and San Miguel</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Boulevard</td>
<td>South of Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Walnut Creek May 2005

**Route of Regional Significance**

Los calculated using Florida Department of Transportation Quality/Level of Service Manual
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for the intersection analysis. The method provides a planning-level analysis of signalized intersections based on the volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) of critical movements at an intersection.\(^6\) CCTA does not have Level of Service criteria for stop-controlled intersections.

**Peak Hour Intersection Operations**
The list of study intersections was selected based on major traffic flows and regional reporting requirements. Figure 13 shows the study intersections and the LOS for the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 21 summarizes the existing AM and PM peak hour LOS for 29 key intersections in the city, based on the traffic counts conducted in 2005.

As shown in the table, all of the study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better, except for the following:

- Bancroft Road and Treat Boulevard
- Civic Drive and Ygnacio Valley Road
- North Main Street and Geary Road
- North Main Street and Sunnyvale Avenue/I-680 ramp
- Oak Grove Road and Ygnacio Valley Road
- Oakland Boulevard and Ygnacio Valley Road
- Olympic Boulevard and Northbound I-680 on/off-ramps
- Walnut Boulevard and Ygnacio Valley Road

At these eight intersections, the peak hour volumes are at capacity.

**TRANSIT**
Transit services in Walnut Creek include Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) trains, County Connection buses, a Downtown shuttle bus system, and paratransit services for the elderly and those with disabilities.

**Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)**
Walnut Creek is served by two BART stations, the Walnut Creek station located at California and Ygnacio Valley Road, and the Pleasant Hill station located at Treat and Oak Road, just outside the city limits. Direct service is available to San Francisco these two stations; stations on the Fremont and Berkeley lines require transfers at MacArthur or 12th Street-City Center stations in Oakland.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Rd and Treat Blvd</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Rd/Walnut Ave and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Way/Camino Pablo and Mt. Diablo Blvd/SR 24 EB off ramp</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Civic Dr</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Newell Ave</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Ave and Geary Rd/Putnam</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Civic Dr/Trinity Ave</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Olympic Blvd</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Dr and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross/La Casa Via and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Way and Penniman Ln/I-680 On-Ramp</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Newell Ave</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Parkside Dr</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Civic Dr and Parkside Dr</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and Geary Rd</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and San Luis Ave</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and Sunnyvale Ave/I-680</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Mitchell Dr/Peachwillow Ln</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Treat Blvd</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Blvd. and NB I-680 On/Off ramps</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossmoor Pkwy and Tice Valley Blvd</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Walnut Creek, 2005 turning movement counts; May 9, 2005.
Table 23
Land Use Alternatives Assumptions and Daily Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Alternative</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Total Employment</th>
<th>Total Daily Auto Trips</th>
<th>Total Daily Transit Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2000)</td>
<td>37,429</td>
<td>58,764</td>
<td>618,623</td>
<td>18,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 General Plan Buildout (2025)</td>
<td>43,262</td>
<td>81,372</td>
<td>795,266</td>
<td>22,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan 2025</td>
<td>45,295</td>
<td>85,167</td>
<td>843,615</td>
<td>24,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management I Alternative</td>
<td>45,295</td>
<td>71,559</td>
<td>727,413</td>
<td>20,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management II Alternative</td>
<td>45,295</td>
<td>65,682</td>
<td>714,643</td>
<td>20,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


FREEWAY OPERATIONS

The impacts of the General Plan Update on freeway operations were assessed using the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual Freeway Operations methodology as well as comparing the congested travel speeds forecast by the model.

The 2000 Highway Capacity Manual Freeway Operations methodology compares the volumes to capacity and assigns a level of service based on the volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C). The forecasts from the model were adjusted by applying the growth between the forecast year and base year model volumes to the existing count. The analysis assumes an ideal capacity of 2,400 vehicles per lane, which is adjusted for trucks, commuters, and peak hour factor. The level of service at all freeway locations during the AM and PM peak hour are summarized in Table 24 by direction of travel.

The volumes shown in Table 24 represent the growth in peak hour volumes over the existing conditions. The overall growth at these locations represents a 13 percent increase during the AM peak hour and a 27 percent increase during the PM peak hour.

In the future, volumes along this segment of I-680 through Walnut Creek will exceed capacity during one or both peak hours time periods in at least one direction. The worst location is I-680 south of Rudgear Road, particularly in the northbound direction during the AM peak hour and southbound direction during the PM peak hour. SR 24 west of I-680 approaches capacity in the westbound direction during the AM peak hour.

Among the General Plan alternatives, there is little difference in the LOS, except for I-680 north of Ygnacio Valley Road in the southbound direction during the AM peak hour. At this location, under General Plan 2025 the LOS is D, but the volumes are just beyond the threshold for LOS C. Otherwise, future growth in volumes along the freeway do not differ significantly among the land use alternatives. This can be attributed to the fact that the land uses growth in Walnut Creek has little effect on the regional freeways through the City. The difference in the growth at these freeway locations generally represents two to
# Freeway Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v/c LOS</td>
<td>Growth v/c LOS</td>
<td>Growth v/c LOS</td>
<td>Growth v/c LOS</td>
<td>Growth v/c LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 at Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.70 C 1,940 0.88 D</td>
<td>1,960 0.88 D</td>
<td>1,960 0.88 D</td>
<td>1,940 0.88 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.89 D 2,610 0.95 E</td>
<td>2,740 0.96 E</td>
<td>1,980 0.93 E</td>
<td>2,300 0.92 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 north of Ygnacio</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.87 D 1,800 1.02 F</td>
<td>1,750 1.02 F</td>
<td>1,800 1.03 F</td>
<td>1,760 1.02 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.63 C 1,220 0.74 C</td>
<td>1,320 0.75 D</td>
<td>1,440 0.73 C</td>
<td>1,190 0.74 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 south of Rudgear</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.88 D 5,210 1.48 F</td>
<td>5,220 1.48 F</td>
<td>5,070 1.47 F</td>
<td>5,030 1.46 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.88 D 2,020 1.11 F</td>
<td>2,040 1.11 F</td>
<td>2,060 1.12 F</td>
<td>2,140 1.13 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 24 west of I-680</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>0.46 F 2,130 0.62 C</td>
<td>2,190 0.63 C</td>
<td>1,860 0.60 C</td>
<td>1,770 0.59 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>0.88 D 1,380 0.98 E</td>
<td>1,430 0.99 E</td>
<td>1,580 0.99 E</td>
<td>1,530 1.00 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 at Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.98 E 1,970 1.16 F</td>
<td>2,120 1.18 F</td>
<td>1,840 1.14 F</td>
<td>1,790 1.14 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.73 C 2,290 0.79 D</td>
<td>2,380 0.80 D</td>
<td>2,250 0.78 D</td>
<td>2,220 0.78 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 north of Ygnacio</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.81 D 1,660 0.96 E</td>
<td>1,760 0.96 E</td>
<td>1,610 0.95 E</td>
<td>1,550 0.95 E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 24 (Continued)

#### Freeway Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.640 0.93 E</td>
<td>1.620 0.93 E</td>
<td>1.660 0.93 E</td>
<td>1.660 0.93 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 south of Rudgear Road</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.180 1.18 F</td>
<td>2.170 1.18 F</td>
<td>2.290 1.19 F</td>
<td>2.260 1.19 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.670 1.47 F</td>
<td>4.690 1.47 F</td>
<td>4.510 1.45 F</td>
<td>4.550 1.45 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 24 west of I-680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.490 0.64 C</td>
<td>1.550 0.65 C</td>
<td>1.630 0.65 C</td>
<td>1.680 0.66 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.640 0.85 D</td>
<td>1.700 0.85 D</td>
<td>1.480 0.84 D</td>
<td>1.400 0.83 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The growth represents the increase in peak hour traffic from existing conditions to Year 2025 conditions. This growth includes both the Walnut Creek growth as well as growth from the surrounding region.

**Source:** Dowling Associates, Inc., 2005.
three percent of the existing traffic volumes. Most of the freeway traffic can be attributed to existing development and growth outside of Walnut Creek.

As the freeway reaches capacity, the predicted speeds from the model are unstable and extremely sensitive to the volumes, particularly where the forecast volumes far exceeds capacity. This is the case for I-680 south of Rudgear Road, where the number of lanes is reduced to three with an additional HOV lane. For the General Plan 2025 Buildout Alternative, the peak hour speeds from the model forecasts for these segments are shown in Table 25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>General Plan 2025 (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 at Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 north of Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 south of Rudgear Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 24 west of I-680</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 at Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 north of Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 south of Rudgear Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 24 west of I-680</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The freeway speeds on I-680 are all below 30 mph during the peak hours in the peak direction. On I-680, speeds are slower in the southbound direction during the AM peak hour and northbound during the PM peak hour.

**LOCAL ROADWAY OPERATIONS**

The roadway impacts were assessed in terms of levels of service for the major roadways as well as delay index for the Routes of Regional Significance.

**Roadway Level of Service**

The traffic volume forecasts for the major roadways in the city and the resulting levels of service are presented in Table 26. The daily traffic volumes are based on forecasts from the Walnut Creek model, which have been adjusted based on the existing counts of daily traffic. These volumes include regional growth as well as Walnut Creek growth. The growth increment from the model between 2000 and 2025 was applied to the existing count. The generalized look-up tables from the Florida DOT Quality/Level of Service Manual were used for this analysis.

In addition to the regional corridors that were identified as congested corridors under existing conditions, several local arterials would also become congested by the year 2025. Those arterial segments that would operate at LOS F based on daily volumes are:

- Ygnacio Valley Road (all three analysis segments)
- Treat Boulevard at Bancroft (two segments)
- North Main Street north of Geary
- Geary west of Main
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing 2003</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Arterials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*     #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road Btw Oakland Blvd. &amp; California</td>
<td>53,200</td>
<td>56,100</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>51,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road Btw Homestead &amp; Marchbanks/Tampico</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>90,400</td>
<td>94,600</td>
<td>89,400</td>
<td>86,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road Btw JMMC &amp; San Carlos Dr.</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>81,700</td>
<td>74,900</td>
<td>72,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat Blvd. Btw Bancroft &amp; Candelero</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>66,400</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>66,600</td>
<td>65,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat Blvd. Btw Carriage &amp; Bancroft</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>57,600</td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>55,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.N. Main Street North of Geary</td>
<td>39,100</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>39,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main Street Btw Geary &amp; San Luis</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>32,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary West of Main</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft South of Treat</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Btw Ygnacio Valley Rd. and Civic</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>24,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Btw Trinity/Civic &amp; Bonanza</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>34,900</td>
<td>37,100</td>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 26 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Drive Btw Ygnacio &amp; Broadway</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>46,600</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Drive Btw Parkside &amp; Walden</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28,300</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>28,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Way South of Penniman NB ONLY</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo Btw Bonanza &amp; California</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>33,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street South of Ygnacio Valley</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell Ave. Btw California &amp; S. Main Street</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>22,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd. Btw Citrus &amp; Ygnacio</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic West of SB I-680 ramps</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Btw Alpine &amp; California</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>30,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Dr. Btw Broadway &amp; Civic</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudgear Rd. East of Broadway</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Broadway North of Newell</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Broadway North of Rudgear</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Main Street South of Mount Diablo</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Main St. North of Lilac Dr.</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Existing 2005</td>
<td>1989 General Plan (2025)</td>
<td>General Plan 2025</td>
<td>Growth Management I Alternative</td>
<td>Growth Management II Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Road South of Rolling Hills Drive</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Way South of Mt. Diablo</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Btw 3rd St. &amp; Geary</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Diablo Btw Mt. Pispah and San Miguel</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Blvd. South of Ygnacio</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>10,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat Boulevard</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main Street</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Ratio of peak hour to off peak travel time*

on the existing travel times. The results are shown in Table 27.

On Ygnacio Valley Road in the westbound direction during the AM peak hour, the delay index is expected to increase to more than 2.0 by 2025. This delay may be attributed to the increased delays east of Oak Grove experienced by regional traffic from growth to the east as westbound vehicles are metered by the signal at this location. The delay index is highest for General Plan 2025.

Treat Boulevard would also experience a delay index of more than 2.0 westbound during the AM peak hour and eastbound during the PM peak hour.

The model forecasts did not show any real difference between existing conditions and any of the future conditions for Geary Road. For North Main Street, the delay index increased in the northbound direction, particularly during the PM peak hour, while in the southbound direction, the peak fluctuated slightly among the alternatives for the AM peak hour.

### Intersection Level of Service

The AM and PM peak hour intersection levels of service were calculated and the results are summarized in Tables 28 and 29. Several intersections would operate below the City standard in the future. Those intersections that currently operate below City standard and/or would continue to operate at LOS F in the future include the following:
### AM Peak Hour Intersection LOS Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>V/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Rd and Treat Blvd*</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Rd/Walnut Ave and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Way/Camino Pablo and Mt. Diablo Blvd/SR 24 EB off ramp</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Civic Dr</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Newell Ave</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Ave and Geary Rd/Putnam*</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Civic Dr/Trinity Ave</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Olympic Blvd</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Dr and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross/La Casa Via and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Way and Penniman Ln/I-680 On-Ramp</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 5, 2005
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**Table 28 (Continued)**

AM Peak Hour Intersection LOS Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>General Plan (2025) V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>General Plan 2025 V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative V/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Newell Ave</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Parkside Dr</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Civic Dr and Parkside Dr</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and Geary Rd*</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and San Luis Ave</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and Sunnyvale Ave/1-680*</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Mitchell Dr/Peachwill Ln</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Treat Blvd*</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Road and Treat Blvd*</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Blvd. and NB 1-680 On/Off ramps</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossmoor Pkwy and Tice Valley Blvd</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Route of Regional Significance  
Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2005
# Table 29

**PM Peak Hour Intersection LOS Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C LOS</td>
<td>V/C LOS V/C LOS</td>
<td>V/C LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Rd and Treat Blvd*</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>E 1.20 F 1.24 F</td>
<td>1.18 F</td>
<td>1.16 F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft Rd/Walnut Ave and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>C 0.84 D 0.85 D</td>
<td>0.86 D</td>
<td>0.83 D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Way/Camino Pablo and Mt. Diablo Blvd/SR</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>B 0.75 C 0.76 C</td>
<td>0.77 C</td>
<td>0.80 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Civic Dr</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>C 1.13 F 1.16 F</td>
<td>1.07 F</td>
<td>1.05 F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>C 0.95 E 0.95 E</td>
<td>0.9 D</td>
<td>0.90 D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Newell Ave</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>B 0.77 C 0.77 C</td>
<td>0.76 C</td>
<td>0.76 C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Ave and Geary Rd/Putnam*</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>A 0.91 E 0.93 E</td>
<td>0.89 D</td>
<td>0.88 D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Civic Dr/Trinity Ave</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>B 0.99 E 1.04 F</td>
<td>0.93 E</td>
<td>0.91 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>C 1.07 F 1.13 F</td>
<td>0.99 E</td>
<td>0.99 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Olympic Blvd</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>A 0.83 D 0.88 D</td>
<td>0.7 B</td>
<td>0.68 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>D 1.14 F 1.18 F</td>
<td>1.09 F</td>
<td>1.07 F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Dr and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>F 1.10 F 1.10 F</td>
<td>1.07 F</td>
<td>1.06 F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross/La Casa Via and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>D 0.98 E 0.98 E</td>
<td>0.96 E</td>
<td>0.95 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Way and Penniman Ln/I-680 On-Ramp</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>A 0.61 B 0.63 B</td>
<td>0.62 B</td>
<td>0.61 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Mt. Diablo Blvd</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>E 1.02 F 1.09 F</td>
<td>0.95 E</td>
<td>0.93 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 29 (Continued)
PM Peak Hour Intersection LOS Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>1989 General Plan (2025)</th>
<th>General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Growth Management I Alternative</th>
<th>Growth Management II Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Newell Ave</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St and Parkside Dr</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Civic Dr and Parkside Dr</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and Geary Rd*</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and San Luis Ave</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main St and Sunnyvale Ave/1-680*</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Mitchell Dr/Peachwillow Ln</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Treat Blvd*</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Rd and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Road and Treat Blvd*</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Blvd. and NB I-680 On/Off ramps</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossmoor Pkwy and Tice Valley Blvd</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Blvd and Ygnacio Valley Rd*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Route of Regional Significance  
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Chapter 4.8, Geology & Seismic Hazards

Figure 20. Regional Faults and Probabilities

Legend
Probability in a 30-year period from 2003 to 2032

- 10%
- 4-10%
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- <1%

Source: U.S.G.S. Working Group, '02, 2003

62% probability for one or more magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquakes from 2003 to 2032
### Table 47 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Control Measures</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Relevant Draft General Plan 2025 Programs and Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterial Management Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>areas of the community.</strong></td>
<td>Provide a bypass for traffic passing through Walnut Creek.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 5, Transportation Policy 1.3** - Promote off-peak start times for Concord Pavilion and other special events.

**Chapter 5, Transportation Policy 3.1** - Maintain the Level of Service standards for roadways, as shown in Figure 4 for the City’s transportation network.

**Chapter 5, Transportation Policy 3.3** - Promote maximum operational capacity and efficiency on arterials and collectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Local Clean Air Plans, Policies and Programs</th>
<th>Strive to meet state and federal air quality standards for the region.</th>
<th><strong>Chapter 4, Built Environment Policy 30.1</strong> - Work with the BAAQMD and the County in promoting better air quality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage housing and mixed commercial mixed-use development in selected locations.</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4, Built Environment Policy 30.2</strong> - Consider additional land use and development criteria, standards, and decisions that have positive impacts on air quality and the quality of life in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4, Built Environment Policy 30.3</strong> - Address localized air quality issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chapter 4, Built Environment Policy 3.1</strong> - Create opportunities for mixed-use developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. Improve Pedestrian Access and Facilities</th>
<th>Provide a safe and attractive walking environment to all.</th>
<th><strong>Chapter 5, Transportation Policy 6.1</strong> - Provide safe and attractive pedestrian routes along arterials and collectors leading to schools, along arterials or collectors that carry high traffic volumes, on all downtown streets, along major streets leading to the downtown, and on all streets leading to transit facilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforce the character of the Pedestrian Retail District as a regional retail destination and gathering place for local residents.</td>
<td><strong>Chapter 5, Transportation Policy 6.2</strong> - Require full frontage curb and sidewalk improvements in all commercial areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chapter 5, Transportation Policy 6.3</strong> - When utility rights-of-way, drainage, or other corridors are established, obtain dedications of land or easements, where appropriate, for paths that would enhance the pedestrian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Control Measures</td>
<td>General Description</td>
<td>Relevant Draft General Plan 2025 Programs and Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, continued</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Transportation Policy 6.4 - Facilitate use of public sidewalks and walkways throughout the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Promote Traffic Calming</td>
<td>The City of Walnut Creek and the County have implemented a number of traffic calming measures.</td>
<td>Chapter 4, Built Environment Policy 20.1 - Strengthen the identity of the Pedestrian Retail District as a pedestrian zone and a shopping destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak period turn restrictions on Walnut Boulevard, and on Homestead Avenue at Ygnacio Valley Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street narrowing on Peachwillow Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn prohibitions on Newell Avenue at Olympic Boulevard (County)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn prohibitions on Treat Boulevard at Jones Road (County)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installation of a roundabout on Oak Grove Road at Walnut Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street narrowing on Castle Rock Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop signs and turn restrictions in the Carriage Square neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tial cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Parks
Future regional growth would result in increased demand for park and recreational facilities throughout the County. As a result, the County and other jurisdictions would need to expand and construct additional parks and other recreational facilities to meet the increased demand. State law allows jurisdictions to require additional development to fund park improvements, which would ensure the provision of adequate parklands. It is unknown exactly where these parks and recreational facilities would occur to support the cumulative increase in population. As specific parkland expansion or improvement projects are identified, additional project-specific, second-tier environmental analysis would be completed. As a result, a significant cumulative impact associated with parks and recreational facilities would not occur.

Police
Future regional growth would result in increased demand for police services throughout the County. This cumulative increase in demand for police services could require the construction of additional facilities in the region, which could result in additional environmental impacts. This increased demand for police services would not require the construction of police facilities in Walnut Creek since the Walnut Creek Police Department does not serve the County or other cities in the region.

The future location of new facilities to serve other communities is unknown. As specific police facilities projects are identified, additional project-specific, second-tier environmental analysis would be completed. Therefore, there would not be a significant cumulative impact associated with police services.

Fire
Future regional growth would result in increased demand for fire services throughout the County. Growth within Walnut Creek combined with growth in other parts of the County could result in the need to construct additional facilities, resulting in additional environmental impacts. The future location of new facilities to serve other communities is unknown. As specific fire facilities projects are identified, additional project-specific, second-tier environmental analysis would be completed. Therefore, there would not be a significant cumulative impact associated with police services.

Schools
Future regional growth would result in increased demand for schools throughout the County. Growth within other Contra Costa communities could result in the need for the various school districts that serve the Walnut Creek planning area to construct additional facilities, resulting in additional environmental impacts. The future location of new facilities to serve other communities is unknown. As specific police facilities projects are identified, additional project-specific, second-tier environmental analysis would be completed. Therefore, there would not be a significant cumulative impact associated with schools.

Libraries
Future regional growth would result in increased demand for library facilities throughout the County. The new library proposed under General Plan 2025 would satisfy some of the regional demand for libraries. However, additional libraries could be needed in other communities as well. It is unknown exactly where these library facility expansions would occur to support the cumulative increase in population, though they would likely occur within urbanized areas where there is a concentration of population. As specific library expansion or improvement projects are identified, additional project-specific, second-tier environmental analysis would be completed. As a result, a significant cumulative impact associated with libraries would not occur.
LETTER 15
Chuck Deleuw. 440 Muller Road, Walnut Creek, CA 94598. September 28, 2005.

15-1: While most of the area within the City limits is classified as having a “moderate” wildland fire threat, much of the area within the Planning Area, which is a larger area, does have a “high” or “very high” threat. The text on page 67 has been changed to better reflect this.

15-2: Usually new development pays for increases in service due to growth through the assessment of fees by the City at the time of project approval.

15-3: This comment asks whether increased congestion on local streets was factored into the decision about whether there would be impacts on response times for the fire, police and ambulance services. Response times for fire services are addressed in Chapter 6, Policy 4.2, those for police and emergency response are in Chapter 6, Policy 5.2. The policies do not say how response times will be kept to acceptable levels, but assure that they will be. Therefore it is not necessary to know if increased congestion was factored in, since this is a review at the policy level. Individual project-level EIRs would need to assess actual response times and impacts that increased traffic may cause.

15-4: The Florida DOT Quality/Level of Service Manual was used for the roadway links since it provides a planning level analysis of the Highway Capacity Manual methodology for arterial roadways and accounts for signalization. Other methods, such as the volume-to-capacity ratio, do not account for delays at signals. The Florida DOT manual also allows for multi-modal analyses of roadways by providing methodologies to determine transit, bicycle and pedestrian levels of service.

15-5: The CCTA methodology was used for the intersection LOS analyses, since it is required by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) for intersection analyses. The CCTA methodology is a variation of the Circular 212 methodology, which is a capacity-based analysis of intersection operations. Results tend to be more conservative than the Highway Capacity Manual intersection operations methodology.

15-6: Mitigation Measure TRAF-5 considers a change in the LOS standard to allow for congested traffic conditions rather than require mitigation measures that may increase roadway capacity or limit future growth. A higher threshold for the Core Area and the Shadelands area would allow for congested traffic conditions that may encourage use of alternative modes.

15-7: LOS high E has been revised to state “v/c: 0.95 to 1.00” on page 130 and the Summary Table.


15-9: The southbound shared right-turn and through lane becomes the critical movement in the future due to the doubling of southbound through traffic by 2025. The growth in the Core Area is not expected to double the amount of traffic on California. Due to congestion on I-680, the demand model tends to assign through traffic onto parallel arterials, including California. The proposed mitigation measure would address the impacts if such volumes were to occur in the future. However, the CCTA methodology used for this analysis is a planning level analysis. More detailed operations analysis of the intersection would be required to determine the required length of a separate southbound right-turn lane on California at Civic/Trinity. Widening of the roadway may make this improvement infeasible.
sible given the on-going development on the west side of California and the plans to neck-down the intersection by removing parking and shortening the crosswalk. As part of the mitigation measure, the City would continue to monitor the operations at this intersection. If the through volumes on California increase as forecast, the City would conduct detailed operations analyses to determine what improvements would be needed to maintain acceptable conditions.


15-11: The identification of high risk areas requires analysis of a number of factors, as noted in Action 1.2.1. This process will occur as an implementation step subsequent to adoption of the General Plan.

15-12: The EIR is correct in defining an active fault as one that has moved within the last 11,000 years. The definition in the General Plan on p. A-5 applies to potentially active faults. The General Plan will be modified to reflect the correct definition.

15-13: The duration of congestion was not used as significance criteria for the EIR analysis. As noted in the comment, LOS capacity is commonly calculated for peak hours, but the duration of congestion would be a factor in determining the quality of life produced by the General Plan development scenarios. The forecasting tools available for the impact analysis do not provide hourly forecasts of traffic volumes, but provides a four-hour peak period forecast. When comparing the CCTA screenline for Ygancio Valley and Treat, the percentage of growth in traffic volumes over the four-hour period tends to be higher than the peak hour, but most dramatic in the peak direction with the percent growth during the four-hour peak being almost 3 times that of the growth in volumes during the peak hour. This indicates that the congestion may extend beyond the one hour peak, particularly where the roadway is already at or approaching capacity.

15-14: This is the heading that the authors chose to best reflect the roadway classifications and no change is necessary.

15-15: This table shows Existing enrollment only, so only one column is needed. No change is necessary.

15-16: The roadway segments in Table 19 were not intended to cover all roadway segments on regional arterials, but only those locations where daily traffic volumes were available and representative of average conditions. Therefore no changes are necessary.

15-17: The dates that the volumes were collected were in 2003, but the analysis was done in 2005. Therefore the source line is correct. Since the text says that the volumes were from 2003 the tables do not have to be changed in order to reflect this in their title.

15-18: This is assumed, therefore no change is necessary.

15-19: This is explained in the chapter text, therefore no change is necessary.


15-21: This is explained in the chapter text, therefore no change is necessary.

15-22: The delay indices listed in Table 20 are for the entire portions of the roadway within the City Limits.


15-24: This is explained in the chapter text, therefore no change is necessary.
15-25: None of the tables have dates in the heading. The date of the traffic counts is given in the source line at the bottom of the table. No change is necessary.

15-26: None of the tables have dates in the heading. The date of the traffic counts is given in the source line at the bottom of the table. No change is necessary.

15-27: Text is correct as written. No change is necessary.

15-28: It is 2005, as noted in the source line at the bottom of the table. No change is necessary.

15-29: This is the same table as Response 14-28.

15-30: It includes regional growth. A note has been added to the table.

15-31: It is 2005, as noted in the source line at the bottom of the table. No change is necessary.

15-32: It is 2005, as noted in the source line at the bottom of the table. No change is necessary.

15-33: No actual comments or questions can be derived from the notations on pages 122 - 124.

15-34: In Table 29, PM Peak Hour Intersection LOS Summary, the v/c ratio for Ross-moor Parkway and Tice Valley Road should read “0.70” for the Growth Management I Alternative. This text is corrected in the Final EIR.

15-35: The Calaveras fault should be colored red on this figure, as the commentor suggests. This figure is reprinted correctly in the Final EIR.

15-36: No actual comments or questions can be derived from the notations on pages 236 and 237.

15-37: Page 282 should read “fire” instead of “police.” This change has been made and is reprinted correctly in the Final EIR.
29 September 2005

Honorable Gary Skrel, Mayor
Members of the Walnut Creek City Council
City Hall
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Mayor Skrel and Members of the City Council:

Years ago when my husband, Bill Chauncey, and I were at UC-Davis for graduate school, 1968-1972, and visited friends in East Bay, we often remarked how much we would like to live in Walnut Creek. Aside from being a physically beautiful location, other amenities were very attractive. For example, when I taught school in Fairfield, a colleague and I often drove to Walnut Creek to shop and have dinner before returning home to Davis.

However, as fate would have it, we moved around, living in Southern California, Oregon and then in Massachusetts for the past 27 years. As retirement age approached, there was only one place we thought of for retirement: Walnut Creek. Still beautiful, still easily navigable, still accessible to other Bay Area destinations, still maintaining good shopping and, thanks to an inflated real estate market in Massachusetts, we were able to purchase a condo in Rossmoor. We arrived in Walnut Creek in March 2005.

That said, my husband and I have become very interested in the Draft EIR: General Plan 2025. We have attended a community meeting held at Shadelands and City Council and Planning Commission meetings. We have read documents, listened to presentations and heard residents’ concerns.

After some of the meetings, we have left City Hall feeling that residents’ concerns have not been given proper consideration as the document heads for approval. We would like to add our comments to others. Here are some issues that increasingly concern us, especially as they relate to maintaining the quality of life in Walnut Creek. They are:

Building height limitations:
To retain the charm and attractiveness of the city as well as preservation of the views of Mount Diablo, we ask that new buildings in downtown and its perimeter be limited to 35' in height. Residents consistently mention sunlight and their desire to maintain a small city environment as well as the views of the mountain.

Core Business District Preservation:
Developers should not be allowed to destroy the pleasant shopping and dining areas on Locust and North Main Streets. (Nor should landlords raise rents to rid the area of small businesses.) Independently owned businesses are a strong feature in the appeal of shopping in downtown Walnut Creek. Many shoppers are tired of the sameness of
merchandise in chain stores; one can shop anywhere and find the same old thing. The independent stores carry unique merchandise and are a welcome relief from the sameness. If the Council is sincere in their desire to continue to attract shoppers to Walnut Creek, they will act to encourage independent businesses that currently exist well with chain stores downtown, creating a shopping experience not found in many other cities and towns.

Parking:
While we have not had difficulty finding parking in downtown Walnut Creek, apparently others have. The city has done a fine job providing garages that blend attractively with the retail environment. The garage on Locust that contains retail and dining (Lark Creek) is a good example. If additional parking is truly needed, the aforementioned garage is a good model. However, additional parking also means additional traffic brought onto already burdened streets.

Density:
We would like to see further discussions of density coupled with consideration of increased traffic. In all meetings we have attended, residents voiced concerns about additional traffic; however, comments made by Ms. Walker indicate that traffic concerns are not part of the document. Councilman Abrams as a registered Traffic Engineer should be particularly sensitive to the need for traffic mitigation. He should be a leading voice demanding thorough review of traffic issues in Walnut Creek. Additional housing should not be brought into the downtown area without plans in place to handle the additional vehicles that would result from more domiciles.

We realize that change is necessary. However, some of the changes proposed by the Planning Commission seem to ignore the voices of the community. The residents of Walnut Creek are educated and articulate. They are also passionate about the quality of life in their city. Many of the issues they have raised speak to the very reasons why Walnut Creek remained the most attractive destination for our retirement years. We are delighted to be residents of this city and hope to enjoy all that it and the area have to offer for years to come.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Sandra S. Chauncey
2664 Ptarmigan Drive, No. 3
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
chaunceyss@netzero.net

Cc: Robert Jorgensen, Chair, Planning Commission
    Sandra Meyer
    Victoria Walker

LETTER 16
Sandra S. Chauncey. 2664 Ptarmigan Drive, No. 3, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. September 29, 2005.

16-1: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no response is required.

16-2: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no response is required.

16-3: This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, therefore no response is required.

16-4: Traffic concerns and the impact of increased housing density on traffic are addressed in Chapter 4.4 of the EIR. Since no specific question is raised about traffic concerns, no further response is required.
To Ms. Victoria Walker  
c/o Planning Department  
Post Office Box 8039  
Walnut Creek, California 94596

From Mrs. Elizabeth C, Heidt  
Casa Cristina  
1632 Live Oak Way  
Walnut Creek, California 94596-4221  
(925) 934-2068 = home  
(925) 639-7285 = cell  
liziegoddess@yahoo.com

Thursday, September 29th, 2005

Dear Victoria,

I am writing about an incorrect page in the draft Environmental Impact Report for the upcoming General Plan 2025. Towards the back of the EIR but not on a numbered or otherwise referenced page is a map titled “1989 General Plan Land Use Map”. On this map there is a depiction of my mother Julia Maxwell’s property at 1632 Live Oak Way as having a designated use of Single Family Low. If this map is truly a depiction of how our property was designated in 1989 than it is incorrect and may be an attempt to re-write history or otherwise distort the facts. For the record, my family’s property had previously been designated Multi Family Very High, exactly like the adjacent property’s across the creek on Carmel Drive. These property’s still enjoy this correct designation. Our property was deliberately altered and devalued against our wishes in 1992 and again in 1994, not in 1989. I remember the years very clearly because it was just after two rejected attempts at eminent domain that occurred in 1986 and in 1991. While we have no plans or desire to develop our family home and property, this arbitrary decision to change our designated use still affects our ability to use and enjoy our property to our best advantage, the latest example being my mother’s recent application for a business license. She applied for and was granted a business license with the idea of opening her home once a month to the public or by appointment to sell antiques, something very appropriate to the area and in keeping with our enjoyment of our home. Her license was revoked later that week because of her designated use and for no other reason. My husband and I have often thought about the possibility of developing a Bed and Breakfast or catering weddings and other occasions when we retire, but given the City’s limitations imposed upon our property we are not optimistic about having such an appropriate home business being allowed. If you look at the map you will see that we are a tiny little slice of suburban yellow in an otherwise obviously multi-colored urban and mixed use area. Over 10 years later it is still our wish to have our correct designated use restored to this property and I can see no justification for continuing to restrict our designated use other than the City’s relentless pursuit to acquire my family’s home.

My other concern about the draft EIR is that our family home and gardens, clearly known to the City to be a significant historical resource, is not even listed in Table 35 on page 163 “Walnut Creek Buildings and Sites Identified as Potentially Historic”. The City
has known of the significance of our property since at least the Civic Park Master Plan in 2001. Indeed, our property was referenced in the Historical assessment of the Lar Rieu property, which was completed in March of 2004 by the same architectural historian, Mr. Ward Hill, who assessed our property for the City when they were drafting the CPMP. The City’s reluctance to include our home in the EIR is beyond my comprehension. I look forward to hearing your response to my concerns.

Very Truly Yours,

Elizabeth Heidt
LETTER 17
Elizabeth C. Heidt. 1632 Live Oak Way, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. September 29, 2005.

17-1: The commentor is correct that title of the General Plan Land Use Map that is included in the Draft Environmental Impact Report does not depict the land use designations as adopted by the City of Walnut Creek in 1989. This map actually depicts the land use designations as adopted by the City Council in 1989 and amended through 2005. The map title is corrected in the Final EIR.

17-2: A City of Walnut Creek Planning Department staff memo from 1993 describes the reasons why the Maxwell property (then known as the French property) was re-designated from Multiple Family Very High density (MFVH: 30-50 dwelling units per acre) to Single Family Low (SFL: 1-3 dwelling units per acre). The property is zoned R-20, consistent with the SFL land use designation and existing use. The land use designation was revised during the last General Plan update to reflect the existing use, which is, in fact, a single family detached home on a 27,400 square foot parcel.

The reasons for keeping the SFL designation include the fact that in 1993 the French family indicated to staff that they wished to live in this home for the remainder of their lives, and that the commentor also repeatedly indicated that it is her desire to live in this single family home and that she has “no plans or desire to develop our family home and property”.

It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to realistically develop this 27,400 square foot parcel to the MFVH density. The property is located along a creek with a required creek bank setback, limiting the developable site area. The property contains numerous heritage quality trees that would require preservation and mitigation under the City’s Tree Protection Ordinance, further limiting the developable area of the site. The Measure A height limit is 45’ maximum, and could not be increased without a vote of the residents of Walnut Creek. Access to the site is extremely limited and no significant number of new residential units could be served or allowed by Fire District regulations over the existing easement.

In addition, it appears that the commentor may choose to pursue a historical resource designation with the California Register of Historical Resources for the home at 1632 Live Oak Way. A “Primary Record” was filed with the State Resources Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation based on the March 2001 evaluation prepared by Mr. Ward Hill (DPR 523 Primary Record Form). This assessment was also based, in part, on an archeological survey and assessment (William Self Assoc., March 2001) which included a site visit by Senior Archaeologist Ms. Leigh Martin. On the basis of this assessment, it appears that the property may be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (resource embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction), and possibly Criterion 1 (associated with significant contributions to the broad pattern of local or regional history), although neither has been formally evaluated.

In addition, according to a landscape evaluation of the Maxwell property, Landscape Architectural Evaluation – 1632 Live Oak Way, (Patillo and Garrett Associates, April 2001), the landscape property is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places because it “possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and…embody the distinctive characteristics of a type [or] period.”
If the commentor is successful in achieving State or Federal Register designation some time in the future, it could further limit the allowable modifications to the home or site.

Given all these factors, it appears quite unlikely that the property will be redeveloped over the 20-year time horizon of this plan, and certainly not to the very high residential densities desired. Therefore, the existing land use designation of Single Family Low is appropriate for this property.

17-3: The commentor is incorrect in the assumption that a higher density zoning or general plan land use designation would have allowed an antique sales business at this property. An intermittent antiques store that is open to the public is not permitted in any residential district, multiple family or single family, in the city. Such retail uses are not permitted in any residential zoning district, pursuant to Municipal Code Section 10-2.3.107. Although certain home-based businesses are allowed in any residential district, these businesses are limited to an office or a business of a personal nature that does not necessitate “the rendering of services to customers or clients on the premises.” Specifically, home-based businesses are prohibited from engaging in retail sales on the premises.

17-4: Municipal Code Section 10-2.3.109 governs the approval of Bed and Breakfast Inns. A Bed and Breakfast Inn requires approval of a conditional use permit in any residential district (single family or multi-family).

17-5: The architectural and historical assessment by Mr. Hill has indicated that the home and grounds at 1632 Live Oak Way may qualify under Criterion 3 for historical significance in the State of California. To the knowledge of the Planning Department, neither the commentor nor any other authorized person has made application to have the property added to the California Register of Historical Resources or Federal Register of Historic Places. If the property is, in fact, listed on the California or Federal Register, that designation should be included in the DEIR.

At this point, the home and grounds are considered “potentially significant” based on the Hill and Patillo assessments as well as the age of the home. The text will be amended to list it in that manner in the Final EIR, along with other potentially significant structures such as the Lar Rieu residence, until such time as it achieves a state or federal historic designation, or the City of Walnut Creek develops standards for local historical significance.
From: Victoria Walker
To: john morse
Date: 9/30/05 10:34AM
Subject: Re: EIR Letter

Dear Mr. Morse:

The City of Walnut Creek has received your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Responses will be included as appropriate in the Response to Comments prepared for the Draft EIR.

Thank you,

Victoria Walker
Assistant Planning Manager
City of Walnut Creek
P.O. Box 8039
Walnut Creek CA 94596
tel 925.943.5829
fax 925.256-3500

>>> john morse <johndanielmorse@yahoo.com> 09/29/05 09:39PM >>>
To Victoria Walker
Community Development Department

What was so wrong with the 1989 General Plan that the city felt it, first, needed to rewrite the entire document, and second, needed to pelt the old document with such negative jargon in the EIR? In "Chapter 5: Alternatives" as I poured through the convoluted verbiage I noticed that every paragraph had some sort of negative comment on the 1989 plan. First, calling it the "No Project Alternative" just didn't make sense. The number of keystrokes for No Project Alternative is actually more than typing 1989 General Plan. Why bother renaming a document with more words except to give it a "No Alternative" connotation? By the way there are Projects in the 1989 General Plan, creating even more confusion by renaming it the No Project Alternative. To me it is quite transparent.

Every time the 1989 G.P was described as superior to the 2025 Plan, there was always some way to knock it down, with phrases like, "(2025 has) improved transportation alternatives," "(1989) has no policy guidance on the protection of visual quality," "(1989) lacks waste reduction...(2025) smarter." (pages 268-271)

Instead of spending half a million dollars writing this document, why didn't the city just add its wonderful ideas to the 1989 plan? That would allow us to have the best of both worlds.

Three other questions I have:
Isn't discussing a specific structure like building a new library, inappropriate for a document like a General Plan?

What is another way to say, "insubstantial deterioration?"

And why didn't you just say that?

John Morse
2093 Magnolia Way
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

---

Yahoo! Mail - PC Magazine Editors' Choice 2005
http://mail.yahoo.com

CC: Margot Ernst
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John Morse. 2093 Magnolia Way, Walnut Creek, CA 94595. Email September 29, 2005.

18-1: Walnut Creek has changed and grown a lot since 1989, and so the City felt that it was appropriate and necessary to update the General Plan to fit the new conditions in the City. It was not meant to malign the 1989 plan.

18-2: “No Project Alternative” is a technical term used in EIRs under the California Environmental Quality Act that has special meaning. It does not mean that there is no building or development, but that the proposed “project” under consideration, in this case the new General Plan, would not go forward and that the status quo would continue. In this case, the status quo is the 1989 General Plan and so the 1989 General Plan development scenario is dubbed the “No Project Alternative.”

18-3: The new library is discussed in the context of the provision of community services and the standard of significance which asks if the proposed General Plan would result in the need for new or physically altered library facilities. As noted in the EIR on pages 86-87, the new population allowed by the General Plan would warrant new library facilities. This is why discussing specific structure, in particular the new library, is appropriate.

18-4: It is not clear where this phrase appears in the document, or what the purpose of this comment is. Therefore no response is required.
To: Walnut Creek Planning

From: Ed Dimmick

Subject: Comments on draft EIR for Walnut Creek Plan 2025

First and foremost, I have concerns about the proposed mitigations for 17 of the 20 intersections listed in the transportation portion of Table 1 in Chapter 2, the Report Summary. Three of the 20 intersections have specific mitigations proposed; the only other proposed mitigation measures for the other 17 are working with other jurisdictions and regional solutions to reduce traffic problems created by growth outside the city, “operations and management for improved efficiency”, and encouraging “alternatives to the automobile”. These have all been tried either without success, or for the maximum success allowable, for at least the last 25 years, through two general plans. The residents have identified traffic in every poll of at least the last 25 years as the major problem in Walnut Creek. When there are no effective mitigations available for traffic, then I have to wonder what the purpose is of having an environmental impact report -- is it just to satisfy a legal requirement which is then ignored, or is it to identify reasons to actually restrict further worsening of the problem? Because the draft general plan does propose worsening these traffic problems.

Under voter-passed Measure C, which created the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, all jurisdictions in Contra Costa County must use a specific method of calculating traffic level of service. This Environmental Impact Report states that traffic levels of service were calculated using the “Florida Transportation Quality/Level of Service Manual” (EIR page 100), and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority method was applied for the intersection analysis, but does not have Level of Service criteria for stop-controlled intersections. This subtle distinction is difficult to understand. Please explain this further.

At a Planning Commission meeting on the draft general plan, John Hall, the Walnut Creek Transportation manager, said that many of the intersections in downtown Walnut Creek are shown at unacceptably high levels of service in the draft general plan in 2025 because of through traffic caused by I-680 no longer being sufficient to handle the through traffic. If this is true, it would seem that it should be highlighted in both the EIR and the general plan so that work can begin now to correct this problem, given the lead time necessary to deal with freeway construction.

I have trouble believing some of the intersection level-of-service numbers. For example, I have seen students unable to leave Las Lomas High School because the traffic is backed up from the signal at South Main and Newell. Yet these are listed as level of service “C”. I regularly see the left turn traffic onto Treat Blvd. from north-bound Bancroft unable to make it through one signal light, yet this is level-of-service “D”. In the morning, when school is in session, traffic on Treat west-bound regularly backs up from
Oak Road past Candelero (several blocks). This wasn’t even listed. Fifteen years ago, when the traffic numbers between 7am and 8am showed only 1/4 of the traffic to be non-Walnut Creek related, the city council made a political decision to change the peak hour to be between 6am to 7am so as to show more regional traffic. Is this still the peak hour, and is this why the numbers do not show the problem to be as bad as it is? What time-frame is used to identify the peak-hour for the primary intersections?

When voters in Walnut Creek passed Measure H, this was eventually ruled to be invalid by the California Supreme Court because it conflicted with the city’s general plan. This draft general plan proposes some height changes which are in conflict with Measure A, which the voters passed 20 years ago. Would this conflict make the city’s proposed general plan invalid, if adopted with these conflicts?

The recent hurricanes in the gulf coast have heightened awareness of what can happen in an emergency, making it clear that people are on their own for at least the first 72 hours. The biggest problem here is what can happen if a great earthquake should occur. However, here, as in New Orleans, the greatest concern could well be a resulting flood. I live adjacent to Walnut Creek (the creek). Until 15 years ago, my area, as well as much of the downtown, was considered to be in a flood plain. This was because of concerns of what would happen if Lafayette Reservoir should give way in a great earthquake. This designation was changed 15 years ago, which improved the cost of insurance. But the possibility is still there. The EIR and the general plan refer to the city’s Emergency Operations Plan. This plan is only in draft form, and does not address the flood that could occur. In talking with the city’s staff person for this subject, she mentioned that the shelter to go to is not identified ahead of time, but will be designated by the Red Cross after the event, and broadcast over the radio. Much more information needs to be given in the general plan, EIR and Emergency Operations Plan about this subject. I also think it would be extremely helpful if meetings were to be held, neighborhood by neighborhood, with a representative of the Fire Department and PG&E and the neighbors, to let people know what to do in the event of an emergency. The time to start planning such meetings is now.

Finally, my understanding of general plans is that they are to be internally consistent. I don’t find that consistency when there are plans to develop, and add more traffic to intersections that are exceeding capacity, and essentially cannot be mitigated. Voter-passed Measure C states that jurisdictions are forbidden from doing this if they want to get their return-to-source money each year.

Sincerely yours,

Ed Dimmick
1251 Sheppard Ct.
Walnut Creek, CA, 94598
LETTER 19  
Ed Dimmick. 1251 Sheppard Court, Walnut Creek, CA 94598. September 30, 2005.

19-1: The purpose of the General Plan EIR is to identify potential impacts of future buildout of the General Plan 2025 and to mitigate significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. Many of the impacts are due to regional growth beyond the City’s control that result in increased traffic volumes through the city.

19-2: As part of the implementation of Measure C, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority prepared the Technical Procedures, which includes a level of service (CCTALOS) methodology for intersections. A local jurisdiction must use the Authority’s LOS method to comply with the Measure C Growth Management Program. Other methods can be used as long as they are in addition to the CCTALOS method. For the EIR analysis, in addition to the intersection LOS, the roadway LOS analysis used the planning-level method from the Florida Department of Transportation Quality/Level of Service Manual.

19-3: On page 120 of the EIR, the discussion includes results of the select link analysis of Broadway, which indicated that 50 percent of the future traffic on Broadway did not have an origin or destination in Walnut Creek. Combined with the forecasted travel speeds on the freeway, which is at or approaching capacity, this highlights the issue of regional traffic using local streets to by-pass congestion on the freeway, resulting in the significant and unavoidable impacts.

19-4: If the back-up occurs at the end of the school day in the afternoon, the analysis covers the commute peak. The intersection LOS results (Tables 28 and 29) show LOS E and F at the intersection of Bancroft and Treat. The intersection of Treat and Candelero was not included in the analysis, which was limited to key locations along regional arterial.

19-5: The peak hour intersection analysis uses the peak hour of traffic from counts conducted over a two-hour period in 15-minute increments. The exact timeframe varies from intersection to intersection, depending upon the actual peak time.

19-6: As general practice, when a City adopts a General Plan, there are inconsistencies created with the existing zoning and other land use regulations. There is process in place for updating zoning and other regulations to be consistent with the General Plan, which is what land use law requires. The process for amending Measure A is different than for other regulations because any proposed change must go to the public for a vote. If the voters reject a proposed change to Measure A, the City would then go through a General Plan Amendment process to amend the General Plan so the policy or action was consistent with Measure A. In places where the height limit is less than Measure A limits, development would not be built above the Measure A limit.

19-7: The flood hazard evaluation in the DEIR found that the potential for flooding would come from an increase in impervious surfaces in flood prone areas. The DEIR found that with the proposed General Plan 2005 policies limiting impervious surfaces and runoff in flood prone areas, the flood risk is minimized and there are no environmental impacts. Provision of an emergency services operations plan is outside the purview of the DEIR. In regards to having meetings neighborhood by neighborhood, the comment has been noted by the Planning Department.

19-8: The commentor is relating two different sets of regulations, neither of which address information in the EIR itself.
September 30, 2005

Victoria Walker
Walnut Creek Planning

Victoria:

Attached are my comments regarding the EIR for General Plan 2025.

The time allotted for public review is frankly insufficient, when we’re talking about hundreds of pages of interlocking subjects. For instance, discounting worsening traffic -- incidentally at the top of most residents’ list -- impacts all emergency response efforts, air quality and the physical environment, and just about everything else. No one, obviously, has been given time to address this interdependence.

I have chosen to briefly bring three sections to your attention. Attached are comments and questions regarding: Police Services, Schools, and Transportation.

With these topics, as well as some of the others I’ve viewed, there is a recurring problem with the EIR: It invariably assumes that average conditions, largely predicated upon rural Walnut Creek, are scalable to urban Walnut Creek despite strong evidence to the contrary. This treatment softens impacts and does not accurately reflect what an EIR is supposed to accomplish.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Michael Frederick
71 Willow Avenue
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
POLICE SERVICES

The EIR recognizes higher crime rates in commercial areas servicing regional shopping, such as Broadway, and high-density residential areas, such as Creekside. This is reflected in the higher call levels from Sector 1 than from Sectors 2 and 3. The latter areas are predominantly owner occupied single-family homes and/or commercial areas geared more for local shoppers.

In analyzing the need for increased police services, consistent with the General Plan’s emphasis upon increased regional commercial development and high-density residential development, it is inferred that the same 1.24 officers per 1000 residents would be required to maintain current response times and crime levels. Response times are currently nonconforming on Priority 1 and 2 calls with the 1989 General Plan.

On 9/17/05, The Times reported that three houses of prostitution were raided on N. Main Street and Creekside Drive. On 9/20/05, The Times reported that a pedestrian on Commercial Lane was robbed at gunpoint. While the public no longer has access to the daily police log, it is readily apparent that high density and commercial areas, particularly serving regional traffic, not only have higher incidence but more serious crime.

Non-owner occupied apartments have significantly higher crime rates than neighborhoods comprised of owner occupied single-family homes. In General Plan 2025, the former residency is promoted over less intensive land usage, which tends to encourage owner-occupied.

This high-density urban environment, with ever-increasing numbers of regional shoppers – as reflected in Sector 1 -- is what General Plan 2025 is all about. To conclude that crime in this built environment can be adequately described by the crime profile throughout Walnut Creek -- largely comprised of relatively rural single-family homes -- refutes the city’s own experience.

A credible EIR should attempt to accomplish its stated purpose -- evaluate the worse case scenario -- instead of fudging to promote the unrealistic best. In particular, the intense development of the Core Area should be assumed, at the very least, to carry crime levels consistent with Sector 1. Ideally, crime level data from Broadway and Creekside should be applied to all potential development.

The above may seem too harsh. It is not. While individual projects may not rise to Creekside or Broadway, the overall effect of pumping a lot of these developments into a relatively small area is to super-size the Creekside / Broadway experience. With density, comes synergism.

In conclusion, the public has the right to know:

What police staffing levels (and what cost) will be required to maintain service?
What crime levels could be expected -- particularly of the more serious variety found in Sector 1?
With projected increased congestion, what will be the effect on Priority 1 and 2 calls during peak traffic times, for different regions of the city?
In the EIR it states: “Service demand increases have occurred due to a variety of other reasons.” What are they and are they promoted through General Plan 2025?

Michael Frederick
71 Willow Ave.
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
Ph and Fax: 925-934-2494
SCHOOLS

San Ramon Valley Unified School District reports the obvious in the EIR, page 83: Multifamily residential units generate three to four times fewer students per household than single family residential.

Relative to the rest of Walnut Creek, the approximately 10,000 new residents will be without children or grandchildren in Walnut Creek. Many will live in more urban environments, less attractive to families – they will have few neighborhood children. It’s the difference between Stow Avenue and the Almond-Shuoy neighborhood – there has not been a child on Stow Avenue in 40 years, due to its urban setting.

The EIR, on the other hand, contends there is no generation rate difference between high-density urban development and single-family homes – it applies the existing 0.34 students per household to high-density urban development. It goes on to analyze the irrelevant need for additional school capacity, under this misguided assumption.

In a community that leans heavily upon school bond measures requiring a 2/3 majority, the infusion of high-density urban residents, constituting 15% of the population, would have tremendous negative consequence for Walnut Creek schools. School bond funding would probably become impossible.

This impact isn’t even touched upon. Does the city have a plan to make up for lost school bond money? Has the city publicly communicated to schools its commitment to financially indemnify the schools from this city-induced impact? As these bond measures typically pass by a razor-thin margin, when they do pass, the city has a responsibility to evaluate this environmental impact and address / mitigate it financially.

Michael Frederick
71 Willow Avenue
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
TRANSPORTATION

This section concludes the obvious, General Plan 2025 will gridlock the town.

Meaningful regional mitigation measures and plans need to be forthcoming. Expressing the need for “regional coordination” while accelerating local contributions to the problem does not mitigate or constitute a plan. There are no definitive mitigation measures presented that result in anything other than serious deterioration of an already acute problem.

How will the city address transportation? Continue to contend there’s nothing we can do about it, so let’s ignore and accelerate our contribution to the problem?

Michael Frederick
71 Willow Avenue
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
LETTER 20
Michael Frederick. 71 Willow Avenue, Walnut Creek, CA 94595. September 30, 2005.

20-1: See Response 14-1.

20-2: The EIR looks at all regions of the Planning Area including the Downtown Core, outlying residential neighborhoods and unincorporated areas. Service providers were contacted to discuss potential growth-related impacts in all of these areas and this is reflected in the EIR.

20-3: The EIR looks at physical changes in the environment, and so it does not need to address the comments and questions listed here. However, the City and Police Department will continue to closely monitor crimes and response times.


20-5: The commentor questions what other reasons that service demand is increased, other than annexation. Walnut Creek has experienced growth as an entertainment and cultural center and attracts more visitors than in the past. Increases in daytime or nighttime population can increase service demands and is not attributed to build out. The EIR also mentions increased commercial growth as another factor.

20-6: This comment states that the EIR has incorrectly applied a flat student generation rate of 0.34 students per household. The commentor suggests that a different generation rate should be used for higher density housing than is used for single family homes. The student generation rates are decided upon by the school districts and this EIR covers 5 districts. Each district has a different generation rate and one district does use a different rate for multi-family and single-family developments. No change to the EIR is necessary.

20-7: An EIR is prevented from addressing school funding by state law, and as such, a lack of school funding can not be considered an impact. No change is necessary.

20-8: Regional mitigation measures to address the impacts of regional growth require coordination with several agencies. The EIR identifies where the potential impacts of regional growth would occur as information for decision-making.

20-9: The transportation policies in the General Plan 2025 identify how the City will address transportation. Any actions on the part of the City to address the impacts of regional growth will require further coordination with other agencies.
Victoria Jackson:
From Al Loosli
120 La Bolsa Rd
Walnut Creek 94598

1) Chapter 1-9 Community work shops—A 24 foot banner
   announcing the work shop dates was hung at various high traffic
   locations.
   
   *There was only 1 banner & it was on Ygnacio east of
   Heather Farms.. Only small minority of Walnut Creek residents
   would see it there. Pleasant Hill uses large banners across several
   major intersections.*

2) Chapter 3   P. 3
   The # used 5343 units & 10,800 new residents are not in keeping
   with previous growth rates…

   *These numbers should be changed to 3500 & 6,600*

2) Chapter 4-2 pg. 51   ABAG predicts 15% growth per 20yrs
   Previous growth rate 10% per %20

   *This is our city & we can grow as we choose!!*

4) Chapter 4-3 fire service   numbers used 8,115 housing units in WC
   SOL and additional 16,418 people.

   *These numbers are way too big and much too fast a growth rate.
   We must reduce these numbers to 5400 & 11,000.*

5) Chapter 4-2 pg 60 “no numeric cap on new residential development”

   *We absolutely need a cap!*
LETTER 21
Al Loosli. 120 La Bolsa Road, Walnut Creek, CA 94598. September 30, 2005.

21-1: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

21-2: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

21-3: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

21-4: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

21-5: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.
Dear MS. Walker,

This letter is in comment to the published Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 EIR document. Please refer to the section titled “What is the General Plan” on page 20 for the specific bullet point descriptions which I am responding to.

My concerns are primarily about the changing nature of our City. Many of us, I think, feel that Walnut Creek is rapidly losing its essentially small town character. This is not only an aesthetic concern, but one concerning how we live together, how we socialize, and how we share and nurture ourselves and our neighbors as a community. This is a town where people develop friendships and nurture our families mostly in a casual way. Many of the friends we have developed we met at the farmers market, at our children’s sports and school events, arts and leisure activities, community meetings and a host of other casually accessible venues. This very accessibility is characteristically an enabler in supporting our ability to maintain a very humane community environment.

Seemingly small losses of community oriented businesses have already contributed to a significant compromise of this sensibility. Simon’s and Navlet’s are home and garden supply facilities which were not replaced locally. Whereas we may have met our neighbors and had casual conversations about our home projects, we now have to go out of our area to an impersonal big box retailer in another city. This is a loss not just of convenience, but of relationship of local businesses to their customers, and of those customer/citizen/neighbor-friends to a shared home oriented facility. I also remember meeting family and friends at Oakville market for lunch and buying truly quality prepared foods to bring home. I’m sorry to say that Andronico’s is not even close to replacing such a small and intimate quality family owned grocery-café. Perhaps no one sat down and thought about the impact that bringing in both Whole Foods and Andronico’s would have on Oakville’s business, but the reality of that is now history.

In order to support the desires and reinforce what the community of Walnut Creek actually wants, planning is going to have to include a comprehensive quality standard. The concern here is one of values and quality of life; concerns in which the members of this community must be continuously engaged. What is required is a vision for this community which places its residents in first place, and requires that investors in commercial property answer to those comprehensive standards; continuously.

Please place tools and methods in place in the General Plan which enable and give real impact to the process of community quality review. Build a citywide plan which elucidates a comprehensive cultural vision for this city; one which preserves the accessibility of shared use areas and seeks to preserve businesses serving the needs of our local residents. Please do not build density on the borders of the traditional downtown area. Preserve businesses such as Bonanza books, small special interest storefronts, and longstanding restaurants and cafes. We don’t want a dense, sanitized, retail optimized and inaccessible city. People are welcome here from outside the immediate area. Let them come and enjoy the same quality community sensibility which still survives, albeit tentatively.

With all due Sincerity and respect… Ron
LETTER 22
Ron Rose.  919 Wiget Lane, Walnut Creek, CA

22-1: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.
TO: CITY OF WALNUT CREEK

RE: General Plan 2025 DEIR

RESPONSE FROM CITIZEN

From: John White 60 Santa Rita Dr. W.C. 934-3962 E: johnwhite@esqatelinet

(on city's agend.

Sep 30-00)

Dear Planners:

First I apologize for this hand-written material (don't have a printer for my computer yet, and very short on time.)

My background: I lived in Walnut Creek since 1952 at 600 Santa Rita Dr. W.C. 94596 934-3962 (Yellowstone 4-3962),

attended schools: Grade 1-3 Walnut Heights (walked)

4-5 Old Central Walnut Creek School (on hill which was graded down in late 1960s (was Midcrest Manor) (Mt) sandstone (stone shingles)

(very few fossils)

5-6 Mt. View School (In San Ramon Creek)

7-8 Parkmead

9-12 Los Lomas H S

UC Berkeley BA 1964 (entire degree)

Complied 6 field trips to S. Mojave Desert, Nev.

US Army - Surgical Technician 1969-1971

Vietnam- 1968 MASH

1971-1973 - St. Mary's College & DVC since 1973

74-83 UC Davis Ph.D. Candidate Degree

91-93 Biotech, CSU Hayward

96-98 - grad student (MS Biology) almost finished

successful research with cancer cells but also HIV

Since 1999 I have had clinical level problems

with OCD (obsessive compulsive disorder)

Treated at VA Martinez since 1989 - managed to

live a relatively normal life. I write down everything

I see.
My Background cont'd:

1984 - present - lots of geology/paleo field work on my own in Walnut Creek area -
Jim Petty of the Army Corps Engineers allowed me to investigate construction of San Ramon Bypass Flood Control Channel 1986 - 1990, very interesting.
Vernal pools in newly recognized volcanic center.
Unfortunately still need to write these stuff up -
lots of photos -

Basically I'm an artist - watercolor, oil,
figure drawings, pen & ink - mostly watercolor.

"Unfortunately" also became "obsessed" with paleo-
and geology when I found scraggly Kittle (?)
Indian remains in San Ramon Creek in 1957 while
at UCSC Wood School (5th grade) whilst in
art class sketching outing.

Since I've lived in Walnut Creek and explored
much of geologically and have also attended
Planning Comm., Design Review, City Council meetings, it
I have a fairly thorough knowledge of the area.

While at UCSC worked up for profit being able to
Dynamic revision on DER.
DEAR COMMENTS:

4.6c Temperature

HWY 24/680 interchange is significantly disrupted (Calaveras Fault on both sides, probably surface break of Mt. Diablo Thrust Fault). Walnut Creek will be essentially shut down to commuters and normal shoppers. A 2-lane collector street is simply inadequate to compensate.

Quality of life has, in my opinion, steadily decreased since the 1960's (when I became a wayfarer). Besides the increase in traffic (driving on the core or almost like the inside of a large traffic donut) the proliferation of stop signs, traffic lights closed waits, etc., have made driving and a Walnut Creek a difficult process—one must make batches plans before going anywhere & I won't say it takes at least twice as much time now just spent in travel time.

Noise: I live on SE U, (750'E of LLHS) and a 60' wing on San Miguel Terrace. There is continuous noise from HWY 24 & 5, Broadway & city at large (when there is jack hammer or night coming from U. Fortunately the decibel levels are just bearable and delay windows & doors shut and the noise (except for the new bedroom or small room—

bathroom). Obviously any new development means increase in noise. I believe that interleaved noise has a stressful psychological impact on everyone—its one degree or another. I know that my mother (91) has difficulty with the noise and her health is part of current day life.
DEIR comments

4.4 Impediments

Managed for big clients on main roads - narrower, flatter curves, paved roads in what should be shoulder. No grading for big trucks.

4.5 Infrastructure -

We used to own garbage men with large bin who came into our property, dumped ours, and proceeded west by jetting across.

Now we have 3 bins - perhaps an advance for the environment overall but more work for less time.

CEC sanitation seems to be doing a good job.

4.6 Visual Quality has of course decreased, especially downtown. One must find certain corners on fifth places (oddly, parking garages are good for taking panoramic photos).

Also, virtually the growth of trees - we have tall redwood stands, but also blocked views.

Open spaces provide good views but are often difficult to access. I believe a number of public parks with open space.

I have become effective block...


4.7 Cultural Resources

Archaeological - The report is incomplete.

In 1957, by Monument School in San Ramon Creek at 26' depth, a deposit of fragments of moccasins and human remains - e.g., left maxilla, in typical stone ground and even keeping the fragments also the side of large mounds of clay on antelope.

And potter's mark. All that was pencil. Very early antiquity. All gone then. It seems he was justly a post-dead head not followed by care. That.

Also I heard from the City Engineer that burial along San Ramon Creek (border of Monument School ground) had been excavated in 1980.

4.7 p. 167 - Statement 3rd paragraph 1st clause should read something like: "The Planning Area undoubtedly contains still undiscovered archaeological material. And paleontological "sites" exist everywhere through rock exposed - especially the Marine piper Miocene (Mi) (Shell ridge) formation (previously eroded hill at Black Escalade). Present exists hill (n. 81' 1st) 1982. Escalade, Wy. Cave - 5 of 19th, Lizard, B." Treatment of these locations can vary according to type. Prehistoric - complete excavation. Paleontological: mostly sampling and careful observation during construction for occasionally found fossils (ventralis obesus) especially in alluvial deposits.

Also found shells. Cool to find in a dry joint of ground. Some shells Alma Ave Park deadlift.

Also, most of the antelope - the remains in the white clavate and darkly (white) cleavage. (Left these, photo). Could see more - I had time.
DEAR commuting

Gully 4  Seismic Hazards

(p.17) Northern extension of Calaveras has clearly been active over last 50,000 yrs and -> 2 Myr
See my map re camp area

Note change in course (to the S) of Los Trampas creek and higher ground to the E of this roughly underlain by Mio sandstone.

Jutting course (E 10,000yrs) of Los Trampas vs to the north and left high ground and southern core area covered with lower alluvium (Pleist) - fossils found here previously noted. Also sandstone or Eocene (trapped a photo or is 1290's)
Also contemporaneous material for possible C14 dating.

This movement is most likely the result of the Mt Diablo Thrust fault which is raising the ground to the E of the Calaveras Los Trampas fault system.

I believe that this Calaveras & related faults system needs more study. It has been under neglected by geologists. The Mt Diablo Thrust fault has only been recognized over the last 15 years (Mt Diablo is 7-2cm per yearly) - unusual.

I think that the propensity for liquefaction in the area and hilly areas has long been somewhat exaggerated. Certain areas may locally landslide or steep hilly slopes - but if the bedrock, steps into the hillside and becomes the problem, which often the case but needs local evaluation.

The Southern part of the core area N to Olympic W of Broadway & E of Caliform Ave is indeed subject to liquefaction - and therefore since the alluvial deposits are not too deep (< 10-20') these problems can be dug out
DEIR comments

1.8 cont...

- For underground parking garages, the appropriate CEQA guidelines should regularly be followed, since this is likely where underground siting will occur (i.e., close to creeks).

- The San Ramon Creek runs primarily through moderately indurated marine sandstone (Mn) and mudstone along the creek should be preserved. Also remove excess vegetation - Erosion channel has allowed buildup of vegetation along middle San Ramon Creek.

However around the confluence of S.R., Las Vegas, and Fire Creeks there is a lot of loose soil and I think seismic upgrading beneath Broadway Plaza is needed. I've noticed in general that there is no subsoil layer, but just top soil right on top of bedrock (hard as ice) hence allowed landslides are restricted to gullies pretty much.

4.10 Hydrogeology

0.97: I believe the tsunami history public should be reassessed, since by 1850, 1853, and 1855 caused back-up flood along creek.

Also Ygnacio Valley area probably more prone to fires as well as life for fire...
4.11 Biological Reserve

We should keep in mind that this is a semi-arid area. The developed city residential parts have a lot of vegetation. Thanks for EBMUD.
LETTER 23
John White. 60 Santa Rita Drive, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. September 30, 2005.

23-1: This comment suggests that if the Hwy 24/680 Interchange is significantly disrupted, perhaps by an earthquake, the arterials and collector streets would be inadequate. It is correct to assume that there is not the capacity on the arterial and collector streets in Walnut Creek to provide an alternative to the interchange, as demonstrated by the roadway LOS analysis. This means that the hours of congestion would increase and motorists would likely seek alternative modes or travel time periods. However, the purpose of the Draft EIR is to evaluate average weekday conditions for traffic. Walnut Creek also has emergency response plans that would help to alleviate problems caused by an earthquake or other disaster. Therefore, no change to the text is necessary.

23-2: This comment says that quality of life has significantly decreased, and on example is that it takes twice as long as it used to cross town because of all the stop signs, traffic lights and traffic. This comment does not regard the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

23-3: This comment suggests that the high level of background noise in Walnut Creek, predominantly from traffic and construction, has a stressful psychological impact, particularly on the elderly. The City is attempting to mitigate noise through city-wide initiatives and project-specific mitigation measures, which are explained in the EIR on page 263. Safety and Noise Policy 9.2, Action 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 would strive to reduce traffic noise levels. In addition, Mitigation Measure NOI-4 lists procedures to reduce construction noise.

23-4: This comment says that it is unsafe for big trucks on many roads because they are narrow, have blind curves, and parked cars on shoulders where they should not be. Because it is not clear on which roads these conditions apply, a detailed response cannot be provided. The comment is noted.

23-5: This comment notes that there are now three bins for solid waste disposal and that CCC Sanitation is doing a good job. Comment is noted and appreciated; no response is required.

23-6: This comment says that visual quality has decreased, particularly downtown. This comment does not regard the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

23-7: This comment says that Open Spaces provide good views but are difficult to access and that “public prescriptive right-of-ways” have become blocked. This comment does not regard the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required. However, this had been brought to the attention of the Parks and Recreation Department.

23-8: This comment says that the archaeological report is incomplete because it omits a find of human remains that the author made in 1957 by Murwood School, as well as a burial that may have been excavated circa 1980 also near that school. The EIR is based on a records search conducted at the Northwest Information Center. If finds have not been recorded they are not included in this EIR and do not change the adequacy of the EIR.

23-9: This comment says that page 167 3rd paragraph should read “The Planning Area undoubtedly contains still undiscovered archaeological material.” The current wording is sufficient and no change is necessary.

23-10: This comment says that treatment of these locations can vary considerably ac-
cording to the type of site: archaeological sites need complete scientific excavation while paleontological sites need mostly sampling, and constant observation during construction. Goal 24 of the General Plan outlines how archaeological sites would be handled and the EIR has ascertained that the approach is a responsible and complete one. This approach would include excavation and observation where appropriate. No change is necessary.

23-11: This comment gives examples of the commentors finds, and says that one was deliberately destroyed by a developer. This comment does not regard the adequacy of the EIR and therefore no response is required.

23-12: This comment says that the northern extension of the Calaveras fault has been active over the last 50,000 years and says that it needs more study. While this comment is welcomed, the EIR relies on published studies and the geo-technical report prepared for the General Plan Update process by Parikh Consultants, Inc in 2004.

23-13: This comment says that the propensity for liquefaction in the core and hilly areas has been somewhat exaggerated and needs local evaluation. Because the EIR study errs on the side of caution, no change in text is warranted.

23-14: This notes that the southern part of the core area is indeed subject to liquefaction, but can be dug out for underground parking garages. Comment noted.

23-15: This notes that the appropriate CEQA guidelines for archaeological finds should be adhered to in the core area since that is likely where finds will occur since it is near the creeks. Comment noted, no response is necessary.

23-16: This says that San Ramon Creek should be preserved and excess vegetation should be removed from the Bypass Channel and San Ramon Creek. Comment noted, no response is necessary.

23-17: The commentor suggests that seismic upgrading is needed beneath Broadway Plaza. While this comment is welcomed, the EIR relies on published studies and the geo-technical report prepared for the General Plan Update process by Parikh Consultants, Inc in 2004.

23-18: This comment notes that alluvial landslides are pretty much limited to gulleys. Comment noted, no response is necessary.

23-19: This comment says that the tsunami flooding patterns should be re-analyzed since Bay Area earthquakes could cause back up flooding in creeks. The Ygnacio Valley area would be more prone to both this and to liquefaction. Comment noted. An earthquake could produce flooding effects, but not those associated with tsunamis. Flooding of creeks is discussed extensively in the EIR.

23-20: Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation Trigger/Timing</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Action/Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mitigation Measure TRAF-1: Regional coordination would be required to address the congestion along the freeway. The General Plan 2025 includes policies that support the goal of reducing the increase in congestion of regional facilities:  
- Chapter 5, Policy 1.1. Working with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Caltrans, and other jurisdictions, develop and implement regional solutions to local traffic problems created by growth outside of the city.  
- Chapter 5, Policy 1.2. Support efforts to obtain funding for improvements to Highway 4 and other existing roads that provide a bypass for traffic passing through Walnut Creek. | Community Development Department | Approval of General Plan 2025 | Community Development Department | Ongoing |
<p>| Mitigation Measure TRAF-2: Roadway widening to provide additional capacity would improve the level of service; however, the downtown Core Area is primarily built out with little opportunity to widen the roadways. Rather any improvements would consider operations and management for improve efficiency of the existing roadway system as well as opportunities to improve the pedestrian-oriented nature of the Core Area. The General Plan 2025 includes policies that support and/or enhance carpooling, transit, bicycling, and walking that would provide an alternative to reduce some of these auto trips. | Public Services Department and Community Development Department | Approval of General Plan 2025 | Community Development Department | Ongoing |
| Mitigation Measure TRAF-3: Ygnacio Valley Road and Treat Boulevard are regional transportation facilities. The City of Walnut Creek will continue working with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Com- | Community Development Department and Public Services | Approval of General Plan 2025 | Community Development Department | Ongoing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Public Services Department</th>
<th>Approval of General Plan 2025</th>
<th>Community Development Department</th>
<th>Ongoing Action/Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure TRAF-3 (continued):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission, Caltrans, and other jurisdictions to develop and implement regional solutions to local traffic problems created by growth outside the city (Chapter 5, Policy 1.1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City has been responsible for the metering of the morning peak period westbound traffic entering the city at Oak Grove Road as part of the regional traffic signal system along Kirker Pass/Ygnacio Valley Road. Similar treatments should be considered for Treat Boulevard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure TRAF-4: The opportunities to improve these intersections are limited due primarily to right-of-way constraints as well as the desire to maintain the pedestrian-oriented nature of the Core Area. The policies of the General Plan 2025 support alternative modes to the automobile that may reduce the traffic congestion. However, this would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An eastbound left-turn lane was constructed and completed in 2005 at Oak Grove Rd and Mitchell Drive/Peachwillow Ln, which will improve the LOS to E (0.96), which is still below the LOS standard and considered a significant impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Olympic Blvd and NB I-680 On/Off ramps, the heavy northbound traffic from the off-ramp is a critical movement with significant volumes coming off the ramp then continuing through the intersection to get back onto I-680. The westbound right-turn movement to access the on-ramp is also a critical movement. The City could prohibit NB off-ramp through drivers destined for the opposite NB on-ramp (during peak period only or all times) to make that through movement. The City shall also investigate modification of the NB on-ramp and WB/NB right-turn to allow continuous right-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | | Verify construction of new turn lane at Mitchell/ Peachwillow

Conduct an operational analysis to evaluate modification options for NB off- and on-ramps
turns to improve operations of the intersection, but this would require an operations analysis and need to account for the bike lane along Olympic and possible right-of-way constraints at the corner. These mitigations would result in LOS E (v/c: 0.93) during the AM peak hour, but would still be at LOS F during the PM peak hour for the General Plan 2025 Buildout condition. Because the mitigation would not reduce the LOS to an acceptable level, this is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

### AIR QUALITY

**Mitigation Measure AIR-2:** The City should add the following wording to Chapter 4 Built Environment Action 30.3.4: “Interstate 680 and Highway 24 are sources of air toxic contaminants. Projects that locate new sensitive receptors (facilities or land uses such as hospitals, day care centers, schools and residences that are occupied for substantial amounts of time by members of the population particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly and people with illnesses) proposed within 500 feet from the edge of the closest traffic lane of Interstate 680 or Highway 24 should include an analysis of mobile source toxic air contaminant health risks, based on appropriate air dispersion modeling. Project review should include an evaluation of the adequacy of the setback from the highway and, if necessary, identify design mitigation measures to reduce health risks to acceptable levels.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation Trigger/Timing</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Action/Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR-2</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Add text prior to approval of General Plan 2025</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Verify text is added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Location of sensitive receptors within 500' of 680/24 Environmental review/prior to project approval</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Evaluation of setback from highway and identification of mitigations for subject projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure AIR-3:** The City should amend Chapter 4 Built Environment Action 30.3.1 to read as follows: “require construction emissions control measures recommended by the BAAQMD.”

A list of feasible control measures that the BAAQMD currently recommends for construction
Mitigation Measure AIR-3 (continued):

projects is provided below. Appropriate measures should be implemented at all construction projects in Walnut Creek. Implementation of these measures would reduce air pollutant emissions associated with construction activities to a less-than-significant level.

For all construction projects:

- Sprinkle water on all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often when conditions warrant.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

For construction sites greater than 4 acres in size:

- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
For construction sites that are located adjacent to sensitive receptors or warrant additional controls:

- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Suspend grading activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph) and visible dust clouds cannot be prevented from extending beyond active construction areas.
- Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time.

Exhaust emissions controls for large projects (greater than 4 acres or projects located within 100 feet of sensitive receptors):

- At least 50 percent of the heavy-duty, off-road equipment used for construction should be CARB-certified off-road engines or equivalent, or use alternative fuels (such as biodiesel) that result in lower particulate emissions.
- Properly maintain all construction equipment.
- The contractor should install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
- Diesel equipment standing idle for more than two minutes should be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on site.
- Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation Trigger/Timing</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitoring Action/Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure AIR-4:</strong> As stated in Chapter 4 Built Environment Action 30.3.2, the City should consider adopting a wood smoke ordinance for fireplaces or woodstoves consistent with the BAAQMD model wood smoke ordinance, or alternatively, consider requiring that all new residential development include fireplaces and wood stoves that are EPA certified wood-burning appliances, pellet-fueled stoves or natural gas fireplaces.</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Approval of General Plan 2025</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Verify Ordinance is considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-1:</strong> Chapter 6 Safety and Noise Policy 9.1 and Action 9.1.1 would control the impacts of new commercial and residential noise sources on the existing environment.</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Approval of General Plan 2025</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Noise Policy 9.2, Action 9.2.1, and 9.2.2 would strive to reduce traffic noise levels through the installation of noise control measures such as quiet pavement surfaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-2:</strong> Chapter 6 Safety and Noise Policy 8.1 and Actions 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 would establish exterior noise level standards for new residences proposed in noisy areas. Chapter 6, Policy 8.2 addresses urban noise conflicts. Chapter 6, Actions 8.2.3 and 8.2.4 specify interior standards to control average and maximum noise levels.</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Approval of General Plan 2025</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Ongoing evaluation and approval of building plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-3:</strong> Vibration impacts should be mitigated through site design and buffers between BART and new residential development. Residential uses proposed as a part of Change Area 13 within 150 feet of BART should include a vibration study to show that vibration levels do not exceed the FTA criteria.</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Location of residential areas within 150' of BART Environmental Review/prior to project approval</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
<td>Evaluation of vibration study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure | Party Responsible for Implementation | Implementation Trigger/Timing | Party Responsible for Monitoring | Monitoring Action/Frequency
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
NOI-4: City’s Municipal Code, Title 4, Article 2, addresses excessive, unreasonable, and prolonged noise; including building construction and repair. Standard measures to minimize construction noise impacts could include the following quiet construction methods:

(a) Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

(b) Locate stationary noise generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area.

(c) Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

(d) When necessary, temporary noise control blanket barriers should shroud pile drivers or be erected in a manner to shield the adjacent land uses. Such noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected.

(e) Foundation pile holes should be pre-drilled to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile. The pre-drilling of foundation pile holes is a standard construction noise control technique. Pre-drilling reduces the number of blows required to seat the pile.

(f) Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the
Mitigation Measure NOI-4 (continued):

- disturbance coordinator at the construction site
- and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.