

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
Adam Foster Contra Costa/Walnut Creek resident adamwfooster@gmail.com	9/23/2015 9:30 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept 4 to be inadequate for a transit village/livable community • Wide roadways that encourage high-speed vehicle movements are not welcoming to families biking • Concept 1B is an excellent long-range plan for the area. It will encourage people to bike for trips to and from the transit village by safely connecting the Iron Horse trail to N. Main Street • Please consider the lasting negative long-term impacts that would come from continuing to prioritize vehicles in a transit village (Concept 4) and implement Concept 1B.
Ronald Kappesser kappesser@icloud.com	9/23/2015 10:24 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disappointed to read of the plan to paint sharrows on Treat Blvd • Concept 2, which includes bike lanes of a proven design is far safer, will do more to encourage cycling and is no worse than your preferred concept 3 based on your own traffic analysis
Erik Owens er.kowens@gmail.com	9/25/2015 2:03 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should add protected bike lanes at Treat
Tom Willging twillgin@gmail.com	9/25/2015 4:35 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat "BikePed" plan mostly discourages people from using bicycles, walking, or using public transportation to get to the Pleasant Hill BART station • 8 lanes for motor vehicles and has only space for a shared sidewalk for cyclists and pedestrians seems destined to continue to promote the automobile • support for Option 1B and 2
Anita Bottari anitabottari@sbcglobal.net	9/25/2015 5:43 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intersection at Treat and Buskirk looks very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclist • needed some kind of warning light that pedestrians are present and waiting to cross • light can be triggered by a pedestrian much like the one on Jones in front of the Pleasant Hill Bart station • Please consider putting in a blinking like to show pedestrians are present and to give them the right of way

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
Sally Goodman ssdgoodman@gmail.com	9/28/2015 9:44 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please accept Bike East Bay's suggestions for separating pedestrians and bikes from traffic and each other
Dave Campbell Advocacy Director Bike East Bay dave.campbell62@gmail.com dave@bikeeastbay.org	9/28/2015 10:38 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • smoothing traffic flow is high on the minds of voters, and keeping 9 travel lanes for cars is one way to do that, but disregarding the safety of residents walking and bicycling does not poll well • We want the road diet with bike lanes • traffic study assumed an increased in traffic for the forecast year of 2040, yet one scenario we are asking be modeled for a Measure J reauthorization is a reduction in vehicle miles traveled • road diet options (1B and 2) should be the recommended options in the Plan • What we want: Separated Bike Lanes • Concepts 1B and 2 from the Plan both propose converting a travel lane in each direction to separated bike lanes (buffered bike lanes along the curb, in the Plan), which is a great idea • Concept 2 partially separates bicyclists from motor vehicles with curbs and islands; oth of these are needed features for the safety of residents bicycling • A further shortcoming of this Plan is that it completely fails to study bus service improvements • The Plan should also show more clearly what are the traffic impacts of options 1B and 2 (a road diet with bike lanes) to a resident driving along Treat Blvd. What will be the additional delay, if any, for this resident when traveling from Main St to Jones Rd? • Plan should summarize the public input to date. What has the public been saying about the types of improvements they want on Treat Blvd? • Plan should include a summary of these nearby related projects and if possible, talk about how they could improve traffic flow and still allow for a road diet with bike lanes on Treat Blvd. At a minimum, the public should have information about what level of traffic on Treat Blvd would allow for the road diet option, and what are the tools and additional projects necessary to achieve the road diet.

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
Kenji Yamada Lead Advocacy Organizer Bike Concord kenji@bikeconcord.org 925.338.1562	9/28/2015 9:44 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety need for dedicated bicycle space without interruption. Nothing less than this is acceptable • Concepts 3 and 4 fail this standard by providing no space separated from motor traffic for eastbound bicycle traffic between Oak Rd and Jones Rd • Concept 2 is better, but provides an uncomfortable and somewhat unsafe experience for both pedestrians and bicyclists by obliging them to share the same right-of-way westward from Oak Rd • Concept 1B is a good treatment whose only shortcoming is the absence of a sidewalk along the south side of the street. We urge the County to choose this concept • ***Also submitted a 108 signature petition on 10/9/15***
Lauren Bayly lbayly62@gmail.com	9/29/2015 10:29 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add a bike lane on Treat Blvd • stretch from the intersection at north main going over the overpass. The sidewalk is very narrow and pedestrians don't really appreciate having to share with a bike and the drivers make it too difficult to share the road with them
Phil Williamson phillipjw@comcast.net	9/29/2015 11:30 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bike plan for Treat Blvd. should conform with Complete Streets guidelines to the max extent possible and ideally include separated bike lanes on each side of Treat with direct and protected access to bart's heavily used bike parking areas
Caedmon Bear Walnut Creek Resident caedmon.bear@gmail.com	9/29/2015 7:55 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reconsider concept 1B or something that is safer and encouraging to bikes and pedestrians • please do whatever you can to remove "sharrows" from all plans • Examples of where this doesn't work is Newell westbound from Broadway to California as well as on California in both directions
Dan Leaverton Berkeley, CA daniel.leaverton@gmail.com	9/29/2015 9:23 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support the plans advocated by Bike East Bay and Bike Walnut Creek. Please encourage more walking and cycling by provide the safest means possible

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
Roger Graves Resident of Pleasant Hill rogergraves@gmail.com	9/30/2015 1:01 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> wanted to respectfully request your consideration to go with a dedicated bike lane option
Nick Lindsey nicklindsey100@gmail.com	9/30/2015 5:17 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm a daily commuter, so is my wife. Please build now, as well as prepare for the future (in a smarter and sane way)
Quan fellowohboy@yahoo.com	9/30/2015 10:12 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I commute via bike to Contra Costa Centre for work every day and would find a dedicated bike lane very useful
John McKeon jmckeon@me.com	10/1/2015 7:31 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please reconsider your stance on protected bike lanes in this project proposal
Matt Rosenthal Walnut Creek Resident matt.rosenthal@gmail.com	10/2/2015 9:54 AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think there are plenty of bike trails and it's not an efficient use of important roadway to put in a bike lane when the canal trail and iron horse trails already exist

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
<p>Bike Walnut Creek bikewalnutcreek@gmail.com</p>	<p>10/2/2015 12:25 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have serious concerns that input from bicyclists and current multimodal transportation studies was not integrated into the plan • Although the combined plan (Concept 4) attempts to balance the needs of a variety of transportation users, the outcome is that it priorities road space for motor vehicle traffic • Shared Use Paths are not “Very Significant Positive” for many pedestrians, especially compared to separated sidewalks • “Bicycle Experience” in Concept 4 is ranked as “Significant Positive” which is an unrealistic measure considering that the recommendation is for bicyclists to either share space with pedestrians or motorists • any plan with sharrows should rank “Bicycle Experience” as “Negative” and at the very least, less than “Driver Experience” • Bike Walnut Creek performs twice annual bike counts and found that on Newell Avenue, which has sharrows, over 30% of bicyclists ride on the sidewalk • Compared to the volume of bicyclists on Walnut Creek’s EBRP separated trails, the amount of bicyclists using sharrows is paltry, indicating that the majority of Walnut Creek transportation users do not find sharing a lane with motorists a comfortable experience; It is clear that feedback from the local bicycling community was not integrated into the plan • As with Bike Concord and Bike East Bay, we will stand behind a plan which ranks both pedestrian and bicyclist experience as “very significant positive”. No option was created that have these, despite the title of the plan
<p>Erin Elder Pleasant Hill Resident elder.reategui@gmail.com</p>	<p>10/2/2015 1:23 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • writing today to voice my support for a separate bike lane on Treat Blvd. between Jones St. and Main St

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
<p>Kristin Tennessen Walnut Creek Resident ktenness@gmail.com</p>	<p>10/2/2015 9:17 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your recommended Concept 4 (combined concept) proposes street treatments that disregard Complete Streets policies endorsed by our local cities, defy recommendations from the NACTO guidelines, go against modern transportation trends, and contradict with goals in your own document's summary • By recommending a plan that creates no protected bikeway, which separates bicyclists from other transportation users, you ignite conflict between peds/bicyclists and bicyclists/motorists; This does not create a safe experience for vulnerable road users • The NACTO 7 guidelines state "On streets with posted 35 mph speeds or faster and motor vehicle volumes higher than 3,000 vpd shared lane markings are not a preferred treatment." Traffic volumes on Treat are 48,000 vpd, which is 16 times higher than the recommended NACTO limit. Furthermore "Shared lane markings should not be considered a substitute for bike lanes, cycle tracks, or other separation treatments where these types of facilities are otherwise warranted or space permits." • Without recommending an implementation that scores "very significant positive" for pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus riders, you are wasting tax payer money by encouraging automobile use for the vast majority of residents • If you continue to recommend Concept 4, I suggest you amend your title to "Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan That Priorities Vehicle Movement Over Human being Quality Of Life."
<p>Matt Dussing dussing@gmail.com</p>	<p>10/4/2015 10:47 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please choose a concept for the Treat Blvd / I-680 plan which separates bicycle traffic from pedestrian traffic, and both from motor traffic, along the entire street span in both directions • bicycles need a dedicated and convenient path separate from cars and pedestrians in both directions between Main St and Pleasant Hill BART • riding a bicycle on a busy mixed use sidewalk doesn't work • If indeed it is determined only a 12 ft shared use path is possible, it would be best if 3 lanes for 2-way bike and then a pedestrian lane could be delineated. This would be similar to the bike path in Fort Mason • Also, no trees in the path! Don't follow Walnut Creek's very poor design along Ygnacio Valley Rd which is exceedingly frustrating to ride along

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
<p>Katelyn Walker walker.katelyn@gmail.com</p>	<p>Oct 7, 2015 at 1:36 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before you continue with your proposal for a "shared path", I would strongly encourage you to go observe how well the "shared sidewalk" idea is working on Ygnacio Valley Road – a half hour during peak commute hours (7 to 8 am or 5:30 to 6:30 pm) will give you a good idea of what it's like out there • Pedestrian comfort and perception of safety will be very negatively impacted if they are forced to share a sidewalk with bicycles • bicycle experience will be negatively impacted by sharing a sidewalk with pedestrians • pedestrians often walk in the middle of the path or weave back and forth as they read their phones, and if they have earphones in or there is oncoming traffic on the path they can be nearly impossible to get around • Having bicyclists travel the wrong way on a shared path (eastbound on the north side of the road) is flat out dangerous • Phase 2 doesn't make much sense – why would you take bicycles and pedestrians off their dedicated "shared path" and make them cross Oak at a busy intersection where wait times to cross are likely longer and the danger of accidents due to right turns is greater? Phase 2 seems like a worse situation than Phase 1 • Putting sharrows on a busy road like Treat Blvd is dangerous, inconsiderate, and short-sighted

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
<p>Greg Currey Caltrans Pedestrian and Bicycle Coordination and Planning Gregory.Currey@dot.ca.gov 510-286-5623</p>	<p>10/9/2015 2:30 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept 4 (the preferred concept) does not provide meaningful improvements for bicyclists along all portions of the study area. The highest number of recorded bicycle-related collisions is at the intersection of Treat Boulevard and Jones Road, where only a westbound Class III bike route, with no eastbound bicycle facility, would be provided • Oak Road to Jones Road—among the reasons listed for not improving the eastbound roadway was that “bicyclists should be encouraged to use the shared-use path on the north side of the road.” However, the Plan shows that the extent of the shared-use path will be outside of this segment • Although the high number of bicyclists observed traveling westbound along Treat Boulevard, but not continuing past Jones Road, could be due to the key access point for the Iron Horse Trail, it could also indicate that this section of Treat Boulevard serves as a barrier to bicyclists due to the high speeds, roadway width, and lack of bicycle infrastructure • At Treat Boulevard and Buskirk Avenue, the 13’ median should be reconstructed to extend through the crosswalk with either a pedestrian passageway channeled through the median, or curb ramps with a level area of at least 48 inches long between the curb ramps • the existing sidewalk on the north side of Treat Boulevard will be converted to a shared-use path, introducing the potential for increased conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists without offering significant improvements for pedestrians in this segment such as widening the existing facility and providing markings to separate travel • Concept 4, Mitigation Measure 2: This measure would remove the existing crosswalk on the west side of the Oak Road/Treat Boulevard intersection, and would not add a bike pocket to southbound Oak Road. While the multiple-threat scenario caused by the two right-turn lanes should be avoided as noted in the Plan, removing an existing crosswalk should also be avoided • Concept 4, Mitigation Measure 3: This measure would not include a bike pocket. Per HDM Section 403.6 (1) advisory standard, “locations with right-turn-only lanes should provide a minimum 4-foot width for bicycle use between the right turn and through lane where bikes are permitted.” Also note this standard when removing slip lanes to place right-turn-only lanes adjacent to through lanes as part of the Plan

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
<p>Bruce "Ole" Ohlson bruceoleohlson@hotmail.com Bike East Bay Delta Pedalers Bicycle Club Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee CCTA Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee</p>	<p>10/9/2015 10:30 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construct sidewalks on each side of the street that extend from at least North Main Street to at least the base of the Iron Horse Trail over-crossing. These sidewalks must be on both sides of the street. The sidewalks must be fully ten-feet wide and must have at least seven-feet clear (without fire hydrants, sign posts, bus benches, bus shelters, etc.) • bicycle facility must be continuous from one end to the other. We should be sure that the curb cuts are designed to accommodate the normal pace of a cautiously ridden bicycle. This is somewhat faster than the 2.5 mph design standard for pedestrians. The curb cuts should be parallel with the direction in which the bicycle is moving (i.e., not on the point of the corner and not set back far around the curve on the side street) • must also make sure that that the entities through which this sidewalk bike path passes allow bicyclists to legally use these sidewalks • I appreciate my bicycle-advocate colleague's desires to see this street put on a road diet and buffered bike lanes included; that is my preferred outcome, too. However, I don't see that happening given the attitudes of our elected officials and their directions to staff

Commenter/Organization	Date Received	Summary of Comments
<p>Grant Gerlach Walnut Creek Resident grantgerlach@gmail.com</p>	<p>10/9/2015 11:27 PM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The north/south connectivity along the Iron horse trail is excellent but East/West travel is unpleasant along Treat Blvd due the freeway like setting with 9 lanes of traffic moving at high speeds and very long wait time to cross the street • I am most interested in options 1B and 2 and would like to see this listed as the preferred options • Both option 1B and 2 provide adequate space for walking and biking along this corridor leaving enough traffic lanes to support current vehicle load with a reasonable amount of delay • Options including Sharrows along this stretch of road is very dangerous due to the high vehicular speeds and likelihood for drivers to weave around cyclist is a very unpleasant experience • forcing cyclist and pedestrians on a single shared use path causes friction and is not a good design considering the different speeds that bikes and peds travel • I am interested to know why Bus service was not discussed in this plan as it goes to hand in hand with ped travel • A road diet along this stretch of roadway is the only way to achieve the aspirations behind making this corridor a more livable area