City of Walnut Creek Sustainability Action Plan CEQA Document: Addendum to the Walnut Creek General Plan Environmental Impact Report

City of Walnut Creek

SCH No. 2004022042

Prepared for:

City of Walnut Creek
Contact: Emlyn Struthers, Administrative Analyst II
City of Walnut Creek
Public Works
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, California 94596
(925) 256-3536
struthers@walnut-creek.org

Prepared by:

PlaceWorks
Contact: Terri McCracken, Associate Principal
2040 Bancroft Way, Suite 400
Berkeley, California 94709
(510) 848-3815
info@placeworks.com
www.placeworks.com

July 2023

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

TABLES

1. Introduction

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The City of Walnut Creek (City) approved the Walnut Creek General Plan (General Plan) and certified the Walnut Creek General Plan Environmental Impact Report (General Plan EIR), State Clearinghouse (SCH) Number 2004022042, in April 2006. The General Plan includes multiple policies and associated actions that address sustainability and conservation, aimed at reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and addressing climate change. In April 2012, the City published and approved the City of Walnut Creek Climate Action Plan (2012 CAP) with an Addendum to the General Plan EIR. The 2012 CAP provided energy use, transportation, land use, and solid waste strategies to reduce the City's GHG emissions to 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 through reduction measures addressing each of the categories listed. In 2020, the City Council directed staff to update the 2012 CAP and broaden it to address environmental sustainability and climate adaptation.

The proposed 2023 Sustainability Action Plan (proposed project) is an update to the 2012 CAP and includes updated information, an expanded set of GHG reduction strategies, climate adaptation and sustainability strategies, and an extended planning horizon to 2045. Like the 2012 CAP, the proposed project is consistent with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183.5; that is, it is a Qualified GHG Reduction Plan and supports streamlined environmental review of GHG emissions for new development. Through its goals and strategies, the proposed project provides the means of implementing policies for GHG emissions reduction and minimizing the impacts of climate change. By incorporating the goals and strategies of the proposed project into the General Plan EIR through this Addendum, the City is ensuring that future development and planning activities conform to the objectives of the proposed project and climate change legislation passed by the State of California.

This Addendum has been prepared to document that the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and that its potential environmental impacts are within the scope of those addressed in the General Plan EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. This Addendum also documents that none of the conditions have occurred, as described in CEQA Section 21166 or CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163, that would call for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. Pursuant to the provisions of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City, acting as the lead agency, is charged with the responsibility of deciding whether or not to approve the proposed project.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

According to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, when an EIR has been certified for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for the project unless the lead agency determines that one or more of the following conditions are met:

- Substantial project changes are proposed that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes would occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that require major revisions to the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- New information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified, or the negative declaration was adopted shows any of the following:

    a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration.
    b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than identified in the previous EIR.
    c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.
    d) Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Where none of the conditions specified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 are present,[1] the lead agency must determine whether to prepare an Addendum or whether no further CEQA documentation is required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[b]). An Addendum is appropriate where some changes or additions to the previously certified EIR are necessary, but there are not any new or substantially more severe significant impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164).

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, as demonstrated in Section 2, *Project Description*, and Section 3, *Environmental Analysis*, of this Addendum, the City has determined that an Addendum to the General Plan EIR is appropriate for the proposed project.

[1] See also Section 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines, which applies the requirements of Section 15162 to supplemental EIRs.

2. Project Description

2.1 REGIONAL LOCATION

Walnut Creek is at the foot of Mt. Diablo in central Contra Costa County and approximately 23 miles east of San Francisco. Walnut Creek is north of the city of Danville, east of unincorporated Contra Costa County, south of the cities of Concord and Pleasant Hill, and east of the city of Lafayette. Regional access to Walnut Creek is provided by Interstate 680 (I-680), State Route 24 (SR-24), and by Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) commuter train service.

2.2 STUDY AREA

The General Plan defines three boundaries for Walnut Creek: the city limits (19.77 square miles under the City's jurisdiction and control), the Sphere of Influence (4.3 square miles that may be annexed), and the lands of interest (4.4 square miles that bear a relationship to the City's planning). Together, the 28.47-square-mile area comprises the City's Planning Area and thus the Study Area for the General Plan EIR and the Addendum to the General Plan EIR prepared for the 2012 CAP. This Addendum assumes the same Study Area.

2.3 REGULATORY SETTING

There are several regulatory documents that address the environmental effects of climate change through reductions in GHG emissions and guided the preparation of the 2012 CAP and the proposed project. The proposed project was prepared to be consistent with federal, State, and regional GHG regulatory provisions. A list of the key regulations is provided here, and a complete list with descriptions are provided in Appendix A, *Regulatory Framework*, of the proposed project:

- Executive Order S-3-05 (2005)
- Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (2006)
- CEQA Guidelines Amendments concerning GHG emissions (2010)
- Executive Order B-30-15 (2015)
- Senate Bill (SB) 32 and AB 197, 2030 GHG emissions limit (2016)
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Clean Air Plan (2017)
- Executive Order B-55-18 (2018) and AB 1279 (2022), carbon neutrality (no net GHG emissions) by 2045
- BAAQMD development of GHG significance thresholds (2022)
- California Air Resources Board's Climate Change Scoping Plan (2022)

Like the 2012 CAP, the proposed project is designed to meet the requirements of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines and the corresponding criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Plan. A Qualified GHG Reduction Plan adopted by a local jurisdiction should include the following elements, as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines provide the methodology to determine whether a GHG reduction program meets these requirements.

- Quantify GHG emissions—both existing and projected over a specified time period—resulting from activities within a defined geographic area.
- Establish a level, based on substantial evidence, below which the contribution to GHG emissions from activities covered by the plan would not be cumulatively considerable.
- Identify and analyze the GHG emissions resulting from specific actions or categories of actions anticipated in the geographic area.
- Specify measures or a group of measures, including performance standards, that, if implemented on a project-by-project basis, would collectively achieve the specified emissions level, as demonstrated by substantial evidence.
- Establish a mechanism to monitor the plan's progress toward achieving the target level and to require amendment if the plan is not achieving specified levels.
- Adopt in a public process following environmental review.

2.4 BACKGROUND

2.4.1 General Plan and General Plan EIR

The General Plan includes policies and actions in the Natural Environment and Public Spaces, Built Environment, and Transportation Elements that address sustainability and conservation and climate change. The policies and actions in Table 1, *General Plan Policies and Actions Related to GHG Emissions Reduction and Climate Change*, were analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

TABLE 1 GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS RELATED TO GHG EMISSIONS REDUCTION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

No.	Policy/Action
Natural Environment and Public Spaces Element	
Policy 4.1	Plan for a full complement of interconnected trails and paths for walkers, joggers, bicyclists, and equestrians, from the regional trails to downtown trails and paths.
Action 4.1.1	Work with the County, the East Bay Regional Park District, and other agencies to develop trail links between residential areas and parks, creeks, transportation, schools, open space, shopping, and various public facilities.
Action 4.1.3	Complete bicycle and pedestrian trail linkages, including the following: In the Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek BART areas; From Heather Farm Park to John Muir Medical Center; and Along the Iron Horse Regional Trail near the Sugarloaf Open Space, downtown, Las Lomas High School and Walden Park.
Action 4.1.4	Use existing easements and creeks for trail links to neighborhoods.

TABLE 1 GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS RELATED TO GHG EMISSIONS REDUCTION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

No.	Policy/Action
Built Environment Element	
Policy 3.1	Create opportunities for mixed-use developments.
Action 3.1.1	Encourage mixed-use development at and near the Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill BART Stations.
Action 6.2.1	In the Pedestrian Retail District, require pedestrian-oriented uses at street level.
Action 6.2.2	Promote building layouts and designs that create pedestrian interest and encourage people to "park once and walk."
Action 6.4.1	Encourage diverse housing options, including mixed-use, higher-density developments.
Action 12.1.1	Review the use of park-and-ride lots to maximize use.
Action 12.1.2	Update the transportation systems management (TSM) ordinance or resolution, as needed.
Action 12.1.3	Encourage transportation demand management (TDM) programs in new development.
Action 12.2.1	Adopt a voter approved Urban Limit Line, either as mutually voted on countywide or relating solely to Walnut Creek.
Policy 15.1	Encourage new development that optimizes both interconnecting street layouts within a neighborhood or residential subdivision and street and walkway/bikeway connections to surrounding neighborhoods and nearby commercial areas.
Action 15.1.1	In new development where street connections are possible, encourage both street and walkway/bikeway connections and discourage use of cul-de-sacs.
Action 21.1.1	Revise City Design Review Guidelines to encourage developers to include the following features in the development of new and the redevelopment of existing shopping centers: Pedestrian walkways and bikeway connections that create safe paths of travel through the shopping center and parking, and to transit and nearby sidewalks; Attractive and convenient bicycle parking; and Orientation of buildings to transit facilities, where applicable
Action 23.3.1	Work with the County toward ensuring that development of the Pleasant Hill BART station area is compatible with and accessible to adjacent areas within the incorporated city.
Policy 26.2	Incorporate natural features such as trees, hillsides, and rock outcroppings into new development.
Policy 26.4	Protect tree resources on public and private property.
Action 26.5.1	Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of, and if necessary, modify the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance.
Action 26.5.2	Plan for the replacement of trees that have been removed.
Action 26.5.3	Set standards for—and require new developments to have—adequate tree canopy.
Action 26.7.1	Consider adopting a "dark sky ordinance" aimed at reducing light spillage both upward and onto adjoining properties.
Action 27.1.1	Explore incentives to use green building techniques.
Action 27.1.2	Consider adding an energy-audit requirement to the City's review processes.
Policy 28.1	Implement energy conservation measures in City facilities and operations.
Action 28.1.1	Conduct an energy audit of all City activities and functions.
Policy 28.2	Promote energy conservation throughout the city.
Action 28.2.1	Adopt residential and commercial energy-conservation ordinances.
Action 28.2.2	Adopt a solar-access ordinance.
Action 28.2.3	Develop incentives to help small businesses become more energy efficient.
Action 28.2.4	Develop incentives for new development or substantial redevelopment to incorporate energy conservation.
Action 29.2.1	Explore possibilities for safe and effective use of reclaimed or recycled water consistent with State law (e.g., for landscape irrigation and toilet flushing in commercial buildings).

2. Project Description

TABLE 1 GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS RELATED TO GHG EMISSIONS REDUCTION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

No.	Policy/Action
Action 29.2.4	Follow existing standards and guidelines for water-conserving landscaping and encourage the planting of native and drought-tolerant plants.
Action 30.1.1	Implement source-reduction and waste-diversion programs within City government.
Action 30.1.2	Give preference to recycled content and environmentally friendly products in City procurement.
Action 30.2.1	Locally implement the State's 1993 Source Reduction and Recycling Element.
Action 30.2.2	Consider adopting a comprehensive source-reduction and recycling plan specific to Walnut Creek.
Action 30.2.3	Promote and participate in residential and commercial waste prevention and diversion programs.
Action 30.2.4	Make recycling convenient for small businesses.
Action 30.2.5	Develop size, location, and design standards for commercial and multifamily trash and recycling facilities and enclosures.
Action 30.2.6	Consider an ordinance requiring businesses and multifamily dwellings to participate in recycling and waste-reduction programs.
Action 30.2.7	Require the recycling of construction waste for all City and private projects.
Action 30.2.8	Encourage shared recycling facilities among businesses, especially those with limited space, for example, within the Core Area.
Action 30.2.9	Provide accessible disposal containers, including recycling containers, at appropriate locations downtown and at City public facilities and parks.
Action 30.3.1	Work with waste management companies to institute curbside residential organic waste-collection programs.
Action 30.3.2	Encourage restaurants to recycle organic waste.
Action 30.1.1	Support local transportation control measures (TCMs) and other ideas in the latest Bay Area Clean Air Plan.
Action 30.1.2	Develop a local, voluntary Clean Air Plan.
Action 30.1.3	Participate in the BAAQMD Spare the Air program.
Action 31.2.1	Review parking lot landscaping requirements to ensure adequate width and depth to allow for appropriate tree canopy.
Action 31.2.2	Investigate policies that promote cleaner air, such as commercial reflective roofing ordinances.
Action 31.2.3	Promote residential development and redevelopment opportunities near transit and commercial centers, and encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.
Action 31.3.2	Adopt a wood smoke ordinance.
Transportation Element	
Policy 2.2	Cooperate with East Bay Regional Parks and other jurisdictions to improve connections to regional trails.
Action 2.2.1	Improve signage and displays along regional trails to provide better way finding and to direct users to convenient rest areas and other facilities,
Policy 2.3	Promote the safety of bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians.
Policy 5.1	Promote bicycle use as an alternative way to get to work, school, shopping, recreational facilities, and transit stops.
Action 5.1.4	Periodically update and distribute a map identifying bikeways in the city and environs.
Action 5.1.5	Pursue grants for construction and development of new and improved bicycle facilities.
Policy 5.2	Provide facilities that encourage and support bicycle travel.
Action 5.2.1	Require appropriate bicycle-related improvements as a condition of site development, design review, subdivision, or building permit approval and for all City street-widening projects.
Action 5.2.3	Improve signalized intersections for bicyclist use along highly traveled bicycle corridors.
Action 5.2.4	Provide bicycle racks and other bike storage facilities at key high-use public locations.

TABLE 1 GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND ACTIONS RELATED TO GHG EMISSIONS REDUCTION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

No.	Policy/Action
Action 5.2.5	Working with local school districts, plan safe, pleasant, and attractive bicycle routes to school and organize programs that promote bicycling.
Action 5.2.7	Revise design guidelines to require, where appropriate, new projects to provide weather-protected, safe bike parking and/or storage facilities and other bicycle-friendly amenities.
Action 5.2.8	Revise design guidelines to encourage the installation of shower facilities in large, new office developments.
Policy 5.3	Oppose the use of motorized transportation (trains, buses, autos, motorcycles) on the Iron Horse Corridor between the Pleasant Hill BART station and Newell Avenue.
Policy 6.1	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.
Action 6.1.2	Working with local school districts, plan safe and attractive pedestrian routes to schools, and organize programs that promote walking.
Action 6.1.4	Eliminate "gaps" in sidewalks/walkways and support the additional connections to regional trails and trailheads.
Action 6.1.5	Provide improved pedestrian facilities via grants and assistance to residents in forming assessment districts.
Policy 7.2	Encourage improvements to transit systems that connect Walnut Creek residents to regional locations.
Policy 7.3	Link high-density residential developments, schools, employment centers, and shopping areas via transit.
Action 7.3.1	Work with the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority (CCCTA) to ensure frequent, peak-hour transit services, including express bus, to Walnut Creek schools, employment and activity centers, and park-and-ride lots.
Action 7.5.4	Require, where appropriate, that new developments provide transit amenities as a condition of project approval.
Policy 8.1	Provide, monitor, and continuously improve a coordinated set of convenient, efficient transportation alternatives for those who would otherwise drive alone, including employees and school children of driving age.
Policy 8.5	Link high-density residential developments, employment centers, and shopping areas via transit, bikeways, and walkways.
Action 9.2.1	Convert selected streets to temporary pedestrian-only use on a regularly scheduled basis
Action 9.2.2	Establish a trail connection that links BART to Mt. Diablo Boulevard and the Pedestrian Retail District (similar to the one identified in the 2002 Shaping Our Future workshop).
Policy 10.1	Link existing and planned bikeways in and through downtown.
Action 10.1.1	Apply land use designations that encourage transit- oriented development around the BART stations and in the Core Area.

Source: City of Walnut Creek General Plan, 2006.

2.4.2 2012 Climate Action Plan

The purpose of the 2012 CAP was to identify how the City would achieve (or exceed) its GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 emissions levels by the year 2020, as required by State legislation. In the 2012 CAP, the City committed to:

- Reduce City operational GHG emissions by 1,963 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) by 2020 and 3,516 $MTCO_2e$ by 2030, equivalent to a 39 percent and 71 percent reduction from the 2005 baseline, respectively.

- Reduce communitywide GHG emissions by 104,747 $MTCO_2e$ by 2020. With the incorporation of State-mandated initiatives, emissions in Walnut Creek would be 544,469 $MTCO_2e$ by 2020, for a total reduction of 15 percent from the 2005 baseline.
- Reduce communitywide GHG emissions by 140,635 $MTCO_2e$ by 2030. With the incorporation of State-mandated initiatives, emissions in Walnut Creek would be 420,103 $MTCO_2e$ by 2030, for a total reduction of 35 percent from the 2005 baseline.

The City has implemented over 80 percent of the 2012 CAP's actions. Climate action has a been a top City priority throughout the past decade. In 2020, the City reviewed its progress and determined that it exceeded its goal of achieving a 40 percent reduction in emissions from municipal operations and a 15 percent reduction in communitywide emissions by 2020. Notable City achievements are listed here, and a more detailed review of the City's GHG emissions since 2005 is provided in Chapter 3, *Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions,* of the proposed project.

- Reduced energy use and transitioned to renewable energy sources.
- Reduced transportation-related GHGs with alternative transportation and trip reduction.
- Expanded electric vehicle infrastructure.
- Transitioned to a cleaner fleet.
- Made progress in the transition to electric hand tools.
- Completed numerous irrigation and landscaping upgrades to conserve water and reduce energy use.

As described in Section 2.4.1, *General Plan and General Plan EIR*, the General Plan policies and actions shown in Table 1 were analyzed in the General Plan EIR and implemented through the 2012 CAP.

2.4.3 2023 Sustainability Action Plan (Proposed Project)

As previously described in Section 1.1, *Purpose and Scope*, in 2020, the Walnut Creek City Council directed staff to update the 2012 CAP and broaden it to address environmental sustainability and climate adaptation. Following this direction, City staff and a consultant team (the project team) developed the proposed project in three phases: (1) project initiating and visioning, (2) policy and strategy development, and (3) plan preparation and environmental review. Each phase integrated community and stakeholder engagement. The proposed project includes the preparation of GHG emission inventories, GHG emission forecasts, and a climate change vulnerability assessment, which is an analysis of how climate change is likely to affect a community. The public engagement and outreach process provided opportunities for ongoing input and guidance from City staff, the public, community stakeholders, advisory bodies, and the City Council. These outreach efforts resulted in a process of vetting and recommending appropriate GHG emission reduction and climate change strategies that reflect the priorities and concerns of the community and respond to community leadership in climate action planning. Accordingly, the strategies in the proposed project reflect the community priorities and recommendations expressed through the community outreach process. This process was also used as a tool by City staff to build new and maintain existing relationships with community partner agencies and organizations needed to help implement the proposed project.

The proposed project, like the 2012 CAP, includes GHG inventories for both communitywide and City operations. The communitywide GHG inventories include the years 2005, 2010, 2015, and 2017, while the City operations inventory is for year 2017. The 2005, 2010, and 2015 GHG inventories were updated to include the latest science and best practices in GHG accounting and emissions factors, and a new 2017 communitywide GHG emissions inventory and a 2017 City operations inventory were conducted. These inventories assess GHG emissions produced by the residential electricity, residential natural gas, nonresidential electricity, nonresidential natural gas, transportation, outdoor equipment, BART, solid waste, water and wastewater, and land use and sequestration sectors.

A GHG emissions forecast uses estimates of future community population and job growth to predict how GHG emissions would grow over time if no action is taken to reduce them at the federal, State, regional, or local level. The GHG emissions forecast in the proposed project is for the years 2030 and 2045 and relies on growth assumptions from the California Department of Finance and Association of Bay Area Governments. As shown in Table 4, *Walnut Creek Business-as-Usual Scenario GHG Emissions, 2005 to 2045,* of the 2023 Sustainability Action Plan (proposed project), GHG emissions in Walnut Creek are expected to increase from 2017 levels by 2045 but remain approximately 15 percent below 2005 levels if no actions are taken at any individual or agency level to reduce emissions.

Just as the GHG inventory and forecast provide a foundation for identifying future GHG emission reductions, the vulnerability assessment helps support future efforts to improve community resilience and adapt to changing climate conditions. Understanding how climate change will affect the community and identifying the vulnerable populations and assets enables the City to implement effective sustainability strategies to create a safer, more sustainable, and healthier community.

By 2030, the City needs to attain GHG emissions of 40 percent below 1990 levels. By 2045, the City needs to achieve GHG reduction of 85 percent below 1990 levels and be on a pathway to support statewide carbon neutrality. To evaluate the City's progress toward meeting its GHG emissions reduction targets, the proposed project acknowledges the City's existing climate policies and programs, planned future actions, and actions already and soon-to-be implemented at the State level and estimates GHG emissions reductions associated with implementation of these actions. As shown in Table 8, *Walnut Creek GHG Reductions and Progress to Goals,* of the proposed project, with implementation of the proposed project, the GHG emissions in Walnut Creek are projected to decline to 306,040 $MTCO_2e$ by 2030 and 77,140 $MTCO_2e$ by 2045, despite continued population growth. This will reduce 2030 emissions to 41 percent below 1990 levels and reduce 2045 emissions to 85 percent below 1990 levels, allowing Walnut Creek to achieve its 2030 and 2045 GHG reduction targets and support the State's goal of statewide carbon neutrality. Implementation of the proposed project allows the City to exceed the reduction standards by 5,040 $MTCO_2e$ by 2030 and 630 $MTCO_2e$ by 2045.

2. Project Description

Meeting the GHG emissions reduction targets is the result of the 21 new sustainability strategies developed by the City, who considered best practices, lessons learned through implementation of the 2012 CAP, and the input and feedback from residents and key stakeholders who represent many community organizations and businesses. Additionally, the proposed project responds to the findings of the vulnerability assessment by including adaptation strategies to increase resiliency as well as strategies that reduce GHG emissions throughout the city. The 21 strategies consist of 15 GHG emission reduction strategies that are organized into 5 sectors (Buildings and Energy Supply, Transportation and Land Use, Water and Wastewater, Waste, and Off-road Equipment) and result in measurable GHG emission reductions. The remaining six strategies support community health, resilience, and comprehensive sustainability but do not have directly measurable GHG emissions reductions—though some support reductions. Table 2, *2023 Sustainability Action Plan Sustainability Strategies*, lists the strategies, which generally include a mix of education and outreach programs to encourage GHG reduction activities, financial subsidies, and other enticements to incentivize GHG reductions, and mandates to require GHG reduction efforts.

TABLE 2 2023 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGIES

No.	Strategy
Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies	
Building and Energy Supply Sector	
Strategy 1	Require transition to renewable and carbon-free energy sources.
Strategy 2	Facilitate energy efficiency and electrification at existing municipal buildings and infrastructure.
Strategy 3	Facilitate energy efficiency and electrification at existing buildings and infrastructure.
Strategy 4	Require electrification and low-carbon materials for new buildings.
Transportation and Land Use Sector	
Strategy 5	Expand adoption and accessibility of electric vehicle modes.
Strategy 6	Increase the availability of electric vehicle charging.
Strategy 7	Electrify the City's vehicle fleet.
Strategy 8	Promote sustainable development, which reduces vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.
Strategy 9	Ensure safe, efficient, and reliable mobility options throughout the community.
Strategy 10	Support reduction of school-related emissions and vehicle miles traveled.
Strategy 11	Expand and improve transportation partnerships to reduce local and regional vehicle miles traveled and emissions.
Water and Wastewater Sector	
Strategy 12	Expand City-led efforts to reduce water use community-wide.
Strategy 13	Expand water reuse community-wide.
Waste Sector	
Strategy 14	Reduce the amount of generated and landfilled waste to ensure a diversion rate of 75 percent by 2030.
Outdoor Equipment Sector	
Strategy 15	Transition to pollution-free outdoor equipment.

TABLE 2 2023 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGIES

No.	Strategy
Community Resilience and Sustainability Strategies	
Community Health and Resilience Sector	
Strategy 16	Reduce the impacts of poor air quality and improve air quality in the community.
Strategy 17	Decrease community vulnerabilities to climate change hazards.
Strategy 18	Create a network of local resilience hubs and support regional resilience hubs.
Strategy 19	Support a fair and just countywide and statewide transition to a low-carbon economy.
Strategy 20	Reduce carbon emissions through local and in-state nature-based solutions, including sequestration.
Strategy 21	Explore unique, community-led sustainability techniques.

Source: 2023 Sustainability Action Plan, PlaceWorks, 2023.

In summary, in combination with existing and ongoing local and State programs, implementation of the sustainability strategies in the proposed project would achieve the City's 2030 and 2045 GHG reduction targets. Each strategy is composed of implementation actions that provide a guide for reducing GHG emissions and promoting sustainability and resilience. Implementation actions can take many forms, including new community regulations (regulatory actions), changes to municipal policies (municipal actions), education and outreach (education and outreach actions), or support for the successful implementation of other actions (supportive actions). Implementation of these 21 sustainability strategies and their associated actions require the City to carry out specific implementation strategies and report on the progress made toward implementing the proposed project. Accordingly, the proposed project includes an implementation program to ensure that each sustainability strategy is assigned to a lead City department responsible for implementation and includes information on the supporting City departments and community partners, the time frames for implementation, and the relative costs for each implementation strategy. The implementation strategies in the proposed project are accompanied by a list of recommendations that were selected through conversations with City staff, stakeholders, and the community.

Some actions can be initiated immediately and may yield significant results in the near term; other actions require long-term and sustained community investment. Because the proposed project is an actively managed document, its implementation strategies require annual monitoring and progress reports, and GHG emissions inventories should be updated every five years. These required updates provide the flexibility for the proposed project to be modified as the science and regulatory framework around sustainability and climate change is refined and improved over time.

2. Project Description

This page intentionally left blank.

3. Environmental Analysis

As previously described in Section 1.2, *Environmental Procedures*, this Addendum has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Section 21166, and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 to determine whether implementation of the proposed project would result in any new impacts in the General Plan EIR. This Addendum only considers the extent to which the proposed project (2023 Sustainability Action Plan) could result in new or more severe impacts than previously evaluated in the General Plan EIR; it does not reevaluate impacts that would remain consistent with the analysis in the General Plan EIR.

The proposed project is a program-level policy document focused on GHG emissions reduction through recommended GHG emission reduction strategies and actions and does not involve any land use or zoning changes that would result in direct or indirect growth or changes in building density and intensity. As shown in the supporting environmental checklist, no provisions implemented under the proposed project would result in population growth and thus would not place additional demands on natural resources (Section 3.4, *Biological Resources*, and Section 3.19, *Utilities and Service Systems*), public services (Section 3.15, *Public Services*, and Section 3.16, *Recreation*), or infrastructure. It does not include any site-specific designs or propose to develop specific projects, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would degrade the physical environment or have the potential to result in physical impacts on the environment. Any future construction-level projects occurring from implementation of the proposed project would be subject to applicable federal, State, and/or City regulations, including compliance with General Plan policies, and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review, including incorporating mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, as required.

Like the 2012 CAP and as demonstrated in the supporting environmental checklist, the majority of the proposed project's strategies would not have the potential to result in new or additional physical impacts on the environment because they continue to be limited in scope to being implemented as regulatory, municipal, education and outreach, and supportive actions. A summary of the proposed project's strategies and actions are categorized by regulatory, municipal, education and outreach, and supportive actions, and summarized herein.

1. Regulatory actions refer to the passage or development of new local regulations, such as amendments to the municipal code. These include actions such as implementing energy-efficiency standards, reducing embodied emissions, supporting electric micromobility (e-bicycles, e-scooters), supporting electric vehicle use (chargers and spaces) and use of BART, optimizing the jobs-housing balance, supporting transit-oriented development and dense mixed-use neighborhoods, supporting complete streets, reducing vehicle idling, encouraging water conservation, reducing solid waste, increasing landscaping opportunities, and supporting fire-safe features.

3. Environmental Analysis

2. **Municipal actions** refer to actions which affect City infrastructure and operations, such as making changes to municipal facilities or purchasing policies. These include actions such as increasing solar installations, conducting energy audits, establishing municipal funds to install energy-efficiency projects (cool roofs, high-efficiency LED fixtures, electric vehicle charging stations), developing incentive programs for City employees, sharing vehicles between departments, reviewing the effectiveness of hybrid virtual and in-person City meetings, transitioning parks and landscaping to water-efficient and drought-friendly materials and practices, expanding recycled water delivery, and identifying community resilience hubs.
3. **Education and outreach actions** include efforts to inform the community about sustainability issues and initiatives. These include actions such as educating the community about renewable energy programs and incentives; promoting Safe Routes to School; promoting the use of sustainable transportation modes; educating about proper fleet-vehicle engine warm-up and midtrip idling at stops; increasing awareness about water conservation, greywater system rebates and incentives, recycling habits, and Spare the Air days; and promoting fair-trade purchasing.
4. **Supportive actions** support the successful implementation of the strategy but do not necessarily involve direct development of legislation or community education and outreach initiatives. Supportive actions include increasing participation in renewable energy use/plans; supporting installation of battery backup systems; incentivizing switching to electric heat pumps; supporting electric vehicle purchases and use (residents, buses, waste haulers, freight trucks), e-bikes and e-scooters, and charging locations; promoting higher urban density, complete streets, and closing the first/last mile gap; supporting safe biking and walking infrastructure; installing traffic-calming features; supporting lawn rebate programs and rainwater capture; supporting the reduction of solid waste and food recovery efforts; and distributing masks and supporting remote work on air pollution days.

The proposed project's actions, like those of the 2012 CAP, would result in beneficial actions that promote green building practices, such as the use of environmentally friendly building materials, reduced water and energy usage, and waste reduction. Additionally, many of the proposed actions, such as installing solar infrastructure and electric vehicle charging stations, are required in other regulatory documents, such as the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Building Code. However, because the proposed project, like the 2012 CAP, promotes and encourages actions to ensure the City of Walnut Creek meets its GHG emission targets, the implementation of some of the actions could have the potential to result in physical impacts to the environment.

The proposed actions that could potentially result in a physical impact to the environment are shown in Table 3, *2023 Sustainability Action Plan Strategies and Actions Impact Potential by Environmental Topic*.

3. Environmental Analysis

TABLE 3 2023 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IMPACT POTENTIAL BY ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC

Strategies and Actions	Action Type	Environmental Topic											
		AES	AIR	BIO	CUL	ENE	GEO	GHG	HAZ	HYD	NOI	TRA	USS
Strategy 1: Require transition to renewable and carbon-free energy sources.													
Action 1.1. Increase the number of City facilities with solar energy and battery storage installations.	Municipal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 1.3. Increase the number of residences and businesses opting into MCE's and PG&E's 100 percent renewable energy service plans.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 1.4. Support installation of battery backup systems at residential and nonresidential facilities with solar panels and ensure streamlined and transparent permitting processes for small-scale battery storage equipment.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 1.5. Pursue procurement of battery energy storage, fuel cells, and other zero-carbon resilience resources for City facilities and encourage these for residential and non-residential sites.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 2: Facilitate energy efficiency and electrification at existing municipal buildings and infrastructure.													
Action 2.3. Install cool roofs and/or green roofs on suitable City facilities as roofs are replaced.	Municipal		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Strategy 6: Increase availability of electric vehicle charging.													
Action 6.1. Continue to expand the electric vehicle reach code, to require electric vehicle charger installation for all new construction.	Regulatory	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 6.3. Incentivize the installation of public, workplace, and residential electric vehicle charging stations (especially at multi-family residential buildings), leveraging existing programs and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority Electric Vehicle Readiness Blueprint and Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Index map.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 6.4. Support and share information on the location of electric vehicle charging companies and chargers within Walnut Creek.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

3. Environmental Analysis

TABLE 3 2023 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IMPACT POTENTIAL BY ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC

Strategies and Actions	Action Type	Environmental Topic											
		AES	AIR	BIO	CUL	ENE	GEO	GHG	HAZ	HYD	NOI	TRA	USS
Strategy 7: Electrify the City's vehicle fleet.													
Action 7.1. Facilitate the installation of electric vehicle charging stations at City facilities, beginning with the priority areas identified by the Contra Costa Electric Vehicle Readiness Blueprint.	Municipal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Strategy 8: Promote sustainable development, which reduces vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.													
Action 8.3. Identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 9: Ensure safe, efficient, and reliable mobility options throughout the community.													
Action 9.1. Provide Complete Street standards and redesign appropriate roadways to meet Complete Street requirements.	Regulatory		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 9.6. Work with East Bay Regional Park District to improve the city's network of regional trails and to ensure the city's trail network extends into neighboring jurisdictions in order to promote the trail system as a key component of the local active transportation infrastructure.	Supportive		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 9.7. Implement the bike share/electric scooter program, piloted in 2018, and construct additional miles of bicycle lanes and supportive infrastructure such as bicycle parking.	Supportive		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 10: Support reduction of school-related emissions and vehicle miles traveled.													
Action 10.1. Continue to work with local schools to regularly promote the Safe Routes to School program. Enhance pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure near public and private schools to enhance active transportation opportunities.	Education and Outreach		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

TABLE 3 2023 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IMPACT POTENTIAL BY ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC

Strategies and Actions	Action Type	Environmental Topic											
		AES	AIR	BIO	CUL	ENE	GEO	GHG	HAZ	HYD	NOI	TRA	USS
Action 10.2. Promote the use of sustainable transportation modes and educate students and their families about safe walking, bicycling, and transit use by building on and expanding the existing Street Smarts Diablo and Contra Costa County Safe Routes to Schools programs.	Education and Outreach		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 10.3. Partner with local school districts to encourage installation of traffic-calming techniques near school sites.	Supportive		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Action 10.6. Assist with local school districts in securing funding for electric buses that serve schools, other school-operated vehicles, and supportive charging infrastructure. Partner with local school districts to encourage installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in school parking lots for faculty, staff, visitors, and students.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 11: Expand and improve transportation partnerships to reduce local and regional vehicle miles traveled and emissions.													
Action 11.8. Work with community partners to enhance the walking and bicycling environment of downtown Walnut Creek by improving sidewalk coverage, improving bicycle lane connectivity, conducting regular repairs and preventative maintenance, and providing pleasant and easy-to-navigate streetscapes.	Supportive		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 12: Expand City-led efforts to reduce water use community-wide.													
Action 12.2. Continue to transition City-managed parks and landscaping to water-efficient and drought-friendly materials and practices, which will reduce the energy usage embedded in the delivery and treatment of clean water and wastewater.	Municipal		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Action 12.4. Partner with water providers and regional partners to promote programs such as BayREN's Water Upgrades $ave program, CCWD's rebate programs, and EBMUD's rebate programs to encourage the retrofitting of existing development with water efficient appliances.	Supportive		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

3. Environmental Analysis

TABLE 3 2023 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IMPACT POTENTIAL BY ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC

Strategies and Actions	Action Type	Environmental Topic											
		AES	AIR	BIO	CUL	ENE	GEO	GHG	HAZ	HYD	NOI	TRA	USS
Strategy 13: Expand water reuse community-wide.													
Action 13.1. Work with Central San to expand their recycled water delivery infrastructure into Walnut Creek.	Municipal		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 14: Reduce the amount of generated and landfilled waste to ensure a diversion rate of 75 percent by 2030.													
Action 14.12. Work with the City's waste hauler through RecycleSmart to increase the share of Walnut Creek residents and businesses that have organic recycling bins and counter-top compost bins, composting sorters or dividers, or other alternative options to encourage composting of kitchen scraps.	Supportive		X			X		X	X		X	X	
Action 14.13. Work with the City's waste hauler to introduce re-use and bulky pick-up days for multifamily developments.	Supportive		X			X		X	X		X	X	
Action 14.14. Work with community partners and restaurants to increase the use of local farmers markets and the purchase of organic and locally sourced foods, and to support the establishment and maintenance of community gardens as a method to reduce packaging and food waste.	Supportive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 16: Reduce the impacts of poor air quality and improve air quality in the community.													
Action 16.1. Require new multi-family residences and new sensitive uses (such as schools, hospitals, or residential areas) to integrate green infrastructure elements as vegetated buffers between buildings and highways and other major sources of air or stormwater pollutants.	Regulatory	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Strategy 17: Decrease community vulnerabilities to climate change hazards.													
Action 17.1. Require brush clearing and maintenance of fire-safe features for all development in the wildland-urban interface.	Regulatory	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	
Strategy 20: Reduce carbon emissions through local and in-state nature-based solutions, including sequestration.													
Action 20.1. Increase tree planting and maintain existing trees on City-owned and -managed lands, using low-maintenance	Municipal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

TABLE 3 2023 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IMPACT POTENTIAL BY ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC

Strategies and Actions	Action Type	Environmental Topic											
		AES	AIR	BIO	CUL	ENE	GEO	GHG	HAZ	HYD	NOI	TRA	USS
native tree species and emphasizing areas with limited existing tree cover.													
Action 20.3. Provide shade trees or shade structures at City-owned parks, public transit stops, plazas, and other outdoor gathering spaces.	Municipal	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X

Notes: AES = Aesthetics; AIR = air quality; BIO = biological resources; CUL = cultural and tribal cultural resources; ENE = energy; GEO = geology and soils; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; HAZ = hazards and hazardous materials; HYD = hydrology and water quality; NOI = noise; TRA = transportation; USS = utilities and services systems
Source: 2023 Sustainability Action Plan, PlaceWorks, 2023.

3. Environmental Analysis

As shown in Table 3, these proposed actions promote more solar energy infrastructure, use of renewable energy, battery back-up systems, cool and green roofs, electric vehicle charging facilities, urban density, complete streets and multimodal infrastructure, trails, bike share and electric scooters, landscaping, trees, and community gardens, clearing of vegetation where wildfire risk is high, recycled water infrastructure, organic composting bins, and bulk-waste pick-ups for multifamily units. As shown in Table 3, the implementation of these proposed actions could result in potential impacts related to the environmental topic areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation, and utilities and services systems. As described in the environmental checklist, most of the potential impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed actions would only occur during the construction and installation of the infrastructure or improvement. The ongoing operation of the proposed actions would have beneficial impacts such as conserving energy and water; reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT), thus reducing emissions; and reducing solid waste in landfills by increasing organic waste composting. However, some of the proposed actions are considered for their long-term operational impacts from increasing trips from the City's waste haulers for more pickups of bulk waste and organic waste bins.

Sections 3.1 through 3.20 provide an evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed project and are organized to correspond with the standards of significance consistent with Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist Form*, of the CEQA Guidelines, as evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Each section contains a summary of the findings of the evaluation, organized into the following two columns:

- Level of Impact for the General Plan in the General Plan EIR presents the level of significance identified for the General Plan in the General Plan EIR, using the following acronyms:
  - NI = no impact. For these topics, there is no adverse effect on the environment.
  - LTS = less than significant. These effects are noticeable but do not exceed established or defined thresholds, and no mitigation is required.
  - LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation. For these circumstances, an established or defined threshold would be exceeded, and a significant impact would occur; mitigation is required and would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.
  - SU = significant and unavoidable. For these topics, a significant impact would occur, and General Plan policies and/or feasible mitigation measures would not diminish these effects to less-than-significant levels.
- Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project presents a yes or no response to these questions:
  - Would the proposed project have the same or reduced impact when compared to the General Plan EIR?
  - Would the proposed project have new or more severe impacts when compared to the General Plan EIR?
  - Are there new circumstances involving new or more severe impacts when compared to the General Plan EIR?

- Is there new information requiring new analysis or verification when compared to the General Plan EIR?

CEQA identifies and analyzes the significant effects on the environment, where "significant effect on the environment" means a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382). The proposed project, which does not increase the development potential, introduce new types of development, or expand the boundaries of the Study Area evaluated under the General Plan EIR, are analyzed herein.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to aesthetic resources?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

3. Environmental Analysis

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Note: With respect to criterion (c), CEQA Section 21071, *Urbanized Area Definition*, has several metrics by which a city can be defined as an urban area. CEQA Section 21071(a)(2) states that a city can be classified as an urban area if the city has a population of less than 100,000 persons and if the population of that city, and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities combined, equals at least 100,000 persons. According to the U.S. Census, the population estimates for 2022 for Walnut Creek is 69,695 residents and two contiguous cities, Pleasant Hill to the north with 34,304 residents, and Lafayette to the west with 25,208 residents, brings the total population of the three contiguous cities to 129,207. Therefore, Walnut Creek is considered an urban area under CEQA Guidelines, Section 21071, and impacts of potential future development projects in Walnut Creek are based on whether the project conflicts with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed Action 1.1 has the potential to result in an aesthetics impact by increasing the number of photovoltaic panels, which could result in unwanted glare. Additionally, proposed actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy (Actions 1.3 and 1.5), battery back-up systems (Action 1.4), and additional electric vehicle charging stations (Actions 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, and 10.6); promote higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Action 8.3); and increase landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3), all of which, depending on the size and location, could have a substantial adverse effect to scenic resources in Walnut Creek.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions increase the number of photovoltaic panels, which could result in unwanted glare (Policy 28.2 and Action 28.2.2). Additionally, General Plan actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy (Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.3, and 28.2.4), promote higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3), and increase landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4), all of which, depending on the size and location, could have a substantial adverse effect to aesthetic resources in Walnut Creek. Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to aesthetics criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 150 through 154) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

Cumulative impacts to aesthetics under criterion (e) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 283) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan, and as such would not result in adverse impacts to aesthetics beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to aesthetics criteria (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Built Environment Element, Quality of Life Element, and Natural Environment and Public Spaces Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to aesthetics, visual quality, and implications of nuisance light and glare. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize aesthetic impacts from development in Walnut Creek that affect a scenic vista and/or scenic corridor (criterion [a]), including the State-designated scenic SR-24 and I-680 (criterion [b]) and introduce new sources of light and glare (criterion [d]). Additionally, all potential future development from implementation of the proposed project would be required to be consistent with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality (criterion [c]).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable state, and/or City regulations and requirements, and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new visual impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to aesthetics criteria (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts identified in the General Plan EIR with respect to aesthetics criteria (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to aesthetics criteria (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3. Environmental Analysis

3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
f) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to agricultural and forestry resources?	NI	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

The General Plan EIR did not include an evaluation of impacts to agricultural and forestry resources pursuant to criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f). There are no qualifying lands in the Study Area that meet the standards

described in criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e)[2] and no further evaluation under this topic is necessary for this Addendum.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	SU	Yes	No	No	No
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Cumulatively contribute to air quality impacts in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin?	SU	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term air quality impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that supports the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). In

[2] General Plan Land Use Map (https://www.walnut-creek.org/home/showpublisheddocument/5020/638118842037700000); Municipal Code (https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/WalnutCreek/#!/WalnutCreek10/WalnutCreek1002A.html); Zoning Map (https://www.walnut-creek.org/departments/community-development-department/zoning/maps/zoning-web-map); and California Department of Conservation (https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciftimeseries/). Sources accessed May 2023.

addition, new haul trips for increasing opportunities for more organic recycling and bulk waste pick up (Actions 14.12 and 14.13) have the potential to cause air quality impacts during long-term operation.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2, 28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1 and 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). In addition, the General Plan has actions to improve opportunities for more recycling, including residential organic waste and landfill diversion (Actions 30.1.2, 30.2.1, 30.2.2, 30.2.3, 30.2.4, 30.2.5, 30.2.6, 30.2.7, 30.2.8, 30.2.9, 30.3.1, and 30.3.2). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to air quality criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 240 through 242) and impacts were found to be less than significant with the exception of resulting in inconsistencies with regional clean air planning efforts where impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. Cumulative impacts to air quality under criterion (e) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 284 and 285) and impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse impacts to air quality beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to air quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Built Environment Element and Transportation Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to air quality. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize air quality impacts from development in Walnut Creek and ensure there are no conflicts with the Clean Air Plan (criterion [a]), reduce increases in criteria air pollutant emissions (criterion [b]), ensure sensitive receptors are not exposed to toxic air contaminant emissions (criterion [c]), and that uses would not generate

substantial odors that would affect a substantial number of people during the construction and operation phases (criterion [d]).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable state, and/or City regulations and requirements, and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, including incorporating mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, as required. Air quality impacts from construction are temporary and deemed to be less than significant through compliance with BAAQMD best management practices and/or site-specific construction health risk assessments. Furthermore, the proposed project would help overall to reduce GHG emissions throughout the city, which would be beneficial to overall air quality conditions throughout the Study Area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new air quality impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to air quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts identified in the General Plan EIR with respect to air quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would increase efficiency and reduce GHGs and therefore would not worsen air quality. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to air quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Instead, implementation of the proposed project would result in a reduction in GHG emissions generated in Walnut Creek, which would be a net air quality benefit to Walnut Creek.

3. Environmental Analysis

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
g) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to biological resources?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable					

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in short-term impacts to biological resources related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, and 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). While the majority of these actions would result in temporary construction impacts, such as the potential to disturb nesting birds, the operation of renewable energy projects, such as solar and wind turbines, have the ability to adversely impact wildlife, including birds through bird strikes, and could be proposed on or near lands with sensitive habitat. In addition, wildlife may be potentially affected through electrocution from transmission lines. Wind turbines, transmission lines, and other facility structures may interfere with behavioral activities, including migratory movements, and may provide additional perch sites for raptors, thereby increasing predatory levels on other wildlife.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to biological resources criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 219 through 220) and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to biological resources under criterion (g) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 284 and 285) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

3. Environmental Analysis

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse impacts to biological resources beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to biological resources criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Natural Environment Element contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to biological resources. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions and other mandatory regulations, such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, as well as the Walnut Creek Municipal Code to minimize impacts to biological resources from development in Walnut Creek. Compliance with General Plan policies and actions and other regulations, as described in the General Plan EIR, would reduce impacts related to the loss of special-status species (criterion [a]), riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities (criterion [b]), protected wetlands (criterion [c]), and wildlife movement corridors (criterion [d]). Implementation of the proposed project would be required to be consistent with all local policies that protect biological resources (criterion [e]). As described in the General Plan EIR, the EIR Study Area is not in any local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan areas and as such, no impact regarding this standard would occur under either plan (criterion [f]).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable state, and/or City regulations and requirements, and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new impacts to biological resources that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to biological resources criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to biological resources criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe

impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to biological resources criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term cultural resource impact related to the construction of infrastructure that supports the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, and 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). Any type of grading or trenching could unearth an unknown cultural resource, and photovoltaic panels or cool roofs could impact historic buildings. Furthermore, increasing density where there are known historic buildings could cause construction impacts that could damage a sensitive historic building through vibration or alter the character of a historic building(s).

3. Environmental Analysis

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3), where the likelihood of historic buildings is greater. Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to cultural resources criteria (a), (b), and (c), which includes historic buildings, archaeological resources, Native American resources, and human remains, were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 167 through 168) and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to cultural resources under criterion (d) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 283) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities that could cause damage to historic buildings, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan, and would not result in adverse impacts to cultural resources beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR, with respect to cultural resources criteria (a), (b), (c) and (d).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Governance Element and Built Environment Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to cultural resources. The types of cultural resources that meet the definition of historical resources under CEQA Section 21084.1 generally consist of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant for their traditional, cultural, and/or historical associations. Under CEQA, both prehistoric and historic-period archaeological sites may qualify based on historical associations. As such, the two main historical resources that are subject to impact, and that may be impacted by implementation of the proposed project, are historical archaeological deposits and historical architectural resources. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize impacts to cultural resources from development in Walnut Creek. In addition, all potential future development is required to comply with federal and State regulations that minimize impacts to cultural resources. For example, the California

Historical Building Code, which provides regulations for permitting repairs, alterations, and additions necessary for the preservation, rehabilitation, relocation, related construction, change of use, or continued use of a qualified historical building or structure, would minimize potential impacts to historic buildings (criterion [a]). Health and Safety Code Section 7052 states that the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony. Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety Code specifies protocol when human remains are discovered during activities involving ground disturbance. If human remains are discovered or identified in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there should be no further disturbance or excavation nearby until the county coroner has determined the area is not a crime scene that warrants further investigation into the cause of death and made recommendations to the persons responsible for the work in the manner provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (the California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act). This section, which applies to both State and private lands, provides guidance for proceeding when human remains associated with Native American burials and associated items are encountered. This act stipulates the procedures the descendants may follow for treating or disposing of the remains and associated grave goods. Compliance with these existing regulations, and the City's ongoing implementation of the procedures for Native American consultation, would ensure that potential unearthed cultural resources are protected, and impacts would be consistent with those of the General Plan EIR, with respect to cultural resources criteria (a), (b), and (c). Furthermore, CEQA requires that future potential projects that implement the proposed project with the potential to significantly impact historical resources be subject to project-level CEQA review wherein the future potential project's potential to affect the significance of a surrounding historical resource would be evaluated and mitigated to the extent feasible. The requirement for subsequent CEQA review, pursuant to State law, would minimize the potential for new development to indirectly affect the significance of existing historical resources to the maximum extent practicable with respect to cultural resources criteria (a), (b), and (c).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable state and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new impacts to cultural resources that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to cultural resources criteria (a), (b), (c) and (d). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to cultural resources criteria (a), (b), (c) and (d).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standards requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe

impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to cultural resources criteria (a), (b), (c) and (d) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.6 ENERGY

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	-	N/A	No	No	No
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	-	N/A	No	No	No
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to energy conservation and renewable energy?	-	N/A	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term energy impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). In addition, new haul trips for increasing opportunities for more organic recycling and bulk waste pick up (Actions 14.12 and 14.13) would increase ongoing energy demand.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2, 28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action

29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1 and 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). In addition, the General Plan has actions to improve opportunities for more recycling, including residential organic waste, and landfill diversion (Actions 30.1.2, 30.2.1, 30.2.2, 30.2.3, 30.2.4, 30.2.5, 30.2.6, 30.2.7, 30.2.8, 30.2.9, 30.3.1, and 30.3.2). While energy criteria (a) and (b) were not introduced to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist*, until 2018, the General Plan EIR included a discussion of energy demand and found that potential future development over the General Plan buildout horizon would result in increased energy demand for construction, lighting, heating, and cooling of residences, and transportation of people within, to, and from the Study Area (see Draft EIR page 286).

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in potential future development impacts beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR with respect to energy criteria (a), (b), and (c).

The General Plan Natural Environment and Public Spaces Element, Built Environment Element, and Transportation Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider energy conservation that ensures that no wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation would occur, and that implementation of the General Plan would not obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. For example, the General Plan requires energy conservation measures (Policy 28.1) and is supported by actions to adopt residential and nonresidential energy-conservation ordinances (Action 28.2.1), adopt a solar-access ordinance (Action 28.2.2), help small businesses become more energy-efficient (Action 28.2.4), and help new development or substantial redevelopment to incorporate energy conservation (Action 29.2.1). Other indirect policies and actions include Policy 3.1, which requires the City to create opportunities for mixed-use developments and is supported by Action 3.1.1 to place mixed-use development near BART stations. Energy-conserving policies and actions include those that encourage people to park once and walk (Action 6.2.1), encouraging transportation demand management programs (Action 12.1.3), supporting multimodal transportation options (Policies 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 8.5, 10.1, and 15.1, and Actions 2.2.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 5.1.4, 5.1.5, 5.2.1, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.7, 5.2.8, 6.1.2, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, 7.3.1, 7.5.4, 9.2.1, 9.2.2, 15.1.1, 10.1.1, 21.1.1, 23.3.1, and 31.2.3). The General Plan promotes energy conservation through applying green building methods (Action 27.1.1), installing cool

roofs (Action 31.2.2), and conducting energy audits (Action 27.1.2). By increasing and maintaining existing trees and landscaping to counteract urban heat island effects, planting native and drought-tolerant landscaping, and reducing use of potable water also conserves energy (Policy 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, 29.2.1, 29.2.4, and 31.2.1). Recycling materials, which reduce wasteful use of energy are also accounted for in the General Plan (Actions 30.1.1, 30.1.2, 30.2.1, 30.2.2, 30.2.3, 30.2.4, 30.2.5, 30.2.6, 30.2.7, 30.2.8, 30.2.9, 30.3.1, and 30.3.2).

Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources from development in Walnut Creek (criterion [a]). In addition, implementation of the proposed actions would ultimately lead to energy conservation and reduced energy demand through actions, as previously identified, that increase opportunities for more efficient uses of energy such as solar and other renewable sources, installing cool roofs and/or green roofs that reduce energy use from buildings, promote the use of electric automobiles, buses, and bicycles and non-motorized modes of transportation such as biking and walking by improving and increasing bike lanes and sidewalks and other complete street facilities, planting more vegetation and trees for shade and to manage air pollution, and provide more opportunities for organic waste composting. Additionally, the proposed actions encourage infill high-density housing where development and infrastructure to support that new development and redevelopment currently exist. Because these actions lead to energy conservation, they would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation (criterion [a]). In addition, these proposed actions further the General Plan policies and actions, described herein and listed in Table 1, to reduce wasteful energy use, increase use of renewable energy, and increase energy efficiency, and therefore, would not conflict with the City's current goals for energy conservation. The state's electricity grid is transitioning to renewable energy under California's renewables portfolio standard (RPS) established under Senate Bills (SB) 1078 and 107. The proposed project, like the General Plan, supports the statewide goal of transitioning the electricity grid to renewable sources. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project, like the General Plan, would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of California's RPS program (criterion [b]). Accordingly, pursuant to the now-adopted energy standards under CEQA, implementation of the proposed project would not produce wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy, and would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to energy conservation and renewable energy (criteria [a], [b], and [c]). Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to energy resources.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State, and/or City regulations and requirements, and undergo an appropriate level

of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new types of development that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to energy criteria (a), (b), and (c). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the conclusions identified in the General Plan EIR with respect to energy criteria (a), (b), and (c).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standards requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to energy criteria (a), (b), and (c) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
iv) Landslides?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

3. Environmental Analysis

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
g) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to geological resources?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term geology and soils impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). There are no strategies or actions that would result in the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and

actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy such as building new solar energy infrastructure, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to geology and soils criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 178 through 180, and pages 167 and 168 for paleontological resources) and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to geology and soils under criterion (g) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 284 and page 283 for paleontological resources) and impacts were found to be less than significant. While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse impacts to geology and soils beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to geology and soils criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Safety and Noise Element and the Built Environment Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to geology and soils. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize geology and soils impacts from development in Walnut Creek, including mandatory regulations, such as the Walnut Creek Municipal Code and California Building Code that minimize potential adverse impacts from earthquake, erosion and soil loss (criteria [a], [b], and [d]) and ensure sensitive and unique paleontological resources are not directly or indirectly affected in the event that such resources are unearthed during project grading, demolition, or building (criterion [f]). Potential future infrastructure improvements and higher urban density in Walnut Creek that could occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project would not rely on septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems [criterion e]).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable state, and/or City regulations and requirements, and undergo an appropriate level

of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in geology and soil impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to geology and soils criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to geology and soils criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standards for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to geology and soils criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	-	N/A	No	No	No
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	-	N/A	No	No	No
c) Cumulatively contribute to GHG emissions and global climate change?	-	N/A	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term GHG emissions impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). In addition, new haul trips for increasing opportunities for more organic recycling and bulk

waste pick up (Actions 14.12 and 14.13) have the potential to generate GHG emissions impacts during long-term operation. Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as GHGs, to the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHGs is fossil fuel use. The use of construction equipment and waste haul vehicles could use fossil fuels.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

The General Plan EIR did not include an evaluation of GHG emissions pursuant to criteria (a) and (b) because these criteria were not introduced to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist*, until 2010, and therefore were not required by CEQA at that time. However, global climate change could have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the General Plan EIR was certified. In the U.S. Supreme Court Case of *Massachusetts v. USEPA* (2007) 549 U.S. 497, 507, the Court explained the issue began garnering governmental attention long before the General Plan EIR was certified in 2006. The opinion states: "In the late 1970s, the Federal Government began devoting serious attention to the possibility that carbon dioxide emissions associated with human activity could provoke climate change. In 1978, Congress enacted the National Climate Program Act, 92 Stat. 601, which required the President to establish a program to 'assist the Nation and the world to understand and respond to natural and man-induced climate processes and their implications." Although the General Plan EIR did not include a GHG analysis, the General Plan EIR included an evaluation of the GHG emissions (carbon dioxide [CO_2], methane [CH_4], nitrous oxide [N_2O], ozone [O_3], sulfur hexafluoride [SF_6], hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons) in Chapter 4.12, *Air Quality*, of the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 240 to 242).

The Addendum to the General Plan EIR prepared for the 2012 CAP found impacts from GHG emissions would be less than significant because the City was committed to reducing GHG emissions and had developed strategies to meet its reduction targets. At that time, the City had set emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2030 that would result in a significant reduction from business-as-usual (unmitigated) emissions growth, consistent with the direction of AB 32 and Executive Order S-03-05 (i.e., the City needed to reduce GHG emissions by 15 percent below current [2005] levels by 2020). The strategies identified in the City's 2012 CAP, combined with emissions reductions from State programs, would achieve a $CO2_e$ reduction of 15.4 percent by 2020 and 34.73 percent by 2030 compared with 2005 conditions. Accordingly, the City would achieve (and exceed) the GHG targets of 15 percent below current (2005) levels by 2020.

Total GHG emissions declined from 609,970 $MTCO_2e$ in 2005 to 456,630 $MTCO_2e$ in 2017, a decrease of 27 percent. A forecast of future GHG emissions allows City Councilmembers, Commissioners, City staff, and community members to identify the reductions necessary to achieve future GHG reduction targets and can help support long-range community planning efforts. The proposed project includes forecasts for the calendar years 2030 and 2045. Walnut Creek's GHG emissions are expected to increase from 2017 levels by 2045 if no future action is taken at any level, including by state, regional, and local agencies. Despite this, total emissions are expected to remain below 2005 levels despite substantial population growth. Emissions

3. Environmental Analysis

from most individual sectors are also expected to remain below 2005 levels, with the exception of natural gas use and BART activity. As with the 2012 CAP, the City must ensure that the proposed project attains specified GHG reduction targets for it to serve as a qualified GHG reduction plan. Collectively, all existing and planned activities (state, regional, and local) are projected to reduce Walnut Creek's 2045 GHG emissions to approximately 21 percent below 2017 levels, or approximately 41 percent below 2005 levels. In total, the proposed project is projected to reduce Walnut Creek's GHG emissions to 306,040 $MTCO_2e$ by 2030 and 77,140 $MTCO_2e$ by 2045. This will reduce 2030 emissions to 41 percent below 1990 levels and reduce 2045 emissions to 85 percent below 1990 levels, allowing Walnut Creek to achieve its 2030 and 2045 GHG reduction targets and support California's goal of statewide carbon neutrality.

Accordingly, pursuant to the now adopted GHG emission standards, implementation of the proposed project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (criterion [a]), would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs (criterion [b]), and would not cumulatively contribute to GHG emissions and global climate change (criterion [c]). Like the 2012 CAP, the proposed 2023 Sustainability Action Plan would not result in a new impact and like the 2012 CAP, it would have a less-than-significant impact related to GHG emissions.

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in potential future development impacts beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR.

The General Plan Natural Environment and Public Spaces Element, Built Environment Element, and Transportation Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to air quality and energy conservation (see Section 3.3, *Air Quality*, and Section 3.6, *Energy*), which in turn also reduce GHG emissions. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize GHG emissions from development in Walnut Creek. The purpose of the proposed project is to reduce GHG emissions from construction and operation of potential future development in Walnut Creek; therefore, implementation of the proposed project is a net benefit to GHG emission reduction from construction and operation of potential future development that implement the Walnut Creek General Plan.

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standards requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR regarding GHG emissions criteria (a) and (b) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	NI	Yes	No	No	No

3. Environmental Analysis

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
h) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to hazards and hazardous material?	LTS/M	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term hazard and hazardous materials impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy infrastructure, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees, and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). In addition, new haul trips for increasing opportunities for more organic recycling and bulk waste pick up (Actions 14.12 and 14.13) have the potential to cause impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials during long-term operation. Potential impacts from these actions are dependent on location and the accidental upset or spill of hazardous materials during construction or operation of any new renewable energy infrastructure, and accidental upset or spill during transport of waste from the City's waste haulers. There are no public or private airports currently in or planned for Walnut Creek, so there would be no impact regarding airports or airstrips (see Draft EIR page 187).

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and

actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). In addition, the General Plan has actions to improve opportunities for more recycling, including residential organic waste and landfill diversion (Actions 30.1.2, 30.2.1, 30.2.2, 30.2.3, 30.2.4, 30.2.5, 30.2.6, 30.2.7, 30.2.8, 30.2.9, 30.3.1, and 30.3.2). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to hazards and hazardous materials criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), and (g), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 187 through 188) and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to hazards and hazardous materials under criterion (h) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 284) and impacts were found to be less than significant. As stated on General Plan EIR page 187, there are no public or private airports currently in or planned for Walnut Creek, so there is no impact regarding airports or airstrips (criterion [e]).While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to hazards and hazardous materials criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), and (h).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Safety and Noise Elements contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to hazards and hazardous resources. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with the General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize hazards and hazardous materials impacts from development in Walnut Creek. In addition, compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials (criteria [a], [b], and [c]) as well as future site-specific project approval and environmental review would ensure a reasonable level of safety for construction workers and users of future development through review and mitigation of site-specific health hazards associated with proposed development required to implement the proposed project (criterion [d]). Potential future infrastructure improvements and higher urban density in Walnut Creek that could occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project would not introduce new population or major roadway changes that would cause additional roadway congestion or change how

emergency response plans or evacuation plans are implemented (criterion [f]) or expose people or structures to hazards from wildfire (criterion [g]).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable state, and/or City regulations and requirements, and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new hazards or hazardous materials impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to hazards and hazardous materials criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), and (h). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), and (h).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to hazards and hazardous materials criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or of-site; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
f) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to hydrology and water quality?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term hydrology and water quality impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees, and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Action 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). Potential impacts from these actions are likely dependent on location and the potential

for soil erosion and runoff during construction or operation of any new renewable energy or recycled water infrastructure and/or other required infrastructure, such as new trails or community gardens.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1 and 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). In addition, the General Plan has actions to improve opportunities for more recycling, including residential organic waste, and landfill diversion (Actions 30.1.2, 30.2.1, 30.2.2, 30.2.3, 30.2.4, 30.2.5, 30.2.6, 30.2.7, 30.2.8, 30.2.9, 30.3.1, and 30.3.2). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, with respect to hydrology and water quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 198 through 199) and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality under criterion (f) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 284) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to hydrology and water quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Natural Environment and Public Spaces Element, Built Environment Element, and Safety and Noise Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to hydrology and water quality. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize hydrology and water quality impacts from development in Walnut Creek, including compliance with State and local regulations related to minimizing the effects of water pollutants and hazards associated with hydrology and flooding (criteria [a] through [e]).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and would undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed would not result in hydrologic and water quality impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to hydrology and water quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to hydrology and water quality criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Physically divide an established community?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to land use and planning?	NI	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions would not have the potential to result in environmental impacts related to the construction of infrastructure that supports the proposed project with respect to land use and planning criteria (a), (b), and (c). The physical division of an established

community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature or the removal of a means of access that would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying areas. The proposed project is a regulatory document prepared for the purpose of reducing environmental impacts.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As described throughout this Addendum, and as shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to land use and planning criteria (a) and (b), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 47 through 49), and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to land use and planning under criterion (c) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 281) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed project is a regulatory document prepared for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions to ensure the City meets its 2045 GHG reduction targets and supports the State's goal of statewide carbon neutrality. The proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. The proposed project maintains the existing roadway patterns and would not include any new major roadways or other physical features through existing neighborhoods that would create new physical barriers in the Study Area (criterion [a]). Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse impacts beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to land use and planning criteria (a), (b), and (c). Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with General Plan goals, policies, and actions that are adopted for the purpose of avoiding an environmental impact (criterion [b]).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and would undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a new land use and planning impact that was not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to land use and planning criteria (a), (b), and (c). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts identified in the General Plan EIR with respect to land use and planning criteria (a), (b), and (c).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. Environmental effects associated with land use and planning impacts of the Walnut Creek General Plan were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 49 and 50). No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to land use and planning criteria (a), (b), and (c) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to mineral resources?	NI	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

The General Plan EIR did not include an evaluation of impacts to mineral resources pursuant to mineral resources criteria (a), (b), and (c). As described in the General Plan EIR on page 2, mineral resources were excluded from evaluation in the EIR through the scoping process because it was determined that the project would not have an impact on those resources. Implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. There are no qualifying lands

in the Study Area that meet the standards described in mineral resources criteria (a) and (b)[3] and no further evaluation under this topic is necessary for this Addendum.

3.13 NOISE

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	LTS/M	Yes	No	No	No
b) Result in the generation of excessive groundborne noise levels?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
d) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to noise impacts?	SU	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term noise impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8);

[3] General Plan Land Use Map (https://www.walnut-creek.org/home/showpublisheddocument/5020/638118842037700000); Municipal Code (https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/WalnutCreek/#!/WalnutCreek10/WalnutCreek1002A.html); Zoning Map (https://www.walnut-creek.org/departments/community-development-department/zoning/maps/zoning-web-map); and California Department of Conservation (https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc). Sources accessed May 2023.

increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). In addition, new haul trips for increasing opportunities for more organic recycling and bulk waste pick-up (Actions 14.12 and 14.13) have the potential to cause noise impacts during long-term operation. Walnut Creek is not within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and there would be no impacts with respect to airport noise (see Draft EIR pages 187 and 255).

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). In addition, the General Plan has actions to improve opportunities for more recycling, including residential organic waste and landfill diversion (Actions 30.1.2, 30.2.1, 30.2.2, 30.2.3, 30.2.4, 30.2.5, 30.2.6, 30.2.7, 30.2.8, 30.2.9, 30.3.1, and 30.3.2). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, with respect to noise criteria (a) and (b), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 263 through 264), and impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation. Cumulative impacts to noise under criterion (d) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 285) and impacts were found to be less than significant for construction noise and significant for increased traffic noise. As stated in the General Plan EIR on page 187, there are no public or private airports currently in or planned for Walnut Creek, so there is no impact regarding airports or airstrips.

While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate, with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing (vibration) activities that could cause damage to historic buildings, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse noise-related impacts beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to noise criteria (a), (b), and (d).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Safety and Noise Element contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider noise impacts. Potential

future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize noise impacts from development in Walnut Creek and ensure that no temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise are in excess of the City's noise ordinance (criterion [a]) and that no excessive groundborne noise levels adversely affect sensitive receptors during the construction and operation phases (criterion [b]).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, so there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, including incorporating mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR, as required. The City Municipal Code Title 4, Article 2 addresses excessive, unreasonable, and prolonged noise, including building construction and repair, and provides a list of appropriate construction noise mitigation methods. All construction projects in Walnut Creek are required to implement appropriate mitigation measures from this list in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, mitigation provided in the General Plan EIR, including implementation of the City Municipal Code, would ensure that these noise impacts would be no greater than what was originally documented for the General Plan (criteria [a] and [b]). Also, the addition of pickups from the City's waste haulers to accommodate new bulk items or organic waste bins would likely occur from haul trips already in circulation (criterion [a]). Therefore, the proposed would not result in noise impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to noise criteria (a), (b), and (d). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in the magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to noise criteria (a), (b), and (d).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meet the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to noise criteria (a), (b), and (d). and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to population and housing?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions would not have the potential to result in environmental impacts related to the construction and operation of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project with respect to housing and population criteria (a), (b), and (c). The proposed project would not generate any new residents to Walnut Creek, and employees would likely be limited to those who work on the short-term construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As described throughout this Addendum and as shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to population and housing criteria (a) and (b), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 60 through 63), and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to population and housing under criterion (c) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 281) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed project is a regulatory document prepared for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions to ensure the City meets its 2045 GHG reduction targets and to support the State's goal of statewide carbon

neutrality. While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or changes to any zoning districts in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and no new population growth or displacement of housing or people is associated with the proposed project (criteria [a] and [b]). Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to population and housing criteria (a), (b), and (c).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan's Built Environment Element and Quality of Life and Governance Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to population and housing. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize population and housing impacts from development in Walnut Creek. Therefore, no new impacts related to population and housing would result from the proposed project compared to what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR.

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, so there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed would not result in population and housing impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to housing and population criteria (a), (b), and (c). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to population and housing criteria (a), (b), and (c).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meet the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to housing and population criteria (a), (b), and (c) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the Proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR:			
		Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Fire protection services?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Police services?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Schools?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Libraries?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Parks?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
f) Other public facilities?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
g) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to public services?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions would not have the potential to result in environmental impacts related to the construction and operation of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g). The primary purpose of the public services impact analysis is to examine the impacts associated with physical improvements to public service facilities required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Public service facilities need improvements (i.e., construction, renovation, or expansion) as demand for services increases. Increased demand is typically driven by increases in population and the proposed project would not generate any new residents to Walnut Creek. The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it would exceed the ability of public service providers to adequately serve residents, thereby requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As described throughout this Addendum and as shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 69 through 89), and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to

public services under criterion (g) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 281 and 282) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed project is a regulatory document prepared for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions to ensure the City meets its 2045 GHG reduction targets and to support the State's goal of statewide carbon neutrality. While proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and transit-oriented development corridors, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan, and no new population growth is associated with the proposed project that would place additional demand on public service providers (criteria [a], [b], [c], [d], [e], [f], and [g]). Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan's Built Environment Element, Safety and Noise Element, and Quality of Life and Governance Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to public services. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with the General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize public services impacts from development in Walnut Creek, including all applicable fees intended to fund City services for maintaining acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, and libraries with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g). Therefore, no new demands for fire, police, school, parks, and libraries would result from the proposed project beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, so there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed would not result in public service impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meet the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to public services criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.16 RECREATION

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to recreation or parks?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions would not have the potential to result in environmental impacts to recreation facilities related to the construction and operation of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project with respect to recreation criteria (a), (b), and (c). The proposed project would not generate any new residents to Walnut Creek, who are the primary users of such recreational facilities, and therefore would not exceed the capacity of the recreation facilities to adequately serve residents or result in the deterioration of existing recreation facilities, thereby requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities.

3. Environmental Analysis

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As described throughout this Addendum and as shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, with respect to recreation criteria (a) and (b), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 89 through 96), and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to recreation under criterion (c) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 282) and impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed project is a regulatory document prepared for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions to ensure the City meets its 2045 GHG reduction targets and to support the State's goal of statewide carbon neutrality. Proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors, but the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan, and no new population growth is associated with the proposed project that would place additional demand on recreation facilities (criteria [a], [b], and [c]). Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to recreation criteria (a), (b), and (c).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan's Natural Environment and Public Spaces Element contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to recreation facilities. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would also be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize recreation facilities impacts from development in Walnut Creek with respect to recreation criteria (a), (b), and (c). Therefore, no new demands for recreation facilities would result from the proposed project beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to recreation criteria (a), (b), and (c).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, so there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed would not result in recreation facilities impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to recreation criteria (a), (b), and (c). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to recreation criteria (a), (b), and (c).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meet the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to recreation criteria (a), (b), and (c) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: • Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or • A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native American tribe.	-	N/A	No	No	No
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to tribal cultural resources??	-	N/A	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

3. Environmental Analysis

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in an impact to a tribal cultural resource related to the construction of infrastructure that supports the proposed project, such as building new solar energy infrastructure, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, and 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Actions 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). Any type of grading or trenching could unearth an unknown tribal cultural resource.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

The General Plan EIR did not include an evaluation of impacts to tribal cultural resources pursuant to criterion (a) because this criterion was not introduced to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist*, until 2017, and therefore not required by CEQA at that time. Changes in law, regulation, or guidelines adoption are not "new information" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 if the information about the issue (i.e., tribal cultural resources) was known or should have been known at the time the original EIR was certified. *Concerned Dublin Citizens v City of Dublin* (2013) 214 CA4th 1301, 1320; *Fort Mojave Indian Tribe v Department of Health Servs.* (1995) 38 CA4th 1574, 1605. Information about tribal cultural resources was known when the General Plan EIR was certified in 2006. SB 18 was passed in 2004. SB 18 requires local governments to contact and consult with California Native American Tribes prior to amendment or adoption of a General Plan, Specific Plan, or designation of Open Space. In addition, Governor Brown's Executive Order B-10-11 (2011), established the Governor's Tribal Advisor and established administration policy to encourage State agencies to communicate and consult with California Native American Tribes.

Impacts to cultural resources, which include historic, prehistoric, and archaeological resources, Native American resources, and human remains, from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 167 through 168), and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to cultural resources were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR page 283) and impacts were found to be less than significant. The Native American Historic Resource Protection Act, commonly referred to as its legislative bill number Assembly Bill 52, passed in 2014 and amended CEQA to address California Native American tribal concerns regarding how cultural resources of importance to tribes are treated under CEQA, and created the new tribal cultural resources category. While tribal cultural resources were not defined at the time of the General Plan EIR, the cultural resources analysis addressed impacts associated with prehistoric, archeological resources, and human remains, including those of Native Americans.

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and

actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy such as building new solar energy infrastructure, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); and improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1) and could increase landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4) and promote higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). Depending on the location of the potential new infrastructure and improvements, unearthing unknown tribal cultural resources could occur similar to unearthing unknown archaeological resources or human remains.

Proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors; however, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR.

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan's Governance Element and Built Environment Element contain goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to archeological resources and human remains, including those of Native Americans. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with these General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize impacts to archeological resources and human remains, including those of Native Americans, from development in Walnut Creek. In addition, all potential future development is required to comply with federal and State regulations that minimize impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources. For example, Health and Safety Code Section 7052 states that the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony. Section 7050.5(b) of the same code specifies protocol when human remains are discovered during activities involving ground disturbance. If human remains are discovered or identified in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there should be no further disturbance or excavation nearby until the county coroner has determined the area is not a crime scene that warrants further investigation into the cause of death and has made recommendations to the persons responsible for the work in the manner provided in PRC Section 5097.98 (the California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act). This section, which applies to both State and private lands, provides guidance for proceeding when human remains associated with Native American burials and associated items are encountered. This act stipulates the procedures the descendants may follow for treating or disposing of the remains and associated grave goods. Compliance with these existing regulations and the City's ongoing implementation of the procedures for Native American consultation

through the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act would ensure that potential known and unknown cultural resources are protected (criteria [a] and [b]), and impacts would be less than significant.

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed would not result in new impacts to tribal cultural resources that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in the magnitude of the existing impacts to unknown archeological resources and human remains, and compliance with Native American Historic Resource Protection Act would ensure that impacts to known tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meet the standards requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.18 TRANSPORTATION

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	--	N/A	No	No	No
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable impact to the transportation network?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees and clearing vegetation where wildfire risk is high (Action 14.14, 16.1, 17.1, 21.1, and 21.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3). In addition, new haul trips for increasing opportunities for more organic recycling and bulk waste pick-up (Actions 14.12 and 14.13) have the potential to cause transportation impacts during long-term operation.

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); and improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1) and increase landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4) and promote higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). In addition, the General Plan has actions to improve opportunities for recycling, including residential organic waste and landfill diversion (Actions 30.1.2, 30.2.1, 30.2.2, 30.2.3, 30.2.4, 30.2.5, 30.2.6, 30.2.7, 30.2.8, 30.2.9, 30.3.1, and 30.3.2). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to criteria (a), (c), and (d), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 128 through 130), and impacts were found to be less than significant with the exception of impacts related to level of service standards, which, as described below, are no longer considered to be an environmental impact pursuant to CEQA.

3. Environmental Analysis

With the passage of SB 743 (September 2013), which was codified in Public Resources Code Section 21099, and the subsequent adoption of revised CEQA Guidelines (December 2018), level of service can no longer be used as a criterion for identifying significant transportation impacts for most projects under CEQA. Level of service is the measure of the average amount of delay experienced by vehicle drivers at an intersection or along a road segment during the most congested time of day. The new CEQA metric (vehicle miles traveled or VMT) measures the total number of daily miles traveled by vehicles on the roadway network and thereby the impacts on the environment from those miles traveled. Level of service is a measure of local vehicle congestion at an intersection or on a road segment, and VMT is a measure of the total miles of vehicle travel measured area-wide or at the project level. In other words, SB 743 changed the focus of transportation impact analysis in CEQA from measuring quality-of-life impacts *to drivers*, to measuring the physical impacts *of driving* on the environment. VMT criterion (b) was not introduced to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist*, until 2018, and therefore was not required by CEQA at that time. As previously stated in Section 3.17, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, changes in law, regulation, or guidelines adoption are not "new information" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 if the information about the issue (i.e., VMT) was known or should have been known at the time the original EIR was certified. Information about VMT was known when the General Plan EIR was certified in 2006. The General Plan EIR included a discussion of VMT in Chapter 4.12, *Air Quality*, of the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 240 to 242). Since the certification of the General Plan EIR, the issue of VMT has become a more prominent issue of concern, as evidenced by passage of SB 743 in 2013.

Proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors; however, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts established in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan, and no new population growth that would generate permanent new vehicle trips is associated with the proposed project. Pursuant to SB 743, infill residential development in high transit-oriented development areas is not considered the type of project that would generate excessive VMT resulting in a significant impact. Infill housing in transit-oriented development areas is anticipated to reduce VMT by putting residents in close proximity to services and transit options, thus reducing trips from vehicles.

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Transportation Element contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to transportation. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with the General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize transportation impacts from development in Walnut Creek and ensure future projects do not conflict with the City's standards for the Walnut Creek circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities (criterion [a]);

would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (criterion [b]); and no increased hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., a sharp curve or dangerous intersection) would result during the construction and operation phases (criterion [c]).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. No mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR would apply to the proposed project because they are all related to level of service, which, as stated, is no longer an acceptable measure for transportation-related impacts pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the proposed would not result in transportation impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to transportation criteria a), b), c), d), and e). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to transportation criteria a), b), c), d), and e).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meet the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to transportation criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	NI	Yes	No	No	No

3. Environmental Analysis

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
c) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
f) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
e) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	NI	Yes	No	No	No
f) Result in significant cumulative impacts related to water, wastewater, stormwater, or solid waste?	SU	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions have the potential to result in a short-term utilities and service system impact related to the construction of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project, such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Actions 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 10.6, 12.2, and 12.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 13.1); improving multimodal access (Actions 9.1, 9.6, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 11.8); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Action 14.14, 16.1, 20.1, and 20.3); and developing new buildings for more urban density (Action 8.3).

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. For example, General Plan policies and actions could result in the construction and operation of infrastructure to support renewable energy such as building new solar energy, energy conservation, and other renewable energy infrastructure (Policy 28.2 and Actions 27.1.1, 27.1.2, 28.2.2,28.2.3, and 28.2.4); installing recycled water infrastructure (Action 29.2.1); improving multimodal access (Policies 4.1, 15.1 and Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 6.2.2, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 15.1.1, and 21.1.1); increasing landscaping, green buffers, and trees (Policies 26.2 and 26.4 and Actions 26.5.1, 26.5.2, 26.5.3, and 29.2.4); and promoting higher urban density in the downtown area and transit-oriented development corridors (Actions 3.1.1, 6.4.1, 10.1.1, and 31.2.3). Environmental impacts from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan, pursuant to utilities and service systems criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 140 through 141), and impacts were found to be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems under criterion (f) were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 284) and impacts were found to be less than significant with respect to wastewater and solid waste, but significant with respect to water supply.

Proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors; however, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan, and no new population growth that would generate permanent demand on service system providers is associated with the proposed project. While the proposed project promotes the installation of more landscaping, trees, and green buffers, these types of improvements would be required to comply with policies of the General Plan, Municipal Code, and the project itself, which require the use of native and drought-tolerant plants and potentially use reclaimed or recycled water for irrigation where safe and effective to do so. Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to utilities and services systems beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR utilities and service systems criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Built Environment Element contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts to utilities and service systems. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with the General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize utilities and service system impacts from development in Walnut Creek and ensure that, during the construction and operation phases, future projects do not exceed capacity of the existing systems for water, wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste that serve Walnut Creek (criteria [a], [b], [c], [d], and [e]). As described, the intent of the proposed project is to reduce demand and promote conservation of water. As such, because

the proposed project does not result in any new growth, it serves a net benefit to the utilities and service systems that serve Walnut Creek (criteria [a], [b], [c], [d], and [e]).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in utility and service systems impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR utilities and service systems criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts with respect to utilities and service systems criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meet the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR utilities and service systems criteria (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.20 WILDFIRE

If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable wildfire impact?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion:

As shown in Table 3, implementation of proposed strategies and actions would not have the potential to result in a wildfire impact related to the construction and operation of infrastructure and improvements that support the proposed project. The Study Area is not in a State Responsibility Areas (SRA) or on lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The nearest SRA or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones are to the west of the Study Area in the city of Lafayette and unincorporated Contra Costa County. Walnut Creek's border to the west is in close proximity to a very high fire hazard severity zone or land designated by CAL FIRE as a State Responsibility Area (SRA). Lands east of Walnut Creek's city boundary are also within an SRA but in CAL FIRE moderate and high fire severity zones.[4]

According to CAL FIRE, the wildland-urban interface (WUI), which is an area of transition between wildland (unoccupied land) and land with human development (occupied land), is subdivided into the "interface" zone (housing adjacent to wildland vegetation, but not mingled with it), the "intermix" zone (where houses and wildland vegetation directly mingle), and the "influence" zone (areas of wildfire-susceptible vegetation surrounding the other zones). The interface and intermix zones carry the highest risk for wildfires affecting developed areas. Unlike wildfire in wildland areas, fires in WUI areas are more likely to damage or destroy buildings and infrastructure that support populations, the economy, and key services in the town. According

[4] California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, FHSZ Viewer, accessed April 13, 2023, https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/.

to CAL FIRE, the Study Area includes areas in the WUI interface (housing adjacent to wildland vegetation, but not mingled with it), the intermix (where houses and wildland vegetation directly mingle), and the influence (areas of wildfire-susceptible vegetation surrounding the other zones) zones.[5]

New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts

As described throughout this Addendum and as shown in Table 1, the General Plan policies and actions related to reducing GHG emissions require similar types of infrastructure and improvements as the proposed project. Impacts related to wildfire from implementation of the Walnut Creek General Plan were evaluated in the General Plan EIR (see Draft EIR pages 67 through 70, and 282). While wildfire criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d) were not introduced to the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, *Environmental Checklist*, until 2018, Chapter 4.3, *Community Services*, of the General Plan EIR addressed impacts to fire protection services and impacts from wildfire, and impacts were found to be less than significant. In addition, while new wildfire maps have been released since the time of the General Plan EIR, CAL FIRE has designated Walnut Creek a Local Responsibility Area (LRA), and it is not in a very high fire hazard severity zone.

Proposed Action 8.3 requires the City to identify and remove barriers and provide incentives to promote higher urban density where appropriate with a mix of uses that reduce auto dependency in the downtown area, identified specific plan areas, and in transit-oriented development corridors; however, the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan and would not result in adverse wildfire impacts beyond what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR with respect to wildfire criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d).

As described in the General Plan EIR, the General Plan Built Environment Element and Safety and Noise Element contains goals, policies, and actions that require local planning and development decisions to consider impacts from wildfire. Potential future development required to implement the proposed project would be required to comply with the General Plan goals, policies, and actions that serve to minimize wildfire-related impacts from development in Walnut Creek and ensure the proposed project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan, exacerbate wildfire risks, exacerbate wildfire risks, or result in a cumulatively considerable impact to wildfire impacts (criteria [a], [b], [c], and [d]).

The implementation of the proposed project would result in changes at the policy level, there is no potential for growth in Walnut Creek or the region associated with the proposed project, and it does not include specific development proposals. All future development projects that would implement the proposed

[5] CAL FIRE, 2019, "Wildland Urban Interface," last edit December 2, 2022, accessed April 13 2023, https://frap.fire.ca.gov/media/10300/wui_19_ada.pdf and https://www.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?url=https://services3.arcgis.com/i2dkYWmb4wHvYPda/ArcGIS/rest/services/cdf_wildland_urban_interface/FeatureServer/0&source=sd.

project would be subject to applicable State and/or City regulations and requirements and undergo an appropriate level of environmental review of project-specific impacts, as required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new wildfire impacts that were not addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to wildfire criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d). For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts identified in the General Plan EIR with respect to wildfire criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d).

Substantial Changes in the Circumstances or New Information Associated with the Study Area

There are no changed circumstances or new information that meets the standard for requiring further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. No changes in land use patterns are proposed in association with the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR with respect to wildfire criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d) and would not meet any other standards under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3).

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	SU	Yes	No	No	No

3. Environmental Analysis

Would the Proposed Project:	Level of Impact in the General Plan EIR	Impacts of the Proposed Project Compared to General Plan EIR: Same or Reduced Impact?	New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	LTS	Yes	No	No	No

Key: NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; LTS/M = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

Discussion

a) With respect to biological resources and cultural resources, implementation of the proposed project would not result in changes to the development standards or land use designations established as part of the General Plan or to any zoning districts in the Walnut Creek Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the scale or location of overall ground-disturbing activities, such as those that could occur from implementation of the General Plan, and no new population growth that would generate permanent demand on service system providers is associated with the proposed project. As discussed throughout this Addendum, including but not limited to Sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.17, the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing impacts.

b) CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, Cumulative Impacts, defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects, which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Cumulative impacts may result from individually minor, but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time. As described in Sections 3.1 through 3.20, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a new or a substantial increase in magnitude of the existing cumulatively considerable impacts of the General Plan.

c) Implementation of the proposed project would not change from the General Plan with respect to direct and indirect effects on human beings. The proposed project would not increase the General Plan's development program and boundaries. As described in Sections 3.1 through 3.20, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a new impact or a substantial increase in magnitude of existing impacts of those of the General Plan EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.

4. Conclusion

As demonstrated in the General Plan EIR and summarized in Section 3, *Environmental Analysis*, of this Addendum, all impacts from implementation of the General Plan were found to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation, except for the significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality and transportation. As shown in Section 3.3, *Air Quality*, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of the proposed project but would not be increased in severity. As shown in Section 3.18, *Transportation*, the significant and unavoidable impacts were related to level of service, which is no longer an appropriate metric for measuring impacts from vehicles, and no impact would occur from the proposed project. Rather, the beneficial strategies of the proposed project would reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality, thus lending to the improvement of the conditions leading to the findings in the General Plan EIR. As described in Section 3, implementation of the proposed strategies and any associated actions would be subject to applicable federal, State, and/or City regulations; undergo an appropriate level of environmental review; and implement mitigation measures from the General Plan EIR as required.

As summarized below, and for the reasons described in Section 3, the City has determined that an Addendum to the General Plan EIR is appropriate for the proposed project. None of the conditions analyzed under the City's General Plan EIR have changed, nor does the proposed project, as an implementing tool of the General Plan, meet any of the criteria for preparing a subsequent or supplemental EIR. The proposed project will not have one or more significant effects not discussed in the General Plan EIR, nor does the proposed project create substantially more severe significant effects than previously examined in the General Plan EIR. The proposed project as implemented would remain consistent with the analysis in the certified General Plan EIR.

4.1 SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES TO THE PROJECT

The proposed project is not a substantial change to the General Plan EIR because it is within the Study Area described in the General Plan EIR in Section 2.2, *Study Area*. Consequently, there are no substantial changes proposed that will require major revisions of the General Plan EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

4.2 SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES IN CIRCUMSTANCES

The proposed project would not result in substantial changes in physical circumstances that would cause a new significant impact or substantially increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact,

and there have been no other changes in the circumstances that meet this criterion. There have been no changes in the environmental conditions in the Study Area that were not contemplated and analyzed in the General Plan EIR and that would result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts in association with implementation of the proposed project.

4.3 NEW INFORMATION

There is no new information of substantial importance (which was not known or could not have been known at the time of the General Plan adoption on April 4, 2006) that identifies a new significant impact; a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact; mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible that would now be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the General Plan; or mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the General Plan EIR and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

5. References

2006. *City of Walnut Creek General Plan Environmental Impact Report.* SCH Number 2004022042.

2006. *City of Walnut Creek General Plan.*

2012. *City of Walnut Creek Climate Action Plan*.

4. References

This page intentionally left blank.