



22 ORINDA WAY, ORINDA, CA 94563

Communications Received from Public

MARCH 6, 2023 LPMC MEETING

ITEM 6.a-Lamorinda Action Plan Update

Name	Pages
Revision for Lamorinda Action plan	1

From: Stella W <swotherspoon@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 3, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Gerring, Teresa; Candell, Susan; pgoalier@ci.lafayette.ca.us; Sivakumar Natarajan
Subject: Revision for Lamorinda Action Plan

Dear Lamorinda Program Management Committee Policy Board and TAC,

I request that the language on page 66, 70 & 106 in the Lamorinda Action Plan February 2023 draft that describes the LOS Standard for Pleasant Hill Road be made more specific for clarity.

At present the text is, "...no LOS standards for downtowns, key school sites, or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs), except on Pleasant Hill Road strive to maintain **current** LOS"

My concern is that "current" is not defined. Is this the current delay at the adoption of the Plan? Is it the current delay when one references the Plan in the future? What is the actual value for "current" delay in seconds, V/C, and LOS? I think for clarity, the Plan should reference either the seconds or V/C as these are higher precision than the broad classes in the LOS reference table.

Another concern is that If the Plan states "strive to maintain current LOS", but the current LOS is F. LOS F is defined as > 80.0 seconds, or without limit. Does this text mean that if the delay increases to, say, 300 seconds - still LOS F, that the RTO is met? This is not the intent of the revision to this RTO. The most recent traffic study I have seen, Pleasant Hill Road Multi-use Pathway Concept Design Study, states the LOS for the intersection of Pleasant Hill Road and Deer Hill/Stanley Blvd. in the PM Peak Hour is 82.2 seconds, V/C 1.03, and LOS "F". Is there another reference for the current actual value - perhaps the CCTA travel model or monitoring data from the intersection?

My suggestion to improve the clarity of this RTO description is to determine the actual "current" delay and describe it in seconds or V/C in the Plan.

Last, I ask that all references (e.g., p 153) to the "previously used performance targets" are revised so they do not say, "Side Street Delay, no LOS rating." This is inaccurate, as the current Action Plan defines the MTSO of Low D for Pleasant Hill Rd.

Thanks for your consideration of this request.

Best,

Stella Wotherspoon