Supplemental Material

For

City of Sacramento

City Council
Financing Authority
Housing Authority
Redevelopment Agency

Agenda Packet

Submitted: 3/31/10

For the Meeting of: 4/1/10

☒ Additional Material
☐ Revised Material

Title: Curtis Park Village (P04-109)

Some of the City staff-requested revisions to the Final EIR were inadvertently left out during preparation of the document. All of these revisions were previously vetted by the City and assumed to be in the Final EIR. None of the following revisions increase an impact or create a new impact.

Contact Information: Jennifer Hageman, Senior Planner, Community Development Department, (916) 808-5538

Please include this supplemental material in your agenda packet. This material will also be published to the City's Internet. For additional information, contact the City Clerk Department at Historic City Hall, 915 I Street, First Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-2604, (916) 808-7200.

Revisions to Chapter 2 of the FEIR:

1. The following revision is required because, although the revision was made to the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, it was inadvertently not made to the Final EIR.

Page 2-36 of the FEIR is hereby revised to add the following text:

The text on page 5.2-37, Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c) is hereby revised as follows:

5.2-1(c) Modify the southbound approach to the Sutterville Road / SR99 SB Ramps intersection to provide a left-turn lane, a combination left-through ~~right~~ lane, and two ~~a~~ right-turn lanes. This change would bring the ~~consist of adding~~ right-turning movements ~~to the existing combination left-through lane and allow that movement to occur~~ under signal control. This mitigation measure is required at five percent of development based on trip generation. The design of the mitigation is subject to the approval of the City Transportation Department and Caltrans. This mitigation measure would reduce the impact of the Proposed Project and all access scenarios to a less than significant level during the p.m. and Saturday peak hours.

2. The text on Page 2-36 of the FEIR is hereby revised to add the following to reflect the effect of implementation of MM 5.2-1(c) (see Item 1 above) on the intersection of Sutterville Road and SR 99 SB Ramp.

Table 5.2-16 on page 5.2-51 is hereby revised as follows:

21. Sutterville / SR 99 SB Ramp	Signal	AM	D	41.1	C	26.0 ~~9.2~~	C	26.0 ~~9.2~~	C	26.0 ~~9.2~~
		PM	D	51.6	C ~~D~~	30.8 52.2	C ~~D~~	30.8 ~~52.2~~	C ~~D~~	30.8 ~~52.2~~
		Saturday	D	54.8	D	38.0 ~~52.8~~	D	38.0 ~~52.8~~	D	38.0 ~~52.8~~

3. Page 2-36 of the FEIR, above the text revision to Mitigation Measure 5.2-7, is hereby revised to add the following text:

The third paragraph on page 5.2-43 is hereby corrected to state that Road D would have the angled parking:

> The site plan shows angled parking along Road D~~A~~ that would require vehicles leaving some of the parking stalls to back across pedestrian crosswalks. This type of design would not comply with City design standards or normal traffic engineering practices and would be considered a ***potentially significant impact***.

4. The following revision is required because, although the revision was made to the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, it was inadvertently not made to the Final EIR.

Page 2-37 of the FEIR is hereby revised:

The text on page 5.2-55, Mitigation Measure 5.2-10(h) is hereby revised as follows:

5.2-10(h) Sutterville Road / SR 99 Northbound Ramps – The project applicant shall pay a fair share contribution to modify signal timing to provide split phase for all approaches and re-stripe the eastbound lanes to provide one left-turn, one left-through, and one through lane. Construct two receiving lanes on the on-ramp for the turning movement from eastbound 12th Avenue to the northbound SR 99 ramp. This mitigation measure would reduce the impact of the Proposed Project and Access Scenario 2 and 3 to a less than significant level.

5. The following revision is required because of the change in queing and capacity to the SR 99 SB ramp due to the revision to the mitigation measure.

Page 2-37 of the FEIR is hereby revised to add the following:

Table 5.2-19 on page 5.2-60 is hereby revised as follows:

Table 5.2-1
SR 99 Ramp Queues - Cumulative

Location	Peak Hour	Storage Capacity (ft)	No Project		Proposed Project[2]	
			Queue[1] (ft)	Adequate Capacity	Queue[1] (ft)	Adequate Capacity
99I-5 SB Off-ramp to Sutterville Rd.	AM	765	975	No	300850	YesNo
	PM		1175	No	7501500	YesNo
	Saturday		1075	No	7751300	No
99I-5 NB Off-ramp to Sutterville Rd.	AM	510	325	Yes	375	Yes
	PM		450	Yes	525	No
	Saturday		325	Yes	500	Yes

[1] Queue represents 95th percentile queue.
[2] Baseline mitigations are assumed to be in place for Proposed Project under cumulative conditions.
Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2010~~08~~.

6. Page 2-37 of the FEIR is hereby revised to reflect the effect of the revised mitigation to the SR 99 ramp:

The text in the third paragraph on page 5.2-60 is hereby revised as follows:

While the traffic queue from traffic signal at the southbound 12th Avenue off-ramp would exceed the storage capacity of the ramp by one car length during the Saturday peak hour under the Proposed Project and all access scenarios, the traffic queue would be shorter than No Project conditions. ~~without the project, the Proposed Project and all access scenarios would add traffic to the ramp and further extend the length of the queue during all three peak hours.~~ Therefore, ~~T~~this is considered a *less than significant impact.*

Revisions to FEIR Chapter 3.1

7. Page 3.1-555 of the FEIR, Response to Comment 5-94, is hereby corrected to state that Road B would have the angled parking:

The proposed project relocates the angled parking to Road D, which will have less amount of traffic than Road A. The traffic operations findings described in the DEIR are not expected to be affected by the proposed angled parking on Road D. Angled parking is expected to slow traffic, which is intended to calm motor vehicle traffic and create a more hospitable environment for pedestrian activity.

8. Page 3.1-556 of the FEIR, Response to Comment 5-95, is hereby corrected to state that Road B would have the angled parking:

See Response to Comment 5-94. In addition, with the proposed angle parking along Road D, not Road A, the comment is no longer applicable since the new location ~~the angled parking~~ is not expected to affect traffic flow through the intersection at Sutterville Road and Road A. ~~To the contrary, angled parking will slow traffic approaching that intersection and act as a good traffic calming measure on Road A.~~

9. Page 3.1-556 of the FEIR, Response to Comment 5-96, is hereby corrected to state that Road B would have the angled parking:

Please see Response to Comment 5-94. The proposed project does not include angle parking along Road A. ~~The proposed angled parking along Road A shall be designed to City standards without affecting the travel lane width.~~ Angled parking is expected to slow traffic flow on Road D , but would not divert traffic to nearby streets such as West Curtis Drive and 24th Street.

10. Page 3.1-556 of the FEIR, Response to Comment 5-98, is hereby corrected to state that Road B would have the angled parking:

Section 15.13.4 Angled Parking in the Design and Procedures Manual states that, "Angled parking will be considered on a case-by case basis. Angled parking shall be required and/or allowed at the direction of the City Traffic Engineer. Implementation of angled parking may require specific approval by the City Council. Table 15-13.4 lists the general criteria for considering angled parking. However, meeting the criteria does not warrant installation of angled parking." Table 15-13.4 lists "Angle Parking Criteria." The City Traffic Engineer has the discretion to allow angled parking where it would be appropriate. The City Traffic Engineer has determined that angled parking on Road D ~~A~~ would be appropriate in this situation where there is a need to promote pedestrian accessibility.

11. Page 3.1-556 of the FEIR, Responses to Comments 5-100 and 5-101, are hereby revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.2-7 (a) shall be considered with the approval of street layouts and the approval of the Tentative Maps. Additionally, with the proposed project, street layout has been revised and several of the non standard roadways have been eliminated.

12. Page 3.1-638 of the FEIR, Response to Comment 16-2, is hereby revised as follows:

An assessment of trip generation for the proposed project ~~revised land uses~~ was performed and described in the memorandum dated September 15, 2009, and is included in Appendix A of the FEIR~~December 9, 2008~~. See Response to Comment 5-28 for additional information.

13. Page 3.1-656 of the FEIR, Response to Comment 19-22, is hereby revised as follows:

As noted in Chapter 1 of this FEIR, Introduction, List of Commenters, and Project Revisions, the project applicant has submitted revisions to the project description, including removal of the roundabout and curve along Road A. It should be noted that in general curving roadways are expected to calm traffic due to restrictions on lines of sight for vehicles on the street. The Urban Street Geometric Design Handbook (ITE 2008, p. 111) states that "Traditional traffic calming designs may include horizontal deflections in the road as well as obstructions."

Revisions to FEIR Appendix A

14. Immediately following Table 4 in the Curtis Park Village – Trip Generation Comparison Memorandum, Appendix A of the FEIR, the following tables are inserted. They were inadvertently left out.

Table 5 Trip Generation – Current Proposed Project (using ITE Trip Generation 8th edition)

Land Use	Amount		Trips Generated									
			Weekday	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Saturday		
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Retail	126	KSF	7,871	107	69	176	363	378	741	516	477	993
Retail / Grocery Store	54	KSF	4,973	117	75	192	300	289	589	296	284	580
Retail / Bookstore[1]	25	KSF	5,184	71	45	116	254	234	488	282	251	533
Restaurants	13	KSF	1,653	78	72	150	86	59	145	97	86	183
Athletic Club	38	KSF	1,634	69	44	113	144	89	233	124	129	253
Multi-Family Residential[2]	248	Units	1,626	25	100	125	100	54	154	75	64	139
Senior Adult Housing - attached	90	Units	313	4	8	12	8	6	14	14	14	27
Single-Family Residential	190	Units	1,877	36	107	143	118	69	187	94	83	177
Park/Open Space	7	Acres	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total Project Trips			25,142	507	520	1,027	1,373	1,178	2,551	1,498	1,389	2,887

Transit Adjustments[3]										
	-142	-2	-1	-3	-6	-7	-13	-9	-9	-18
Retail (-1.8%)	-90	-2	-1	-3	-6	-5	-11	-5	-5	-10
Grocery Store (-1.8%)	-93	-1	-1	-2	-5	-4	-9	-5	-5	-10
Bookstore (-1.8%)	-30	-2	-1	-3	-2	-1	-3	-2	-1	-3
Restaurant (-1.8%)	-29	-1	-1	-2	-2	-2	-4	-2	-3	-5
Athletic Club (-1.8%)	-109	-2	-8	-10	-8	-5	-13	-6	-5	-11
Residential (Daily -3.1%, a.m. -3.7%, p.m. -3.6%, Sat. -3.1%)	-502	-10	-11	-21	-29	-24	-53	-29	-28	-57
Total Transit Adjustments	-5,830	-822	-816	-1,638	-2,254	-2,505	-4,758	-3,319	-3,113	-6,432
Internal Trips	-3,769	-500	-509	-999	-2,204	-2,040	-4,244	-2,270	-2,274	-4,544
Pass-by Trips (31% of net retail trips)[4]	15,041	3,656	3,741	7,397	8,887	6,969	15,856	9,232	8,173	17,405
New External Trips										

[1] Trip generation for Weekday and AM peak hour of Bookstore were based on trip generation ratio of Retail/Shopping Center.

[2] Trip generation for Saturday peak hour was based on data from Low Rise Apartment (ITE 221)

[3] Transit adjustments and transit trips for restaurant and theater are assumed to be the same percentage as for retail use.

[4] Pass-by adjustments are made for shopping center, grocery store and bookstore only

[5] The Saturday distribution for Senior Adult Housing – attached is based on Senior Adult Housing – detached (ITE 251)

*** Some totals do not add up due to rounding**
Sources: Dowling Associates, Inc. 2009

Trip Generation – DEIR Proposed Project (using ITE Trip Generation 8th edition)

Land Use	Amount		Trips Generated									
				AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Saturday		
			Weekday	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Retail / Shopping Center	136	KSF	8,274	1 1 2 1 1	 7 2 7	1 8 4 1 9	3 8 2 3 0	3 9 8 2 8	7 8 0 5 8	5 4 3 2 9	5 0 1 2 8	1, 0 4 4 5 8
Retail / Grocery Store	54	KSF	4,973	7	5	2 1	0 2	9 2	9 4	6 2	4 2	0 5
Retail / Bookstore[1]	25	KSF	5,177	7 0	4 5	1 5 1	5 4	3 4	8 8 1	8 2	5 1	3 3 1
Restaurants	13	KSF	1,653	7 8	7 2	5 0	8 6	5 9	4 5 1	9 7 1	8 6	8 3 1
Dinner Theater	502	Seats	1,436	8	7	1 5 1	8 8	4 3	3 1 1	0 3	7 1	7 4 1
Multi-Family Residential[2]	212	Units	1,408	2 2	8 6	0 8 1	8 7	4 7	3 4 1	6 6 1	5 6 1	2 2 2
Senior Adult Housing – Attached[5]	80	Units	278	4 3	6 1 0	0 1 3	8 1 1	5 6	3 1 8	2 9	2 8	4 1 7
Single-Family Residential	183	Units	1,813	4	3	7	4	7	1	0	0	0
Park/Open Space	7	Acres	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total Project Trips			25,023	4 4 5	4 6 6	9 1 1	1, 3 1 1 9	1, 1 4 2	2, 4 6 1	1, 4 9 0	1, 3 4 2	2, 8 3 2

Transit Adjustments[3]										
Retail (-1.8%)	**-149**	**-2**	**-1**	**-3**	**-7**	**-7**	**-14**	**-10**	**-9**	**-19**
Grocery Store (-1.8%)	**-90**	**-2**	**-1**	**-3**	**-6**	**-5**	**-11**	**-5**	**-5**	**-10**
Bookstore (-1.8%)	**-93**	**-1**	**-1**	**-2**	**-5**	**-4**	**-9**	**-5**	**-5**	**-10**
Restaurant (-1.8%)	**-30**	**-2**	**-1**	**-3**	**-2**	**-1**	**-3**	**-2**	**-1**	**-3**
Dinner Theater (-1.8%)	**-26**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-1**	**-1**	**-2**	**-2**	**-1**	**-3**
Residential (Daily -3.1%, a.m. -3.7%, p.m. -3.6%, Sat. -3.1%)	**-109**	**-2**	**-7**	**-9**	**-8**	**-4**	**-12**	**-5**	**-5**	**-10**
Total Transit Adjustments	**-496**	**-9**	**-11**	**-20**	**-29**	**-22**	**-51**	**-29**	**-26**	**-55**
Internal Trips	**-5,573**	**-727**	**-724**	**-1443**	**-323**	**-323**	**-646**	**-699**	**-699**	**-1391**
Pass-by Trips (31% of net retail trips)[4]	**-3,919**	**-553**	**-553**	**-1106**	**-212**	**-212**	**-424**	**-239**	**-239**	**-478**
New External Trips	**15,035**	**3113**	**3104**	**6217**	**8467**	**6733**	**15200**	**9262**	**7818**	**17080**

[1] Trip generation for Weekday and AM peak hour of Bookstore were based on trip generation ratio of Retail/Shopping Center.

[2] Trip generation for Saturday peak hour was based on data from Low Rise Apartment (ITE 221)

[3] Transit adjustments and transit trips for restaurant and theater are assumed to be the same percentage as for retail use.

[4] Pass-by adjustments are made for shopping center, grocery store and bookstore only

[5] Saturday distribution for Senior Adult Housing – Attached is based on Senior Adult Housing – Detached (ITE 251)

*** Some totals do not add up due to rounding**
Sources: Dowling Associates, Inc. 2009

Trip Generation – As Analyzed in DEIR (using ITE Trip Generation 8th edition)

Land Use	Amount		Trips Generated									
				AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Saturday		
			Weekday	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Retail Commercial	92	KSF	6,439	90	57	147	590	720	1,310	320	300	620
Retail / Grocery Store	54	KSF	4,973	171	75	246	280	288	568	264	254	518
Retail / Bookstore[1]	25	KSF	5,220	73	46	119	154	154	308	82	51	133
Restaurant	13	KSF	1,653	78	72	150	86	59	145	76	57	133
Dinner Theater	560	Seats	1,602	94	82	176	88	84	172	60	136	196
Hotel	150	KSF	969	41	27	68	47	44	91	34	41	75
Health Spa	85	KSF	2,799	43	60	103	75	69	144	11	11	22
Single-Family Residential	216	Units	2,112	40	121	161	137	70	207	94	107	201
Park/Open Space	7	Acres	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total Project Trips			25,778	491	466	957	1,377	1,226	2,603	1,348	1,338	2,804
Transit Adjustments[2]												
Retail (-1.8%)			-116	-	-	-3	-	-	-	-	-	-15

		2	1		5	6	1 1 -	8	7	
Grocery Store (-1.8%)	-90	- 2	- 1	-3	- 6	- 5	1 1	- 5	- 5	-10
Bookstore (-1.8%)	-94	- 1	- 1	-2	- 5	- 4	-9	- 5	- 5	-10
Restaurant (-1.8%)	-30	- 2	- 1	-3	- 2	- 1	-3	- 2	- 1	-3
Dinner Theater (-1.8%)	-29	0	0	0	- 2	- 1	-3	- 2	- 2	-4
Hotel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Spa (-1.8%)	-50	- 1	- 1	-2	- 3	- 3	-6	- 2	- 2	-4
Residential (Daily-3.1%,am,-3.7%,pm-3.6%,Sat-3.1%)	-65	- 1	- 4	-6	- 5	- 3	-8	- 3	- 3	-6
Total Transit Adjustments	-474	- 9	- 9	- 1 9	- 2 8	- 2 3	- 5 1	- 2 7	- 2 5	-52
Internal Trips	-5,802	- 7 5	- 7 5	- 1 5 1	- 2 5 9	- 2 5 9	- 5 1 9	- 3 0 1	- 3 0 1	- 602
Pass-by Trips (33% of net retail trips)[3]	-3,520	- 5 0	- 5 0	- 1 0 0	- 1 8 9	- 1 8 9	- 3 7 7	- 2 1 6	- 2 1 6	- 431
New External Trips	15,982	3 5 7	3 3 2	6 8 7	9 1 1	7 5 5	1, 6 6 6	9 2 4	7 9 6	1,7 19

[1] Trip generation for Weekday and AM peak hour of Bookstore were based on trip generation ratio of Retail/Shopping Center.

[2] Transit adjustments and transit trips for restaurant and theater are assumed to be the same percentage as for retail use.

[3] Pass-by adjustments are made for shopping center, grocery store and bookstore only

* Some totals do not add up due to rounding

Sources: Dowling Associates, Inc. 2009