



March 31, 2016

Bob Burke
Greenheart Land Company
1777 Oakland Blvd, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, California

Subject: Trip Generation Comparison between the El Camino Real / Downtown Specific Plan EIR and the 1300 El Camino Real Greenheart Project DEIR

Dear Bob:

This letter summarizes the results of our review of the trip generation assumptions used in the El Camino Real / Downtown Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) compared to the assumptions used in the 1300 El Camino Real Greenheart Project Draft Infill EIR. Fehr & Peers prepared the traffic impact analysis (TIA) for the ECR/Downtown Specific Plan EIR that was certified in June 2012. At the time that the ECR/Downtown Specific Plan TIA was prepared, there were existing proposals and environmental documents for both the Derry Lane and 1300 El Camino Real properties. As known approved / pending projects, the traffic added by these projects were included in the cumulative analysis of the ECR/Downtown planning area. The attached table summarizes the trip generation assumed for the original projects in the ECR/Downtown Specific Plan TIA as well as the trip generation for the current 1300 El Camino Real Greenheart proposal. The trip generation came from the trip generation tables included in the environmental documents prepared by other consultants for each project.

The last line for each project (*in italics*) shows the net new trips assumed in the TIA prepared for each project. The net new trips represent the trips added by each project to the roadway network that was used in the evaluation of the intersection and roadway operations. The comparison at the bottom of the table shows that the proposed Greenheart project will generate substantially less traffic on a daily basis (-2,718 trips) than what was originally assumed in the ECR/Downtown Specific Plan TIA. In addition, the proposed project will generate less traffic in the evening peak hour (-126 trips). There is a slight increase in trips during the morning peak hour (80 trips); however, this level of increased trips would have been offset by the 1% per year growth factor assumed in addition to the known projects in the ECR/Downtown Specific Plan analysis.

Overall the proposed Greenheart project has a reduced level of impact on the transportation network than the uses originally assumed in the ECR/Downtown Specific Plan EIR.

Please feel free to call me, if you have any questions on the information provided.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Eckols, P.E.
Senior Associate

Trip Generation Summary and Comparison
Downtown Specific Plan EIR versus Proposed 1300 ECR Greenheart Project DEIR

Proposed Use	Size	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total
1300 El Camino Real - March 2009								
Office	58,700 s.f.	646	80	11	91	15	72	87
Grocery Store minus pass-by	51,365 s.f.	5,251	87	80	167	245	158	403
<i>Net New Trips</i>		5,897	167	91	258	260	230	490
Derry Project - March 2008								
Residential	135 d.u.	791	10	50	60	48	23	71
Commercial minus pass by	17,025 s.f.	639	11	7	18	24	26	50
Office	1,500 s.f.	17	2	0	2	0	2	2
Medical-Dental Office	4,000 s.f.	145	8	2	10	4	11	15
Existing Uses	Counts	(1,031)	(24)	(19)	(43)	(46)	(52)	(98)
<i>Net New Trips</i>		561	7	39	46	28	9	37
1300 ECR Greenheart Project - February 2016								
Apartment	202 d.u.	1,348	21	82	103	84	45	129
General Office	199,300 s.f.	2,129	280	38	318	49	241	290
Shopping Center minus pass by	29,000 s.f.	2,495	40	20	60	101	113	214
Internal Capture/Transit Reduction		(1,457)	(52)	(39)	(91)	(80)	(99)	(179)
Existing Uses	Observations	(775)	(3)	(3)	(6)	(28)	(25)	(53)
<i>Net New Trips</i>		3,740	286	98	384	126	275	401
Comparison								
ECR / Downtown Specific Plan EIR (both projects)		6,458	174	130	304	288	239	527
Change in trip generation with New Uses		(2,718)	112	(32)	80	(162)	36	(126)