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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

On October 21, 2005, the City of West Sacramento (City) distributed to public agencies and the general public a draft environmental impact report (DEIR) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Raley's Landing project. The project applicants—Raley's, Inc.; the Teel Family Trust; D/P Fourth Street, LLP (Panattoni Development); Principal Real Estate Investors; and Signature Properties—are requesting approval of various discretionary entitlements in support of a mixed-use development consisting of residential, commercial, and office uses that would occupy approximately 18.2 acres in West Sacramento bordered by the Sacramento River on the east; Fifth, Fourth, and Third Streets on the west; West Capitol Avenue on the south; and E and G Streets on the north.

In accordance with Section 15105 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a 45-day public review period was provided on the DEIR that ended on December 6, 2005. Two letters providing comments on the document were received. In addition, consistent with Section 15202 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a public meeting was held by the City of West Sacramento Planning Commission on November 17, 2005, during which time the planning commissioners and the public were given the opportunity to provide oral comments on the DEIR.

This document responds to the written and oral comments received on the DEIR and has been prepared in accordance with Sections 15089 and 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines. It is divided into three chapters:

- Chapter 1, "Introduction," provides an overview of the environmental review process and presents a summary of the proposed project and alternatives.

- Chapter 2, "Comments and Responses to Comments on the DEIR," reproduces public comments received on the DEIR, including a transcript of the November 17, 2005, public meeting, and presents responses to those comments.

- Chapter 3, "Revisions to the DEIR," identifies changes made to the DEIR in response to the comments.

This document and the DEIR together make up the final EIR (FEIR).

1.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The DEIR evaluated the proposed project as summarized below and as described in detail in Chapter 2 of the DEIR.

The proposed project consists of residential, commercial, office, and open space features oriented toward the Sacramento River waterfront on the east and toward West Capitol Avenue, a major thoroughfare and entryway to West Sacramento, on the south. At buildout, the proposed project would contain up to approximately 900 multifamily residential units, 845,000 gross square feet of office space, 102,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, and possibly 100-300 hotel rooms with a 7,000- to 15,000-square-foot conference center; it would provide between 4,348 and 4,648 on-site parking spaces, including surface and multilevel parking spaces.

The proposed project is divided into four development areas: the Washington Street property and the River 1, River 2, and River 3 areas. The project components would be incorporated into these four areas as follows.
1.2.1 Washington Street Property

The Washington Street property is bordered generally by G Street on the north (the portion west of Fourth Street does not extend as far north as G Street), West Capitol Avenue on the south, Fifth Street on the west, and Third Street on the east. It is a planned mixed-use area combining retail and residential uses. Development on this property would be primarily residential, with 6.9 acres proposed for development of approximately 550 multifamily residential units in two phases. At buildout, the property would have approximately 40,000 square feet of retail uses and 900–1,000 off-street parking spaces. A 20-foot setback proposed for the northern boundary of the property would allow for emergency vehicle access.

The buildings proposed for the Washington Street property would have four levels of housing over one level of a partially submerged garage, as well as a portion of the retail space. The overall height of the development would be 65 feet. The buildings would have live-work units and townhomes along West Capitol Avenue, and the retail space would be concentrated along Third Street. The interior of the community would include amenities for the residents, including a pool, spa, private gym, recreation center, and barbecue area.

1.2.2 River 1 Area

The River 1 area is bordered by the Ziggurat office building on the north, Third Street on the west, the Sacramento River on the east, and the State Route (SR) 275 exit for West Capitol Avenue on the south. This 4.6-acre parcel would be developed with a mixture of commercial, residential, and retail uses, including approximately 245,000 square feet of office space, 42,000 square feet of retail/restaurant uses, and one of the following two scenarios: 200 multifamily residential units or 150 multifamily residential units and a 100- to 300-room hotel with a 7,000- to 15,000-square-foot conference center. Between 1,000 and 1,200 parking spaces would be provided in the River 1 area.

The River 1 area would be developed with three main structures over a two-story parking structure base and would be located around a central plaza. The office tower, which would be the tallest of the three structures, would be located on the west, furthest from the river. It would have approximately 18 levels, including the parking garage, and an overall height of approximately 245 feet. The second tallest structure, the north building, would serve as either an apartment/condominium tower or a hotel and conference center and would be set back from the river to protect the existing views from the Ziggurat. It would have approximately 12 levels, including the parking garage, and an overall height of approximately 145 feet. The shortest structure, the south building, would serve as an apartment/condominium complex and would be located along the southern property border, along West Capitol Avenue, so that the taller buildings would overlook it to the south and east. The south building would have approximately six levels, including the parking garage, and an overall height of approximately 72 feet.

One-story retail shops are planned at grade along Third Street. The interior of the retail spaces would front the two-level parking garage under the planned central plaza. Two to three levels of residential units are planned above the retail space and along the south portion of the garage. The retail at grade level and residential uses above would screen the parking area and create a stepped appearance, providing a change in scale along Third Street to support the pedestrian corridor. Development in the River 1 area would include many public amenities, such as open space, landscaped areas, and access to River Walk Park.

1.2.3 River 2 Area

The River 2 area is bordered by the River 3 area on the north, Second Street and the existing parking garage on the west, the Sacramento River on the east, and the Ziggurat on the south. Proposed development in the 1.2-acre River 2 area consists of a single building containing approximately 150 multifamily residential units and
structured parking for approximately 300 vehicles. The building would have approximately 17 stories and an overall height of approximately 190 feet. This development is in the preliminary conceptual design stage.

1.2.4 RIVER 3 AREA

The River 3 area is bordered by E Street on the north, Third Street on the west, the Sacramento River on the east, and F Street and the River 2 area on the south. Proposed development in the 5.6-acre River 3 area includes approximately 600,000 gross square feet of office space, 20,000 gross square feet of commercial space, and structured parking for 2,148 vehicles. The development would consist of a common podium of lobby and parking uses with two towers rising from the shared podium. The towers would be oriented on the eastern and western portions of the podium. The eastern portion of the development would be constructed before the western portion. Commercial and project amenity spaces would line the east, south, and west facades of the project. Specifically, a cafeteria and terrace garden, designed as project amenities for the owner/tenant, are proposed for the east facade; the south facade would have one story of owner/tenant amenity space and a lobby on the west end; and two stories are planned for the entire west facade, along Third Street. Retail/commercial space is planned for the first story; the story above is planned for parking. The step back for the facade would be located at or below the mandated stepback height of 36 feet. At that point, the west facade would step back 20 feet before rising to its full height. The east tower would have approximately 14 stories of office space above a five-story lobby and parking podium. Approximately 400,000 gross square feet of office space are planned, with a typical office floor containing approximately 24,000 gross square feet of space. The parking structure would accommodate approximately 1,426 cars on four levels of covered parking and one open deck on the roof; additional surface parking might be available. The east tower would have approximately 19 stories, including the podium levels, and an overall height of approximately 300 feet.

The west tower would have approximately seven stories of office space above a four-story lobby and parking podium. The difference in lobby heights between the eastern and western portions of the development reflects the east to west downward gradient on which the building would be built. Approximately 200,000 gross square feet of office space are planned, with a typical office floor containing approximately 24,000 gross square feet of space. The parking structure would accommodate approximately 725 cars on four levels of covered parking and one open deck on the roof. In addition, approximately 20,000 gross square feet of commercial spaces would be available along Third Street. The west building would have approximately 11 stories, including the parking structure, and an overall height of approximately 180 feet.

1.3 ENTITLEMENTS

The following list identifies the entitlements requested from the City for the Raley’s Landing project:

- Raley’s Landing Development Agreement modifications, including:
  - design review,
  - agreements regarding inclusionary housing, and
  - tree removal permits;
- Planned Development – 30 (PD-30) text modifications;
- Washington Specific Plan minor deviations;
- Owner Participation Agreement changes to reflect the revised development plan, acknowledge improvements already completed, and reflect change in ownership; and
1.4 PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The proposed project would require the approval of the City Council. The following other permits and approvals also may be required before implementation of the proposed project.

1.4.1 FEDERAL

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: endangered species consultation for effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB). A previous habitat conservation plan for VELB may be applied.

1.4.2 STATE

- California Air Resources Board: emissions permit

- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board: general construction activity stormwater permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan – approval of plan to control stormwater runoff during construction

- California Department of Fish and Game: endangered species consultation – if state-listed endangered species or their habitat is substantially affected by the proposed project

- Office of Historic Preservation: decision on eligibility for listing of potentially historic resources in the California Register of Historical Resources

- Reclamation Board: encroachment permit (including review by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)

1.4.3 LOCAL

- City of West Sacramento: approval of building permit, grading permit, drainage plans, and other site improvements as required in the Washington Specific Plan and PD-30 text

- West Sacramento Fire Department: review of site design and construction plans for fire safety

- Yolo/Solano Air Quality Management District: Authority to Construct, Permit to Operate

1.5 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The DEIR evaluated three alternatives to the proposed project as listed below and as described in their entirety in Chapter 4 of the DEIR:

- No-Project (No-Development) Alternative,
- No-Project (Existing Plans) Alternative, and
- Reduced Development Alternative.
2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DEIR

2.1 LIST OF COMMENTERS

Two letters were received commenting on the draft environmental impact report (DEIR) during the public comment period, and members of the public and the planning commissioners provided oral comments on the DEIR during the November 17, 2005, Planning Commission meeting. The list of commenters on the DEIR, along with the topic of each comment, is presented in Table 2-1. Each letter and comment has been assigned a letter/number designation for cross-referencing purposes (for example, the first state agency letter is Letter S1, and the first comment in the letter is S1-1). The comment letters and public meeting transcript and the responses to the substantive environmental issues raised in those letters and the transcript are presented in Section 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/ Meeting</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Comment Topic(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LETTER COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETTER COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>November 18, 2005</td>
<td>S1-1</td>
<td>Safety at at-grade railroad crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Boies, Utilities Engineer, Rail Crossings Engineering Section, Consumer Protection and Safety Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation, District 3</td>
<td>December 5, 2005</td>
<td>S2-1</td>
<td>Trip generation for commercial/retail uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katherine Eastham, Chief, Office of Transportation Planning—Southwest and East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak-hour traffic volume calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-2</td>
<td>Trip generation methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-3</td>
<td>Trip generation for office uses in River 3 area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-4</td>
<td>Coordination with Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-5</td>
<td>State highway system impacts and mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-6</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian travel modes in the Transportation Management Plan objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-7</td>
<td>Analysis of alternative transit options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-8</td>
<td>Smart growth concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS MADE AT NOVEMBER 17, 2005, PUBLIC HEARING</td>
<td>Transcript of public meeting on the draft EIR</td>
<td>November 17, 2005</td>
<td>PH-1</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable traffic impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-2</td>
<td>Traffic impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-3</td>
<td>Capacity at wastewater treatment plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/Meeting</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Comment Topic(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-4</td>
<td>Raley Field parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-5</td>
<td>Police and fire protection services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-6</td>
<td>School capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-7</td>
<td>Location of &quot;Washington Street&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-8</td>
<td>Police and fire protection services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-9</td>
<td>Existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-10</td>
<td>Inclusionary housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-11</td>
<td>Police and fire protection services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-12</td>
<td>Traffic impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-13</td>
<td>Mitigating traffic impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-14</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-15</td>
<td>Traffic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-16</td>
<td>Traffic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-17</td>
<td>Tower Bridge level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-18</td>
<td>Shadow impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-19</td>
<td>Currently allowed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-20</td>
<td>Mitigating traffic impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-21</td>
<td>Shadow impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-22</td>
<td>Mitigating traffic impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-23</td>
<td>Air quality impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-24</td>
<td>Traffic, building height, school, police and fire service, waste treatment impacts, and air quality impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-25</td>
<td>Sacramento River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-26</td>
<td>Impact on river flora and fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-27</td>
<td>Historical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-28</td>
<td>Redevelopment of area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-29</td>
<td>Historical buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-30</td>
<td>Traffic delays associated with rail traffic and drawbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH-31</td>
<td>Traffic impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 WRITTEN AND ORAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The written and oral comments received on the DEIR and the responses to those comments are provided in this section. All comment letters and the public meeting transcript are reproduced in their entirety, and each is followed by responses to comments related to the DEIR.
November 16, 2005

Jim Bermudez  
City of West Sacramento  
1110 West Capitol Avenue  
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Dear Mr. Bermudez:

Re: SCH# 2005042083; Raley's Landing

As the state agency responsible for rail safety within California, we recommend that any development projects planned adjacent to or near the rail corridor in the County be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind. New developments may increase traffic volumes not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade highway-rail crossings. This includes considering pedestrian circulation patterns/destinations with respect to railroad right-of-way.

Safety factors to consider include, but are not limited to, the planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-rail crossings due to increase in traffic volumes and appropriate fencing to limit the access of trespassers onto the railroad right-of-way.

The above-mentioned safety improvements should be considered when approval is sought for the new development. Working with Commission staff early in the conceptual design phase will help improve the safety to motorists and pedestrians in the County.

If you have any questions in this matter, please call me at (415) 703-2795.

Very truly yours,

Kevin Boles  
Utilities Engineer  
Rail Crossings Engineering Section  
Consumer Protection and Safety Division

cc: Pat Keir, UP
S1-1 The City acknowledges that the project would be located near an existing at-grade railroad crossing (Third Street between D Street and C Street) and that safety at the crossing may be a concern. However, the crossing is currently signalized per applicable requirements for vehicle safety, and pedestrian access is not appreciably different from that at other at-grade crossings in existing urbanized areas in the city of West Sacramento and nearby in the city of Sacramento. Although implementing the Raley's Landing project would result in increased vehicle and pedestrian traffic at the Third Street at-grade crossing, it is the City’s belief that current infrastructure at the crossing is appropriate to maintain sufficiently safe conditions. In addition, the City does not have an impact fee in place to fund rail corridor improvements, including further improvements at the Third Street at-grade crossing, and no policy decision regarding the future funding of rail corridor improvements is planned at this time. Therefore, there is not an established mechanism for the Raley’s Landing project to make a fair-share contribution to further improvements at the Third Street at-grade crossing, and no such mechanism is anticipated to be established in the immediate future. However, City staff shall coordinate with the California Public Utilities Commission regarding safety considerations at at-grade railroad crossings in the City and mechanisms to identify and address potential safety concerns.
December 5, 2005
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Raley’s Landing Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report
SCH#2005042083

Mr. Jim Bermudez
City of West Sacramento
1110 W. Capitol Avenue
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Dear Mr. Bermudez:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Raley’s Landing Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Our comments are as follows:

- Caltrans calculations indicate that this project is expected to generate approximately 2,415 A.M. and 2,226 P.M. peak hour trips. These calculations include the 86,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, which is identified in the DEIR (page 3.3-28). If land uses within the development change from the proposed land uses (to those such as service stations or restaurants, which would result in higher trip generation rates) the peak hour trip figures will increase substantially.

- Note: Caltrans uses four-hour windows for peak hour traffic volume calculations (6 A.M.-10A.M / 3 P.M. - 7 P.M) and would like to ensure that the same baseline is used to calculate trips for this project, as we feel this more accurately captures the regional peak hour commute times.

- Regarding the Project Vehicle Trip Generation (Table 3.3-8) and the Project Vehicle Trip Generation (Unadjusted ITE Trip Calculation) and Project Vehicle Trip Generation-Adjusted (Table 3.3-10), Caltrans would like an explanation of the methodology developed, which resulted in the Adjusted calculation as indicated in Table 3.3-10.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Mr. Jim Bermudez  
December 5, 2005  
Page 2

- In Table 3.3-8 (page 3.3-29) titled, “Project Vehicle Trip Generation (Unadjusted ITE Trip Calculations)”, for the General Office land use for the River 3 Area, daily vehicle trips are shown as totaling 5,301. However, the calculation for this category (per ITE code 710 with a trip rate daily average of 11.01) for a 600,000 square foot building results in over 6,600 daily trips.

- We applaud the City’s efforts to mitigate the expected traffic impacts through its Fair Share Funding program to be used for Interchange improvements, including the Jefferson Boulevard / U.S. 50 interchange and the South River Road / U.S. 50 interchange. While the Traffic Fee Impact Program is being updated and project improvements not currently programmed (page 3.3-21), Caltrans would like to underscore our commitment to work with the City of West Sacramento in developing comprehensive and effective mitigation strategies that will reduce traffic impacts to state highway and access facilities.

- Mainline impacts should be identified for the State Highway System and mitigation should be identified.

- Caltrans commends the City for development of the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) for this project. We also suggest noting, specifically, the enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian travel modes in the TMP objectives (page 3.3-19).

- Caltrans would also like to suggest that a thorough analysis of alternative transit options, including bus service to this development (and others in the immediate area). This analysis would:
  - Include input from the transit provider on how existing bus routes (or new bus routes) could be extended to serve those in rapidly developing areas including realistic timelines for implementation.
  - Discuss how special needs transportation could be provided to this development.
  - Assess how new transit service could be funded, including the use of developer fees and other innovative financial arrangements.
  - Analyze how transit facilities and equipment could be used in any potential emergency evacuation of the development.
- Determine how best to utilize abandoned rail lines for future light rail transit / streetcar development for the project.
- Provide summaries of meetings, discussions or comments between the project sponsor, developer(s), municipality, transit operator, regional transportation agency and Caltrans that addressed mobility impacts—including impacts to the State Highway System—which the project will generate.

- We applaud the effort to encourage livability and “Smart Growth” concepts in the planning of the project including high-density housing, mixed uses, transit oriented designs and connectivity with other bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the immediate surroundings of the project area.

Please provide our office with copies of any further action regarding this project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Patrick Tyner at (916) 274-0558.

Sincerely,

Katherine Eastham, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning—Southwest and East
Page 3.3-28 of the DEIR contains only Table 3.3-7, which is titled "Project Vehicle Trip Generation Rates and Formulas." This table does not contain square footage values of commercial/retail uses, or other land uses, associated with the proposed project. Table 3.3-8, on page 3.3-29, does contain such information, and it is assumed that the commenter intended to refer to this page, and this table, in the comment letter. The comment letter implies that the proposed project contains 86,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses. This is incorrect. As identified in Table 3.3-8 and in the project description on page 2-6, the proposed project would contain 102,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses (40,000 square feet on the Washington Street property, 42,000 square feet in the River 1 area, and 20,000 square feet in the River 3 area).

The comment letter does not provide the calculation methodology used by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the project trip generation estimates included in this comment (i.e., 2,415 a.m. and 2,226 p.m. peak-hour trips). Therefore, it is impossible to determine why the Caltrans trip generation estimates differ somewhat from those provided in the DEIR: Table 3.3-8, Unadjusted ITE Trip Calculations, 2,402 a.m. and 2,563 p.m. peak-hour trips; Table 3.3-10, Project Vehicle Trip Generation—Adjusted, 1,941 a.m. and 2,084 p.m. peak-hour trips. The commenter does not express a concern here regarding the differing trip generation results; therefore, this item is not addressed further in this response.

Regarding the potential for land uses to change from what is analyzed in the DEIR, as described in Section 4.2.2, "Variations of the Proposed Project" (page 4-4 of the DEIR), the overall development vision for the Raley’s Landing project site has remained consistent for almost 20 years. Based on information from the project applicants and the City’s staff, only minor variations of the proposed project have been considered for the site before the current development plan was submitted. It is very unlikely that land uses developed at the project site would differ substantially from those described in the DEIR.

However, if changes in land use were proposed, the City would evaluate whether these changes would have the potential to generate new or substantially greater environmental impacts than those described in this EIR and would assess whether further CEQA analysis would be necessary. If appropriate, a subsequent EIR, a supplemental EIR, or an addendum to this EIR would be prepared, consistent with Sections 15162–15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines. All environmental issue areas would be considered in the assessment of whether new or substantially greater environmental impacts might occur, including the potential for increased vehicle trip generation.

For city of West Sacramento surface streets, new peak-hour traffic counts were taken in April 2005. The count periods were 2 hours, with the peak hour identified as the highest traffic hour within the 2-hour count period. The general procedure applied to these counts was that if evidence indicated that the highest traffic hour was not contained in the 2-hour count period, new counts were taken to fully capture the peak hour. For the state highway system, the counts or volumes used for the EIR analysis were provided to the traffic consultant (DKS Associates) by Caltrans District 3 staff. In general, the counts provided were multi-hour counts, and counts were provided for multiple days for most analysis locations. The highest traffic hours were averaged for all midweek days (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday) where multiple days were provided. Because these procedures were followed, it is unlikely that the highest traffic hour volumes were missed in the analysis.

The methodology for the vehicle trip generation adjustments/reductions expressed in Table 3.3-10 of the DEIR is described on pages 3.3-9 and 3.3-10 of the DEIR. The methodology for estimating the vehicle trip reductions was based on the City of West Sacramento travel demand model, which in turn is based on
the SACMET regional travel demand model. Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates generally are based on more isolated, suburban uses, where vehicle counts at driveways can be taken with some certainty that the vehicle traffic relates directly to the use in question. The City travel model showed that actual vehicle trip generation at the Raley’s Landing site would be lower than a more conventional suburban site because of higher transit use, higher use of nonmotorized travel modes (bike and walk), and higher rates of internalization of trips on the project site attributable to the mixed-use nature (residential, commercial, office, and open space) of the project. The ratio between the model external vehicle trip percentage and a more conventional suburban area percentage was then used to adjust the ITE trip rates.

S2-4 In the calculation of total daily trips for the General Office land use (ITE Use # 710) in the River 3 area, the formulaic rate for daily trips was used rather than the “trip rate daily average.” Use of the formulaic rate is consistent with the recommended use specified in the trip generation manual and with City of West Sacramento traffic study guidelines. The use of the formulaic rate explains the discrepancy in daily vehicle trips between what is expressed in Table 3.3-8 in the DEIR and the calculation described by Caltrans in the comment.

S2-5 The City appreciates Caltrans’s positive acknowledgment of the City’s traffic impact fee program and the specific allocation of funding from this program to interchange improvements (i.e., the Jefferson Boulevard/U.S. Highway 50 [U.S. 50] interchange and the South River Road/U.S. 50 interchange). The City shall continue to coordinate with Caltrans regarding the implementation and updating of this program.

S2-6 The traffic analysis in the DEIR evaluates several state highway facilities, including U.S. 50 eastbound and westbound between Interstate 5 (I-5) and South River Road, I-5 southbound from the P Street on-ramp, I-5 southbound between the J Street on-ramps and the Q Street off-ramps, and I-5 northbound between the P Street on-ramps and the J Street off-ramps (Tables 3.3-5 and 3.3-17). Although these are all identified as weaving segments rather than mainline segments, Caltrans approved the extent of state highway facilities included in the project traffic analysis before the DEIR was prepared. The extent and methods of the traffic analysis to be conducted for the Raley’s Landing EIR were discussed with Caltrans’s staff during a meeting on April 19, 2005, and a written version of the traffic analysis extent and methodology was provided to Caltrans for review. During these exchanges of information Caltrans’s staff indicated that the merge segments and ramp facilities included in the traffic analysis were sufficient.

If the extent of the traffic analysis were expanded to include state highway mainline segments in the project vicinity, the impact conclusions and mitigation measures identified in the DEIR would not be altered. Under cumulative plus project conditions, state highway facilities in the project vicinity, including mainline segments, would operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS) during peak periods. Implementing the proposed project would add vehicle trips to these facilities, resulting in a significant impact based on thresholds of significance used in the EIR (see page 3.3-14 in the DEIR). The impact mechanism (i.e., the addition of vehicles to a facility already operating at an unacceptable LOS) and result of the impact (i.e., a significant and unavoidable impact) are the same as currently described for weaving segments that are immediately adjacent to mainline segments on I-5 and U.S. 50. Other than the allocation of traffic impact fees to specific state highway facilities described in Mitigation Measure 3.3-8 in the DEIR (i.e., the Jefferson Boulevard/U.S. 50 interchange and the South River Road/U.S. 50 interchange), there is no mechanism for the project applicants to contribute funding to other freeway improvements, including improvements that might address impacts on freeway mainline segments. These limitations on available mitigation are described in the discussion of Mitigation Measure 3.3-8 and would apply to freeway mainline segments in the same manner that they are applied to freeway weaving segments in the DEIR.

S2-7 The City appreciates Caltrans’s positive acknowledgement of the requirement that a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) be developed and implemented for the proposed project. The preparation of a
TMP, as described in the discussion of Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 on pages 3.3-19 and 3.3-20 in the DEIR, is a requirement of the City’s Transportation System Management (TSM) provision of the City’s Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17.67). Much of the information and many of the requirements in the discussion of Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 are taken directly from the TSM provision. Text has been added to the discussion of Mitigation Measure 3.3-6, clarifying the nexus between the TSM provision, the required TMP, and the information in the mitigation measure. (See Chapter 3, “Revisions to the DEIR.”)

The TMP objectives on page 3.3-19 of the DEIR referenced in the comment letter are taken verbatim from the TSM provision. Although the suggestion in the comment that an objective related to “the enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian travel modes” may be a fitting objective for a TMP, to include this item in a list that repeats TSM-provision objectives would require the City to amend the TSM provision to incorporate this suggestion. Given these circumstances, it would not be appropriate to alter the TMP objectives listed in the DEIR.

S2-8 The comment does not identify any deficiency in the DEIR or suggest that the requested transit analysis be included in the EIR. Therefore, it is difficult to respond directly to the request in the comment in the context of updating or adding information to the EIR. The comment suggests that an analysis of transit options be conducted that addresses several topics listed in the comment. Analysis alone does not constitute mitigation under CEQA. Mitigation must consist of avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing or eliminating over time, or compensating for a significant adverse environmental effect (see State CEQA Guidelines Section 15370). Therefore, it is assumed that the comment does not constitute a request to include the proposed analysis as a mitigation measure.

In addition, several of the elements suggested for inclusion in an analysis of alternative transit options identified in the comment letter are outside the scope of this EIR and/or outside the ability of the project applicants to implement or influence, such as the potential use of abandoned rail lines for future light rail/streetcar development.

The City has had discussions with transit providers regarding service to the project area and will continue these discussions to ensure that bus service is available to residents, employees, and visitors associated with the Raley’s Landing project. In addition, Mitigation Measure 3.4-2 in the “Air Quality” section of the DEIR requires that the project applicant “[c]oordinate with the City and the local transit service provider (Yolobus) to install appropriate transit-enhancing infrastructure on the project site, such as transit shelters, benches, street lighting, route signs and displays, and/or bus turnouts/bulbs.” The City shall bring up the topic areas for analysis identified in the comment letter at future meetings with transit providers and shall keep Caltrans apprised of these meetings and the topics discussed.

S2-9 The City appreciates Caltrans’s positive acknowledgement of the “livability,” “smart growth,” and mixed-use elements of the project.
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CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Move on to Item 5.

MR. RIKALA: Mr. Chairman, Item No. 5 is a public meeting on the Draft EIR being proposed for the Raley's Landing Project, and Jim Bermudez will be making the staff report.

MR. BERMUDEZ: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. Let me begin with a little discussion on the EIR previous to this one. My project EIR is a little bit different project level. My conclusion is to give you the direction and the scheduling of the particular project so that we are all aware, so that you know the organization of the actual action that you will be making in the future.

The item is a public meeting on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. It is for the Raley's Landing mixed-use project. In a few minutes I will give you a brief historical perspective. I think this is really important with the Raley's Landing Project in today's modern era right here, that there is quite a significant historical past regarding this particular site. We start with the purpose of tonight's meeting.

Typically, when staff has received a project we
look at the project and determine that it is a completed project, which we have done with this particular project. And in concurrency we actually research out environmental documents in the past and see if there is any possibly way we can tear out past documents. With the case of Raley's Landing there were a couple environmental documents. However, we like to use the term of stale which is simply means that it is an outdated document, does not accurately reflect what is being considered for you and before the Council.

With that said, we solicited EDAW, a firm, to help us with the drafting of and working through the environmental impact report. And later on they will give a presentation to further discuss the EIR and some of the impacts that they have discovered.

On April 18th, 2005, we had a Notice of Preparation go out to agencies, letting them know that there was a proposed project. On 27th of 2005 of April, we actually had two scoping meetings; one with the general public in the evening and one in the mid afternoon with agencies, government agencies and entities. At the public meeting in the evening we roughly had 20 individuals from the community show up and provide us with some comments. And those are detailed with the Draft EIR that I presented to you last week. The details are on some of the questions
that we hopefully have addressed within the Draft EIR at this time.

So going in to the project, the project is approximately 18.2 acres, and it encompasses the Washington Specific Plan area. And the site obviously bordered by the Sacramento River, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth Streets, West Capitol Avenue to the south and E and D Streets to the north. An important thing about this project is that it actually encompasses four different areas, so it is quite large for today's standards in the City. It does consist of the Washington Street property, River 1, River 2 and River 3, as you see there.

Segue into a little bit of the history of this. It was envisioned that the city -- prior to the City, Yolo County, prior to incorporation, that there was, obviously, taking advantage of river entity next to this particular area, that they saw kind of a broad picture. They created a redevelopment plan for the project, number one. That was approved by the Yolo County Board of Supervisors in 1986. Within that plan they created Broderick Reuse Area, as you can see on the exhibit there. In the Broderick Reuse Area they came up with the formulation of a Planned Development 30, and as we know today that is referred to as PD-30, and the Draft EIR essentially encompasses the segment A as you see in the exhibit there.
At the time of the rezoning, Yolo County, they envisioned the PD-30 to kind of resemble a high development area, high intensity-type development, taking advantage of the river, acclimating to the river and the adjacent feature into the project area. In today's standards of looking at PD-30 test, it is kind of out-dated in a way; it doesn't really match up to what high intensity development is in this current point in time. So there will be in the future when I come back a visual text amendment that we will be making and asking for the Planning Commission support on those.

Right now in the PD-30 the regulations are, as I said, a little bit -- don't reflect what the current project brings to the table. We will make those adjustments. Following the timeline in 1987 when the City incorporated and in 1990, the City adopted its first General Plan. So we still have the PD-30 during all those actions and adoptions. In 1996, the Washington Specific Plan was adopted. And as you can see, it pretty much resembles the Broderick Reuse Area. This is the area you see delineated with the dashed line on the exhibit.

In that same year, 1996, the Raley's Landing Agreement was adopted or negotiated between the City and the Raley Company, as well the Teel Family Trust. Within that development agreement still continued the vision of
intense high development, which included a 429-room hotel, 945,000 square feet of office space, which was factored into the ziggurat buildings in current times right now, 46,000 square feet of retail area, about 3,300 parking spaces, a 218 unit apartments. As I mentioned, it really right now, if you look at the Specific Plan, looks at the past exhibits, it really resembles kind of what this project has been to the table. I kind of look at it as a confluence of all the past prior supervisory meetings and decisions and adoptions into kind of what is to be expected in this particular waterfront zoned area, with what Raley's Landing is bringing to the table.

As far as the draft environmental review process, I'll give you kind of a timeline of how that has evolved. On October 21st, the Draft Environmental Impact Report hit the street for public comment and review. That particular document closes on December 6th, 2005. In your staff report I refer that we can bring that back to the Planning Commission on December 1st for a public workshop. Since the completion of the report, we bumped that meeting back to December 15th for a workshop-type of format, and that will be getting into more specifics of the merits of the project as opposed to just the Environmental Impact Report for tonight.

What I would like to also reiterate, that there is
no action tonight; it is just more of a public comment
time where the public can come and address their comments.
We have a note taker so they will be able to record, any
comments that are being made by the public. In addition,
there is not to be an expectation on the comments of the
merits of the project. This is strictly an open dialogue
to get the feedback from the public.

What we will do is we will take the comments,
address the comments and then come back and put those in
the Final EIR, which that Final EIR will come back to you
in January during a public hearing process, and you will
make a recommendation to the Council to certify that Final
EIR. So that is kind of the steps and transactions that
we have to take. Also, action that the Commission will be
expected to take in the future and you will hear about it
more in the workshops are the Washington Specific Plan
minor deviation. This is to address some of the high
concerns of structures that are being concerned. Planned
Development 30 amendment, which will take care of some of
the guidelines and provisions which don't reflect what the
project brings at this current time to what was adopted
back in the early and mid '80s. In addition, there will
be four development agreements for each particular area
that will have to be discussed and worked through as well,
and then following up on the owners participation
agreement and the facility agreement that the Redevelopment Agency will conceivably carry forward in the future and approval by the agency.

So with that, I hope I have explained to you the timeline and purpose of today's meeting. I will stress with the public that because we have a note taker that they sign up with the comment card by our secretary so we can kind of track who is actually saying what and we can incorporate that into the document and possibly state your name as they come to the podium so we can have that in the report.

Before I turn it over to Sean, I will come back at the conclusion of the comments and just reiterate the timeline and the next hearing so the public is aware what the scheduling is.

With that, unless the Commission has any questions I can --

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Jim, have the cards been passed out? Do we have any?

MR. BERMUDEZ: They have.

MR. BECHTA: Wait for the presentation to boot up.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I am Sean Beck with EDAW. I am going to be doing a presentation related to the Draft Environmental Impact Report compared
to the Raley's Landing project.

The purpose of tonight's hearing is threefold. I would like to describe the Raley's Landing Project briefly, elaborate on a couple of things that Jim didn't get a chance to cover, summarize the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Report that we prepared for the project now on the street and receive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Just to go over the CEQA issue, not to you but to the public here. The purpose of an EIR, multiple purposes, to evaluate the project, to inform the public and the decision-makers of the project's environmental impacts, to identify measures to mitigate significant impacts and identify alternatives that would feasibly reduce those significant impacts and identify impacts that cannot be mitigated or avoided. An EIR is primarily a public disclosure document, a disclosure to the decision-makers who are evaluating the effects of the project.

Just noting that a significant impact definition is a substantial and adverse change in the physical environment. If environmental effects at the time we do our evaluation are not substantial nor adverse, they will not be considered significant effects typically and we would not provide mitigation.
Jim talked about the details and the planning history and modifications to the planning documents. These are all part of the proposed action of evaluating the EIR.

Brief characteristics of the project. Made up of four different areas. High density mixed-use project; 845,000 total square feet of office uses, proposed 102,000 square feet of commercial, 900 multi family residential units with option to have 850 units in a hotel is included in the project and 4,351 to 4,650 on-site parking spaces.

The different areas in the project, four areas. The first is the Washington Street property. The property that is currently used for parking for Raley Field events, the gravel parking lot. Proposed there will be approximately 515 multi family residential units, approximately 40,000 square feet of retail, 900 to a thousand off-street parking spaces.

River 1 area. 245,000 square feet of office uses; 42,000 square feet of retail restaurants uses. And this is where the hotel option comes in. If the hotel is put in, it will be 100 to 300 rooms with a conference center and 150 multi family residential or straight 200 multi-family residential and 1000 to 1,500 parking spaces.

River 2 is the smallest area. Proposes 150 multi-family residential units, structured parking for 300
vehicles.

And finally, River 3 is 600 square feet of office uses, 20,000 square feet of commercial uses and the structured parking for an estimated at this time 2,151 vehicles.

This was a full coverage EIR. We looked at a broad range of issue areas listed here, ranging from land use to geology and soils to culture resources. Amongst those issue areas, all of them had some form of significant impact other than land use and planning and population and employment and houses. Amongst those issue areas where there were significant impacts, all of those could be mitigated to less than significant levels, except for isolated impacts to transport, circulation, air quality, noise and vibration, public utilities and visual resources. There we have significant an unavoidable impacts, and I will describe each of those.

First, the traffic analysis. It was a pretty fairly extensive traffic analysis, 22 surface street intersections were evaluated, seven in the City of Sacramento. That was per the request from the City. We coordinated with them early in the EIR process to see what they wanted evaluated. Seven freeway segments were analyzed, as well as two freeway on-ramps. And that was coordinated with CalTrans, what they wanted to see.
Five significant, unavoidable impacts, two of those were related to the City of Sacramento intersections. Basically, there is not funding mechanism where the City of West Sacramento, the applicant, can mitigate for intersections in the City. That is why those are significant and unavoidable. Similarly, we had one significant and unavoidable impact related to freeway segments. Again, that was the purview of CalTrans, and the applicant cannot guarantee that CalTrans will make any improvements, when they might happen and if they might happen, if at all.

Another of -- the fourth one is at the Jefferson Boulevard/Sacramento Avenue intersection. Basically that intersection can be mitigated to a less than significant level, but the mitigation is tied to an improvement on Sacramento Avenue, and we took a very conservative approach and said we can't guarantee the timing would be such that all the improvements that are needed would happen before the traffic impact generated by the project happens. If there is a significant impact, it would be for a short term and would be resolved once the timing coincided for those improvements.

And the final one is Third Street and Tower Bridge and Gateway intersection. That intersection under cumulative traffic analysis will operate at a LOS below
City standards service, below City standards even without the proposed project, and the proposed project then contributes to traffic in that intersection.

The other issues are air quality. Significant, unavoidable impact is related to emissions during construction. That is looking at Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District emissions thresholds. Those would be exceeded. Typically any project of any size during construction will exceed those thresholds, even with mitigation we would have substantial mitigation to minimize emissions during construction. Similarly, different threshold, different air quality management threshold will be exceeded during project operations, a project of any size. Given the air quality conditions in our basin, it would be difficult not to exceed.

On noise issues, we have mitigation measures to reduce construction noise, but, again, we took a conservative approach, and we cannot guarantee that during all conditions, during daytime hours that the City threshold will not be crossed. We considered significant, unavoidable, even though we do have extensive mitigation measures to minimize construction noise and the other noise issues related to the project being in most proximity to Raley Field, there will be exterior noise levels that will exceed City standards.
On public utilities, this is fairly kind of following a chain of foreseeable events. Issue, the project will contribute wastewater that will eventually go to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, that then will contribute to the need to expand that plant, that the EIR done for that plant expansion identifies significant, unavoidable air quality impacts. So, in fact, this project will make a small contribution to that impact. So from a CEQA perspective we felt it prudent to follow that chain of events, but it is a fairly distance impact from those projects.

Last issue area, visual resources. We did prepare various -- various photo simulations were prepared by a specialist in the area. We found significant, unavoidable impacts. I will show the project here. One of them, again, in multiple areas. We took a conservative approach in the EIR. The criteria was whether the project would result in significant degradation of the visual character of that area. We have to admit that there is at least a significant alteration to the visual character with the inclusion of these buildings in an area where there are now none, and came to the decision that once the buildings are in, going through the design review process, we believe will be put in aesthetically pleasing buildings. Reasonable people may differ, so we may still consider a
significant degradation, so we erred to the conservative there.

One thing that I did want to point out, in the EIR, particularly for River 3, we have it up there as a 300-foot tall building currently proposed for a 280-foot building. Again, we wanted to make sure that we were following, looking at the real upper limits, what might happen.

The other aesthetic area is related to shadow. Most jurisdictions in CEQA don't have set guidelines related to shadow. Because these are tall buildings, we want to make sure we address the issue. The criteria we used, whether the proposed project would result in shading of what we consider shadow sensitive land uses, public open space and private yards during substantial portions of the day. For most of the project the shadows move from the west to the east as the day goes on. Nowhere will get shaded for a substantial period.

The only place we couldn't make that finding is related to the Washington Street property, which is you look at -- during the summer solstice, the longest day of the year which shadows the shortest, you see there is minimal shading leaving the project site. As you get into the equinox, the shading gets a little bit longer as you go through the day. It is when you get to the winter
solstice when the shadows are the longest that you see
during the morning the project is casting longer shadows
that are hitting some existing homes. Here are some
existing homes, and they continue to be shaded during
various portions of the day as the sun moves across the
sky and the shadows from the various buildings hit those.
So that is where we came to the conclusion, based on our
criteria, that there was significant, unavoidable effects
related to shading of residential yards.

The EIR also includes an alternatives analysis. We
looked at a no-project, no-development alternative, and
I will be describing each of these in a
no-project/existing plans alternative and a reduced
development use alternative.

The no-project/no-development alternative basically
assumes existing condition remains, no development on the
project site and continued use of Washington property for
parking is expected. This alternative had the least
environmental effects because it contained the existing
conditions.

The no-project/existing plans alternative basically
looked at the maximum allowable development, looking at
the plans that are currently in effect, existing
entitlements on the property, looking at the maximum
available development allows for up to roughly 88,000
square feet of office space relative to the proposed
project, up to 4,000 square feet of commercial; and it is
lower on the residential units by 340 units and up to an
additional 128 hotel rooms. Overall, the environmental
effects are generally similar to the proposed project
under this alternative.

And the reduced development alternative; per CEQA,
we pretty much created an alternative to address those
significant, unavoidable impacts, try to minimize those.
So we reduced the office commercial uses proposed under
the project by 50 percent, reduced the residential uses by
75 percent and kept the same project footprint, but
reduced the building height, and that reduced all the
environmental effects. But the significant, unavoidable
effects that we found under the proposed project remain
significant and unavoidable under this alternative. There
was still substantial shading in that one area and there
were a still traffic impacts at intersections that were
significant and unavoidable. There were still air quality
impacts that were significant and unavoidable. That
alternative, although it minimized the impacts, didn't
reduce any of them below the significant criteria.

So a little bit of history again on where we are in
the process. We did have the Notice of Preparation that
is released April 2005. We had a scope meeting that Jim
referred on April 12. We released the Draft EIR for public review on October 21st. We have today's hearing, now, November 17, an opportunity for the Commission and public to provide comments. Public comment period closes December 6th.

We acknowledge it is a large document to review, but the focus, by that time the focus of having a thorough review rather than necessarily a brevity in the review. Then we will prepare, after the public review period closes, we will respond to the comments and prepare a Final EIR and the project decision, Notice of Determination. I am not sure how staff sees it, but January, February for Planning Commission on the decision, and City Council review February, March. Those are flexible, particularly for the public to participate, maybe here interested in the project. There is an opportunity to provide views. There is a court reporter here to transcribe those and have those transcripts in the Final EIR.

Written comments can be submitted to Jim Bermudez at the address provided there, and we will provide an address afterwards. Also, as we accept comments tonight, we ask the focus be on the analysis and conclusions in the Draft EIR. That is the hearing for tonight; it is on the EIR, not the project itself and analysis and conclusions.
in the EIR. Please one speaker at a time, which the
format is very conducive to. We also ask try to limit
repeating what others have said to maximize the number of
speakers and topics for us preparing the Final EIR. We
respond to a comment whether it is said once or said
multiple times. So multiple times does not reinforce our
on approach to this, and then noting the time limits that
multiple people can speak.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you.

Allow the public comment period first. We have
any?

I will repeat, again, tonight we are not looking
for comments about the desirability of the project but
just comments about the Draft Environmental Impact Report,
if you want to add or say about that.

So we have Marghe Covino.

MS. COVINO: Covino, means with wine, and I
wish I had some right now. I don't know how you people do
this. This is really amazing. I would like to refer you
to Page 5. What we heard in the presentation was one
thing that was really nice and pretty bloodless. But just
the last half of Page No. 5. With or without the project
the impact related to operations at Third Street and Tower
Bridge intersection would be significant and sufficient
feasible mitigation is not available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

And when we go to talk about this, the level of service and degradation of level of service with or without the project, the impacts related to operations at the following state highway facilities would be significant, and this would -- the mitigation is not available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level at the following on- and off-ramps: east and westbound South River Road, I-5 and P Street, J Street. All state highway facilities would operate at a level of service F during a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

The weaving section on I-5 southbound between J Street on-ramps and the Q Street off-ramps would operate at level of service F during peak hours. And you just have to visualize that.

It also says there is no mitigation to the proposed project available to address impacts at the following intersections: Third Street and Capitol Mall, Third Street and J Street, Third Street and P Street and I Street and Jibboom Street. There is no way out or in, it looks like. I am not saying that this is not a nice project. It is a good idea. We certainly need the office building, but we need to do something about this traffic stuff. Somebody needs to talk to CalTrans or somebody needs to look at
some of these on-ramps and off-ramps, start developing them and start looking at that now before it gets to a point where people are killing each other from road rage, if nothing else. It just much seems like it was very likely and nicely presented to you. But the real stuff right here, just as far as traffic is concerned, is very scary and --

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: That is why we have these comments.

MS. COVINO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you, Marghe.

We have Mary Lasell next.

MS. LASELL: First I want to address -- I think you referred to Jefferson Avenue. I don't know how that can be mitigated. I am going down that way everyday, coming home that way everyday and I don't know where half these people are coming from or going to. This starts at 6:00 in the morning and it is bad and at three-something, four-something, five-something, six-something. And in case you don't know that, we've got, I think they're called, Capitol Apartments by the Broderick Post Office, and then at the southeast corner I understand they're going to put more apartments in there. Then you throw in all this other stuff. I don't see how it could be mitigated.
And onto the northwest interceptor, that I went to plenty of those meetings. The way that works, too, first come first served. As we are making plans for building up to 300-foot tall buildings, is there really going to be room for those people in the sewage treatment plant?

The other thing is that, as I mentioned earlier, where are the people attending Raley Field supposed to park once they start developing those lands that they are parking on now? I didn't see the report, but I am going to throw in where are the police, are the police and fire personnel coming along are for the ride, too? Because we are go to need more of them.

Also, the incoming residents will have impacts on the school. As is now, they don't have enough room building-wise, cafeteria-wise. And I call the kids at the high school, I call them a herd because they remind me of dairy cows you see standing under the one structure just trying to keep out of the sun or the rain and that creates problems within the school. So they tend to get into a few scuffles over there.

The other thing I was just curious where Washington Street is. I have lived here all my life and I still don't know where Washington Street is that's been mentioned in the Broderick area.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you, Mary.

That is all the request I have from the audience.

At this time I will ask the Commissioners to make
comments.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I'm going to try to keep
my comments very short tonight. Part of what I was
reading, and I guess I need to go back one step. Part of
this project is going to be in the redevelopment site,
right, Jim? And I was --

MR. BERMUDEZ: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I was kind of -- when I
was reading through it, I was hoping we would see some
very specific ideas coming out of it. When we built the
ziggurat building, one of the things that came out of that
was a fire truck that was going to go up so high so we can
try to save Commissioner Ledesma when he's working in that
building. But he was only on the second floor, so it was
easy to save him. They provided that to the City. What I
was kind of looking for, what they're talking in there
about we have some extra police and extra fire, certainly
equipment. I hope this progresses along so we see that is
being provided to the City, if they are going to do this
type of thing.

If they are going to build these buildings larger
than we had planned on, I just don't know how to get into
it. I saw it in there. I know the police were concerned. Fire is concerned. I never really saw how we were mitigating those projects. And also this being a redevelopment area that is being helped, I think we have helped that area somewhat in what we built already, the sewer and water capacity and stuff. I saw in the paper that they were going to participate in the housing. But I didn't see that they were going to participate in inclusionary housing on-site, and it was just done. I thought that should be part of it. They come in here, and we have already assisted in some of that.

We should make very sure that those type of issues are addressed, and we try to keep inclusionary housing on-site and not somewhere else. We provide the necessary things that the police and fire are going to need.

So other than that I don't really think I have other comments. I thought those were things that should be looked at a little closer.

The traffic, while I agree completely with what Marghe said, most of those areas that you talked about doesn't matter if we build it or not, they are at a level of service F before we start. So I don't think we can go higher than F. If he could, we might include that. I saw that, too, and I was going to say something about traffic. I mean, it is already there in the City, unfortunately.
That's it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MORAZZINI: I have a couple comments to make. I don't want to get away from the scope of the EIR. But the areas that were indicated that can't be mitigated beyond significant are things that we ought to be paying attention to. I just want to talk about the traffic a little bit.

We are going to have traffic congestion, and I would really like to see some of the mitigations going beyond what they are talking about now, which could include things like transit support trolley and that sort of thing. Because we are not going to be walking to this facility from other areas, you are going to have to get there somehow. And it's kind of interesting because Sacramento City commented there is too much structured parking here, and that is going to take away from their revenues across the river. It appears, though, there is a lot of on-site parking for those office workers and those residents. For the people who are going to frequent this, for those offices, the employees to get there, we are going to have to do better than what we are doing now. I would like to see more focus to that and somehow, without looking at a specific design which we are not supposed to do, there is some conductivity between these structures so people can get from one building to the other very easily.
And I don't know what means besides walking that there
might be some sort of shuttles or that sort of thing,
because we are starting from scratch here, bare ground.
We are not trying to make something out of something else.
This is kind of the first shot and it ought to be right,
and there is too much at risk not to.

Also, regarding parking, the off-site parking,
there is some indication and references, but no really,
specific information regarding where this off-street
parking is going to be. And a lot of projects we are
seeing, we are seeing projects like West Capitol Avenue,
going to be seeing, there is recommendations to get
on-street parking again. There we have a project in the
rivers that there is no on-street parking. We need to
determine in our design what we want to do. Do we want to
make this an urban area, and I presume some on-street
parking. What options are we going to have? Where is
that on-street parking going to be specifically located?
There is references in the EIR to having on-street
parking, but it is not specific enough to let a viewer see
where it is going to be.

I guess one of the things that really strikes me,
too, is the significance of the project and things we are
seeing differently. We are seeing high rise buildings now
where this is the first time this Commission really had to
worry about reflections and shadows and that sort of thing. This is kind of sign of things to come. We do have the triangle that we are going to be dealing with. And when I first saw this, I didn't pay that much attention to it. There were some people wearing jackets in the shade, where there are other people in their sleeves, that sort of thing needs to be addressed, plus traffic impacts of are neighbors across the river. This is the first project I have seen that identified issues beyond our City limit, and we have traffic issues that we are going to been dealing with in Southport that also have impacts across the river. And maybe that information is going to be vital to us in the decision making process.

So there is a lot of new issues coming before us. I think regarding the traffic issue and conductivity of these buildings there should be something more specific as far as what the solutions are, what the mitigating factors are. For example, on the Sacramento Avenue, Jefferson, it takes about the significant impact, but it doesn't say what the level of service is going to be with the right turn lane, for example, on southbound Jefferson from Sacramento Avenue. It says that there is a problem there. This is the solution, but it doesn't say what the level of service, resulting level of service, is going go to be.

And Tower Bridge, it doesn't say what that
mitigation activity is going to create as far as level of service. But I would hope that the public -- we have a lot of people here, and I hope that more people would comment on this project because we are going to need all the help we can get to get through this process, the City will.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: This is a public meeting, anyone that wishes to speak needs to fill out a card.

COMMISSIONER WHITE: Thank you, Chair, and while we're waiting. I saw the shadow impacts from Washington Street properties and those being only 65 feet tall, there will be shadows in the neighborhoods behind them. I am wondering why there doesn't seem to be more analysis of the 180-foot and 300-foot towers on the River 3 area in the neighborhoods that are immediately to the north of that.

So I would like to see that actual projection, maybe in some future iteration of this. What those shadows look like on those properties to the north of that, especially during winter solstice. It seems to me if the 65-foot tall tower makes a shadow, a 300-foot is going to make a big shadow.

I think that one of the things that was brought up
in this EIR is that current PD-30 and Raley Landing Development Agreement allowed them to build quite a lot of what is here already, although not to this height maybe, and maybe not to this density. But if you look as what has already been agreed upon for this area, a lot of this can go in as is. So now we need, as Ron was stating, now we need to decide how do we make this a smart development. And is going taller the right thing to do.

One of the impacts I would like to see analyzed a little further, I understand we have decided the traffic is going to be gridlocked here at all considerable times, which I can understand that already. What are the other potential mitigations that maybe haven't been analyzed to a higher degree? That is including better pedestrian access across the I Street Bridge and how would that add into being able to mitigate some of the impacts. A lot of people live here. Most likely work across the river and downtown and/or vice-versa. Those that live in Joe towers might come across this way. Traffic is traffic, and it is one of those things we all realize is going to happen. Ironically, now it is heading up in my direction. But those are the two things that I think aren't necessarily looked at, specifically the shadows cast by the River 3 towers and what is the impact on those. I would like to see a drawing on that.
But even more importantly is what creative concept could we come up with from a traffic standpoint that assists in traffic here? And using some of those things that exist already, like with Raley Field, we have the shuttle, 50 cents you can pick it up all over downtown Sacramento. What things could be done, including in this development? One of the things we continue to look at Southport, we ask our developers to help mitigate the impacts that they created. I think that this should be different up here. So if you are going to build this density, and it is a good thing, it is going to bring a lot of services to the city, the impacts for traffic. Specifically you to have dig a little deeper, see what else you can find here that maybe is already being done other ways that we might be able to go about it.

Those are the comments I have specifically to the EIR.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: We have any more requests from the audience?

Pat Flint.

MS. FLINT: Thank you for taking the request after it was discussed. One thing the goes along with traffic air pollution on Page 6, it talks about implementation of the proposed project would result in long-term operational related emission, such to violate
applicable air quality standard emissions, would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

And at the end of that paragraph it says: Thus implementing the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable adverse impact with respect to operational emissions. The Sacramento Bee, not too long ago, did an article, and I don't recall what it exactly said, but California Air Resources Board declared that corridor of the freeway which runs along the Sacramento River an air quality violation issue, and that is another thing you really have to take into consideration.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you, Pat.

Jude Lee.

MS. LEE: I also thank you for wanting more input from the public. I actually hesitated coming up here because of the idea don't reiterate, which I am going to right now. Basically, traffic would be a real concern of mine. I imagine a lot of people with traffic. Height of buildings, just the whole idea about police, schools, fire, waste treatment, and also just the quality of life. When you have a whole lot of people in such a small area, I think it just makes it more difficult to actually enjoy life. I will say I will be one of those people.

And so I am talking about also noise level. There
is -- air pollution was mentioned and also rivers. I have
a great affinity for rivers and to have a large
development, I know a lot of development near the river,
but I think rivers are important for people, and it's good
to just be aware of the kind of development that is being
looked at by a river.

So, anyway, those are most of the things. I really
do appreciate your wanting public input on this.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you.

Lana Paulhamus.

MS. PAULHAMUS: Thank you for letting me
comment on this issue. I think one of the things that --
I have read this through rather fast, but I think some of
the environmental issues regarding the riparian habitat
and some of the environmental issues that we face with the
river life, I am thinking of some of the animal life that
exists around the Broderick boat ramp and the trees and
some of the natural flora and fauna that are going to be
disturbed by this massive development. Also, the fact
that it is the oldest part of West Sacramento. And I
think the effort should be made to recognize some of the
historical areas and give recognition to some of the sites
that have historical significance for the City of West
Sacramento.
I will take a real active role in my neighborhood in getting people's input regarding this particular project and environmental impact report.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you.

That is all of the requests that I have. We will be glad to take a couple more if there is anyone out there.

Chris.

COMMISSIONER LEDESMA: I am fine.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: We have some pretty good comments, especially from the public. All I could say, to repeat that traffic impacts is mind boggling. Significant and unavoidable and not mitigatable are words that kind of bother me.

That is all I have to say.

With that, we will close this public hearing and move to Item --

MR. BERMUDEZ: Can I restate how the process -- the next few meetings. As a reminder, the public review closes on December 6th. So for the last speaker, if you possibly can -- I will accept letters, E-mail exchanges as well for the record regarding the Environmental Impact Report until December 6th.

In addition, the workshop will be scheduled for
is -- air pollution was mentioned and also rivers. I have a great affinity for rivers and to have a large development, I know a lot of development near the river, but I think rivers are important for people, and it's good to just be aware of the kind of development that is being looked at by a river.

So, anyway, those are most of the things. I really do appreciate your wanting public input on this.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you.

Lana Paulhamus.

MS. PAULHAMUS: Thank you for letting me comment on this issue. I think one of the things that -- I have read this through rather fast, but I think some of the environmental issues regarding the riparian habitat and some of the environmental issues that we face with the river life, I am thinking of some of the animal life that exists around the Broderick boat ramp and the trees and some of the natural flora and fauna that are going to be disturbed by this massive development. Also, the fact that it is the oldest part of West Sacramento. And I think the effort should be made to recognize some of the historical areas and give recognition to some of the sites that have historical significance for the City of West Sacramento.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you, Lana.

Martha Mills:

MS. MILLS: Thank you also for extending the time for public comments. I haven't had a chance to digest the document either, but I am a member of the Public Advisory Committee for the redevelopment plan, so the conversations today build on top of another layer of conversation regarding redevelopment in a much broader view. And coming from the river walk presentation this evening where they were asking for public comments, that is yet another dimension of this whole conversation that I need think needs to be kept in mind. We are not talking about that one development. We are talking about what is going on with the river walk as well as what is going on in the broader view in that whole area. You definitely need to stay away from the myopic view.

This kind of reminds me, the design of this project, and I realize I need to stick to the environmental impact -- it reminds me of a sci-fi movie I once saw that took place in the salt desert where it suddenly -- some kind of rain or liquid was put down in the desert and an enormous salt crystal grew up and took over the base. And it reminds me of that, except the difference is these big salt crystals, that is the
buildings, are going to be planted amongst existing residential communities. And I think they have a significant culture impact. I haven't had a chance to read that part of the impact, the cultural impact on that, and sensitivity not only to the ecosystem but historic nature. Literally, these are our last surviving Victorians from across the street from what will be the large structures. I think those are tall things that need to be kept in mind.

Final comment. Anybody who lives in the area, and I happen to live on Fourth Street, just a block over from where this development is going to be, knows if you have any place to go that is on the other side of the river, you've got to plan about 15, 20 minutes in case you get caught by the railroad track or get past the freight trains you will get caught by the drawbridge and be prepared to wait if you do. Have something to read or listen to because it is a good 15 minutes. Compound that with the river walk people going to river walk, people coming down to work in this space and the residents that are already being added to that area. You are going to have a lot of very angry people sitting at that drawbridge waiting and waiting and waiting, and there is no place for them to go, especially in this case. So definitely want to keep that in mind.
I will take a real active role in my neighborhood
in getting people's input regarding this particular
project and environmental impact report.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: Thank you.

That is all of the requests that I have. We will
be glad to take a couple more if there is anyone out
there.

Chris.

COMMISSIONER LEDESMA: I am fine.

CHAIRPERSON PINKWART: We have some pretty
good comments, especially from the public. All I could
say, to repeat that traffic impacts is mind boggling.
Significant and unavoidable and not mitigatable are words
that kind of bother me.

That is all I have to say.

With that, we will close this public hearing and
move to Item --

MR. BERMUDEZ: Can I restate how the process
-- the next few meetings. As a reminder, the public
review closes on December 6th. So for the last speaker,
if you possibly can -- I will accept letters, E-mail
exchanges as well for the record regarding the
Environmental Impact Report until December 6th.

In addition, the workshop will be scheduled for
December 15th and that will address more merits of the
project and dive into a lot of the, I would say,
Commissioner Morazzini's comments that he had as well the
other Commissioners.

(Whereupon, the Planning Commission
recessed and then continued on with its
agenda.)

(Public hearing concluded at 8:42 p.m.)
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PH-1 The comment refers to page 5 of the Planning Commission agenda prepared by the City for the November 17, 2005, public hearing. The agenda presents a summary description of the Raley's Landing project and identifies the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with implementing the project. The presentation referred to in the comment is the summary of the project and the impact conclusions identified in the DEIR, presented earlier during the public hearing by Sean Bechta of EDAW, the preparers of the DEIR.

The comment accurately characterizes the traffic impacts expected on the roadways in the vicinity of the project site. As described for Impact 3.3-6 (page 3.3-19 of the DEIR), even without the project, the intersection of Third Street/Tower Bridge Gateway would operate at an unacceptable LOS during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The mitigation identified would reduce the level of impact; however, site constraints and other factors would prevent implementation of intersection improvements that would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Similarly, the comment accurately summarizes the discussion of Impact 3.3-8 (the cumulative impact on state highway facilities) (page 3.3-21), and Impact 3.3-10 (the cumulative impact on four Sacramento intersections) (page 3.3-23 and -24) and the conclusion that no mitigation is available to reduce these impacts to less than significant. As stated in the DEIR, no mechanism exists for projects in West Sacramento to provide funding or otherwise contribute to traffic network improvements to mitigate significant impacts in the city of Sacramento caused by West Sacramento projects.

As indicated in the responses to comments in letter S2 and in particular the response to comment S2-5, the City of West Sacramento has been in contact with Caltrans regarding the Raley's Landing project and intends to coordinate with the agency regarding the City's traffic impact fee program and the allocation of funding from this program for improvements to interchanges affected by the proposed project.

PH-2 It is assumed that the comment refers to the Jefferson Boulevard/Sacramento Avenue intersection, which is addressed in Impact 3.3-2 in the DEIR (page 3.3-15). The discussion of Impact 3.3-2 identifies that under the "existing plus project" condition, the addition of project traffic would result in the intersection operating at level of service D (LOS D) during the p.m. peak hour. This impact is considered significant because the intersection operates at LOS C, an acceptable LOS, under existing conditions without the proposed project. The DEIR has identified intersection improvements that would improve intersection operation to an acceptable LOS during the p.m. peak hour under existing plus project conditions. Because the improvements are related to the widening of Sacramento Avenue, however, they may not be in place before implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, this temporary impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Based on the results of traffic modeling, the proposed improvements at the Jefferson Boulevard/Sacramento Avenue intersection are sufficient to maintain an acceptable LOS (LOS C) under cumulative development conditions, with or without the proposed project. The cumulative traffic model includes future development assumptions based on a thorough analysis of planned future projects in the city. Therefore, it is assumed that the apartment complex referenced in the comment is reflected in the cumulative traffic model. It should be noted that LOS C, which reflects both existing conditions and cumulative conditions at this intersection, does not indicate a free flow of traffic. As described in Table 3.3-1 of the DEIR, LOS C "marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operations of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream."
general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.” Therefore, the current presence of heavy traffic at this intersection (as expressed by the commenter) does not necessarily reflect that it is operating at an unacceptable LOS.

PH-3 As described in the discussion of Impact 3.7-4 (pages 3.7-12 and -13), after West Sacramento is connected to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) via the Lower Northwest Interceptor project, the interceptor line will have a flow capacity of 47 million gallons per day (mgd), considerably more than required for the 0.28-mgd average daily dry weather flow calculated for the project. In the long term, the proposed project would contribute to the need to expand the capacity of the SRWTP; however, there is no doubt that sufficient wastewater treatment service would be available for the proposed project. The availability of wastewater treatment capacity at the SRWTP is also described in the discussion of Impact 3.7-4.

PH-4 The Washington Street property currently is used as a parking lot for Raley Field events. Following project implementation, this space could no longer be available for Raley Field parking. As described in the DEIR, this land is leased to the River Cats. Although this area would no longer be available for parking, numerous parking spaces associated with office and retail development under the proposed project would be located near Raley Field. As described in “Project Parking Analysis” on pages 3.3-12 and -13, the City anticipates a degree of shared parking following completion of the project. For example, the demand for office parking would peak at midday. Most events at Raley Field are held in the evening, when most of the office parking spaces would not be in use. In addition, the existing parking structure adjacent to the Ziggurat office building would be available for use during Raley Field events.

PH-5 The increased demand for fire and police department personnel related to the proposed project is addressed in the discussion of Impacts 3.6-1 and 3.6-2 (pages 3.6-5 through 3.6-8). As described in the DEIR, the coordination and funding necessary to maintain an adequate level of fire and police service in the city would be ensured with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 and 3.6-3.

PH-6 The increased demand for public school facilities and services is addressed in the discussion of Impact 3.6-4 (page 3.6-9). As described in the DEIR, the middle and high schools in the project vicinity would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the students generated by the proposed project. The elementary schools in the area, however, would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the students generated by the project. This impact is identified as less than significant in the DEIR because the project applicants would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to the Washington Unified School District. Under state law, the City is limited to charging a statutorily created fee to offset impacts on local school districts generated by proposed projects. Payment of these fees is considered sufficient to reduce impacts on schools from students generated by housing projects to a less-than-significant level, and the City is not authorized to require mitigation beyond payment of the fees.

PH-7 It is assumed that the commenter is questioning the use of the term “Washington Street property” in the DEIR. The “Washington Street” name was adopted by the project applicants to identify one of the areas included in the Raley’s Landing project. There is no roadway currently named Washington Street in the project area. The street name derives from the original subdivision map recorded in 1919 by the Washington Land Company as Subdivision Number 1. On that map, a street that ran between Third and Fifth Streets was called Washington Street, an acknowledgment that this section of West Sacramento was once known as the town of Washington.

PH-8 The discussion of Impacts 3.6-1 through 3.6-3 (pages 3.6-5 through 3.6-8) addresses the increased demand for fire protection facilities, systems, equipment, and services (including the need for a fire truck equipped to respond to fires in high-rise buildings); fire flow; and police protection facilities, services, and equipment. These impacts would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the DEIR.
PH-9  As described in Section 3.7, "Public Utilities," most of the infrastructure needed to serve the proposed project is already in place at the project site, including water delivery and wastewater removal infrastructure.

PH-10  As stated in the discussion of Impact 3.2-4 (page 3.2-10), the City's affordable housing ordinance (Chapter 15.10 of the City's Municipal Code) identifies numeric goals associated with providing affordable housing in the city. The DEIR identifies several options included in the ordinance for satisfying those goals, including providing housing on-site, providing housing off-site, and paying fees. The project applicants are currently coordinating with the City to determine how they will satisfy the City's 15% affordable housing requirement.

PH-11  See the response to comment PH-8 for information regarding the provision of police and fire services. No further response is necessary.

PH-12  The commenter is correct in stating that there is no LOS standard beyond LOS F. No roadways, intersections, or state highway facilities analyzed in the EIR currently function at LOS F, although three state highway facilities and one city of Sacramento intersection operate at an unacceptable LOS during the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hour under current conditions (see discussion on page 3.3-7 of the DEIR). Under cumulative development conditions, without the addition of project traffic, two city of West Sacramento intersections, one city of West Sacramento roadway, five state highway facilities, and four city of Sacramento intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS during the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hours, with some of these facilities operating at LOS F.

PH-13  Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 in the DEIR requires that "pedestrian access to and from the project areas shall be designed to maximize the convenience and comfort of project residents, employees, and visitors who walk to, from, and within the project. Internal pedestrian connections within project areas shall be provided to minimize extra walking distance within the project areas. Sidewalks shall be installed on all project fronting streets and on internal project streets. Pedestrian connections from the River 1, 2, and 3 areas and River Walk Park shall be provided. A pedestrian connection shall be provided from River 1 to Tower Bridge Gateway and the planned pedestrian walkways on Tower Bridge." In addition, this mitigation measure states that minor and major office tenants at the project site would be required to comply with the City's Transportation System Management provision included in the City's Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17.67) and prepare and to implement a Transportation Management Plan to maximize and promote alternative commute modes. See also the response to comment S2-8, above, regarding coordination with transit providers.

PH-14  The only on-street parking spaces included in the proposed project are 20 angled surface parking spaces located on the northern edge of the River 3 area, on the south side of E Street. (Page 2-10 of the DEIR identifies the number of spaces as 23; however, following further refinement of the project design, the number of spaces has been reduced by three.) All other parking spaces described as part of the proposed project would be off-street/on-site, either in parking structures or as surface parking on the project sites. The continued availability of on-street parking adjacent to the project sites would be determined by the City based on roadway infrastructure conditions, traffic safety considerations, and other factors.

PH-15  The inclusion of intersections in the city of Sacramento in the EIR traffic analysis was based on a request from City of Sacramento staff in response to the notice of preparation for the EIR and during the associated public scoping process. These requests were conveyed in a letter and during a coordination meeting. City staff appreciates that the commenter may find the information valuable to the decision-making process.

PH-16  Whenever possible, the mitigation measures identified in Section 3.3, "Transportation and Circulation," identify specific improvements to the affected roadways to reduce the traffic impacts to a less-than-
significant level. Regarding the project-related impact on the Jefferson Boulevard/Sacramento Avenue intersection (Impact 3.3-2) and the mitigation identified to reduce that impact, page 3.3-15 of the DEIR and Table 3.3-12 state that with the project, the intersection would operate at LOS C during the a.m. peak hour and LOS D during the p.m. peak hour. The LOS standard for this intersection is C. As shown in Table 3.3-22, the intersection would operate at LOS B during the a.m. peak hour and LOS C during the p.m. peak hour following the addition of a southbound right-turn lane. Tables 3.3-22 and 3.3-23 identify the LOS at transportation facilities where significant impacts occur both before and after mitigation.

PH-17 As described in the discussion of Impact 3.3-6 in the DEIR, the Third Street/Tower Bridge Gateway intersection would operate at LOS E during the a.m. peak hour and at LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under cumulative no-project conditions. With the addition of project traffic, the intersection would operate at LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. There are no opportunities for further infrastructure improvements at this intersection other than those already assumed under the cumulative traffic condition. Therefore, improvements to LOS cannot be achieved through physical improvements to the intersection. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 would reduce the project’s contribution to vehicle trips at this intersection, but as identified in the discussion of the mitigation measure, any quantification of the actual trip reduction at this location resulting from the mitigation measure would be speculative. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to estimate a change in LOS or the V/C (volume-to-capacity) ratio associated with implementation of this mitigation measure or to assume that the mitigation measure would, or could, reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Hence, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

PH-18 In response to comment PH-18, a shadow simulation for the River 3 area has been prepared and is included in this FEIR as Exhibit 1. As shown in the exhibit, shadows cast by the River 3 development would reach residences to the north only during the winter months. Shadows from the River 3 development would fall on these residences during the morning and during part of the midday hours. As identified in the discussion of Impact 3.12-5, and supported by the shadow simulation, implementing the proposed project would not result in shading of residences along E Street for a substantial portion of the day. Therefore, shading/shadow impacts, as they apply to these residences, are considered less than significant.

PH-19 As summarized in the “Raley’s Landing Development Agreement” section on page 3.1-7 and described in much greater detail in Appendix B, “Raley’s Landing Comparison of Proposed Modifications,” the proposed project does not differ substantially from development proposed for the project site nearly 20 years ago. The commenter is correct in stating that the proposed project allows taller structures than under current conditions. The environmental effects of the proposed project structures, including the current height proposal, are evaluated in the EIR.

PH-20 See the response to comment PH-13. Several mechanisms to encourage walking to, from, and through the project site are included in Mitigation Measure 3.3-6, including creating pedestrian connections between the project site and the Tower Bridge, hence connecting the project site to the city of Sacramento. Various other potential trip reduction measures are also included in Mitigation Measure 3.3-6.

PH-21 See the response to comment PH-18. No further response is necessary.

PH-22 See the responses to comments S2-8 and PH-13. Several mitigation actions other than roadway infrastructure improvements are identified in the DEIR. No further response is necessary.

PH-23 The comment refers to page 6 of the Planning Commission agenda prepared by the City for the November 17, 2005, public hearing. The commenter summarizes air quality-related information from the agenda and provided during the public hearing, but does not comment on the analysis or conclusions of the DEIR.
Shadow Simulations for the River 3 Area

Source: HOK Architecture 2005  G 05110023.01 015

Exhibit 1
PH-24 See Section 3.3, "Traffic and Circulation," for a detailed analysis of the project-related impact on intersections and roadways in the vicinity of the project site. See also the responses to comment letter S2 and responses to comments PH-1 and PH-2. See Section 3.6, "Public Services," for a detailed analysis regarding the provision of school, police department, fire department, wastewater treatment services, and other public services to the project. Section 3.5, "Noise and Vibration," identifies the project's impact on noise levels in and adjacent to the project site.

PH-25 Section 3.10, "Hydrology and Water Quality," addresses the water quality impacts related to construction and operation of the proposed project. As described in the discussions of Mitigation Measures 3.10-2 and 3.10-3 (pages 3.10-14 and -15), the project engineers and contractors are required to comply with the requirements of the City of West Sacramento Stormwater Management Program and with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements, including establishment of best management practices, identified through consultation with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that the water quality impact on the Sacramento River would be less than significant.

PH-26 The proposed project's impact on plants and wildlife are analyzed in Section 3.11, "Biological Resources." The impact on riparian habitat is specifically addressed in the discussion of Impact 3.11-4 (page 3.11-15). Although the impact on remnant riparian habitat would be significant, mitigation has been identified to replace riparian habitat at off-site locations where they would receive long-term protection, reducing this impact to less than significant. See also the response to comment PH-25.

PH-27 Section 3.13 of the DEIR, "Cultural Resources," describes in detail the history of the project area and the historical resources known or with potential to occur. Potentially significant historical and prehistoric resources are identified according to federal, state, and local guidelines. Mitigation measures are identified to reduce potential impacts on significant historical and prehistoric resources to a less-than-significant level.

PH-28 The Redevelopment Agency has coordinated extensively with City staff during preparation of the EIR to ensure that issues related to the redevelopment area are appropriately considered. The proposed project and the EIR consider integration of the Raley's Landing project with River Walk Park on several levels. For example, Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 in Section 3.3, "Transportation and Circulation," requires creation of pedestrian connections between the project site and River Walk Park; River Walk Park is considered a sensitive noise receptor in Section 3.5, "Noise and Vibration"; the planned extension of River Walk Park to the north is considered in the evaluation of recreation facility supply and demand in Section 3.7, "Public Services"; and the potential for proposed buildings to cast shadows on River Walk Park is evaluated in Section 3.12, "Visual Resources."

PH-29 The environmental impacts of the proposed project on cultural resources, biological resources, and aesthetic resources are all evaluated in the EIR.

PH-30 Traffic delays in the project vicinity associated with trains passing at at-grade railroad crossings, or with the raising of draw bridges, are short-term events with no defined schedule. Traffic generated by the proposed project would not alter the timing or frequency of these events and therefore would not alter obstructions to the flow of traffic provided by these facilities under existing condition. The only effect associated with the addition of project traffic would be a potential increase in queue lengths as vehicles wait for roadways/bridges to again become passable. Potential queue lengths during worst-case conditions at the Tower Bridge (i.e., during peak-hour traffic) are described in the discussion of Impact 3.4-3, and the potential for increases in local mobile-source carbon monoxide concentrations associated with these idling vehicles are evaluated.
Based on the traffic modeling conducted in support of the EIR and the available mitigation measures, the EIR accurately identifies where significant and unavoidable traffic impacts may occur.
3 REVISIONS TO THE DEIR

This chapter includes revisions to text in the DEIR. Text changes are intended to clarify or correct information in the DEIR. The changes shown in this chapter result from the following sources:

- clarifications in response to comments received on the DEIR and
- corrections identified by the City and the consultant who prepared the DEIR.

Revisions are shown as excerpts from the DEIR text, with strikethrough (strike-through) text for deletions and underlined (underlined) text for additions. The changes appear in the order of their location in the DEIR.

Executive Summary, last paragraph on page ES-4 is revised as follows:

The Raley’s Landing project consists of residential, commercial, office, and open space features oriented toward the Sacramento River waterfront on the east and toward West Capitol Avenue, a major thoroughfare and entryway to West Sacramento, on the south. Under the proposed project, residences would be located near a large number of workplaces, as well as near present and future public transit systems. At buildout, the proposed project would contain approximately 900 multifamily residential units, 845,000 gross square feet of office space, 102,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, and possibly 100-300 hotel rooms with a 7,000- to 15,000-square-foot conference center; it would provide between 4,354-4,348 and 4,654-4,648 on-site parking spaces, including surface and multilevel parking spaces. The City proposes to amend the Raley’s Landing Development Agreement and PD-30 text to accommodate the proposed mixed-use development included in the Raley’s Landing project and to annex the Washington Street property (one of the project development areas described below) to the PD-30 zone so that it can share residential entitlements associated with the PD-30 zone.

Executive Summary, second full paragraph on page ES-6 is revised as follows:

The River 3 area is bordered by E Street on the north, Third Street on the west, the Sacramento River on the east, and F Street and the River 2 area on the south. Proposed development in the 5.6-acre River 3 area includes approximately 600,000 gross square feet of office space, 20,000 gross square feet of commercial space, and structured parking for 2,118 vehicles. The development would consist of a common podium of lobby and parking uses with two towers rising from the shared podium. The towers would be oriented on the eastern and western portions of the podium. The eastern portion of the development would be constructed before the western portion. Commercial and project amenity spaces would line the east, south, and west facades of the project. Specifically, a cafeteria and terrace garden, designed as a project amenities for the owner/tenant, are proposed for the east facade; the south facade would have one story of owner/tenant amenity space and a lobby on the west end; and two stories are planned for the entire west facade, along Third Street. Retail/commercial space is planned for the first story; the story above is planned for parking. The step back for the facade would remain at or below the mandated stepback height of 36 feet. At that point, the west facade would step back 20 feet before rising to its full height.

Executive Summary, second full paragraph on page ES-7 is revised as follows:

As described previously, the project would provide between 4,354-4,348 and 4,654-4,648 on-site parking spaces, including surface parking and spaces in multilevel parking structures. On the Washington Street property, 900-1,000 off-street parking spaces would be used primarily to support residential uses; they also would be used to support the retail uses proposed for the site. Between 1,000 and 1,200 parking spaces would be provided in the River 1 area to support a mix of commercial, residential, and retail uses. Some of these spaces would be provided in a parking structure associated with the office tower; others would be included in the hotel or apartment/condominium buildings or both. Approximately 300 parking spaces would be developed for the 150 residential units proposed for the River 2 area. In the River 3 area, approximately 2,118-2,148 parking spaces
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would be provided for the office development. Most of these spaces would be provided in an on-site parking structure; however, 24 20 angled surface parking spaces would be located on the northern edge of the River 3 area, on the south side of E Street.

Table ES-3, pages ES-12 and ES-13 are revised as follows:

3.2-4: Population, Employment, and Housing — Consistency with Housing Goals and Policies. The General Plan and the Washington Specific Plan identify various goals, policies, and implementation programs related to the provision of affordable housing and housing for people with special needs. The City's affordable housing ordinance identifies numeric goals associated with the provision of affordable housing in the city. The developers would coordinate with the City to ensure compliance with the City's affordable housing policy satisfaction of these goals through one or more available mechanisms. This impact is considered less than significant.

Table ES-3, pages ES-14 and ES-15 are revised as follows:

3.3-3: Provide Improvements along Third Street between E Street and West Capitol Avenue (Existing Plus Project)

Mitigation for this impact would be upgrading Third Street from its current class (residential collector) and configuration (two or three travel lanes) to an arterial street, with four travel lanes (two lanes in each direction) between West Capitol Avenue and G Street, and two travel lanes (one lane in each direction) north of G Street. This improvement would include some access limitations to driveways fronting on Third Street and raised medians to prevent left turns out of the driveways, and other operational improvements to this section of Third Street. Project access points on Third Street shall be limited to the following:

- one driveway on Third Street for the River 1 project area, allowing right turns in and out and left turns in from Third Street southbound;
- one driveway on Third Street for the Washington property, allowing right turns in and out (left turns into the driveway can be allowed if the developer provides, at its sole cost and expense, a turn pocket on northbound Third Street that the City determines meets city standards); and
- no driveway access to Third Street for either the River 2 or River 3 areas.

The project applicants shall implement the Third Street fronting improvements on the Washington Street property and in the River 1 area during project construction. The City shall be responsible for restriping Third Street.

Table ES-3, first full paragraph on page ES-16 is revised as follows:

The project applicants have already contributed $100,000 of the cost of signalizing the Fifth Street/G Street intersection. In accordance with the Public Facilities Agreement, the project applicants shall contribute $100,000 of the cost of signalizing the Fifth Street/G Street intersection. The remaining cost of signalization shall be funded through the Traffic Impact Fee Program, with the project applicants also paying fees into this program as appropriate. The City shall be responsible for implementing this improvement. This improvement is not currently programmed, although funds are dedicated within the Traffic Impact Fee Program for improvements to various unspecified intersections as needed. The Fifth Street/G Street intersection would fall within this category. The City shall monitor traffic volumes and delays at this location through its regular traffic engineering data collection and shall program the improvement when the signal is warranted.
Table ES-3, pages ES-16 and ES-17 are revised as follows:

Implementation of mitigation at the Third Fifth Street/G Street and Fifth Street/F Street intersections would involve payment into the Traffic Impact Fee Program. Because the Traffic Impact Fee Program is being updated and the project includes two development options for the River 1 area (900 residential units or 850 residential units and hotel and conference center), the specific amount of the fee that the project applicants would pay into the Traffic Impact Fee Program is uncertain. If the fees were calculated based on the current fee schedule and based on the land use square footage and the number of dwelling units identified in the current description of the project, the project applicants would contribute approximately $7.3–7.4 million to the City’s Traffic Impact Fee Program (Pascoe, pers. comm., 2005). As stated earlier, however, the City is updating its Traffic Impact Fee Program and will be approving a new fee schedule in fall 2005. If the fees were calculated based on the fee schedule currently being considered by the City Council, the project applicants would contribute approximately $8.2–8.3 million to the Traffic Impact Fee Program (Bermudez, pers. comm., 2005). The actual amount that the Raley’s Landing project applicants would pay toward the program would be determined based on the fee schedule in place as building permits are issued for each building. The fees would be calculated based on the square footage of the various land uses and the number of dwelling units identified in the ultimate submittal to the City.

Table ES-3, pages ES-17 and ES-18 are revised as follows:

3.3-6: Reduce Vehicle Trip Generation from the Proposed Project (Cumulative Plus Project)

The Third Street/Tower Bridge Gateway intersection is included as part of the City’s planned conversion of Tower Bridge Gateway from its current classification as a freeway with no at-grade intersections, to an arterial street, with three at-grade intersections. The Third Street/Tower Bridge Gateway intersection configuration and infrastructure included in the City’s planned Tower Bridge Gateway conversion are the same intersection characteristics used in this analysis. There are no opportunities for further improvements to this intersection because of site constraints and other factors. Therefore, the only opportunity for the proposed Raley’s Landing project to mitigate this impact is to reduce the number of trips generated by the project and, consequently, minimize the number of trips contributed to this intersection. This would be achieved by both minor and major office tenants as defined in the City’s Transportation Systems Management (TSM) provision included in the City’s Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17.67). The TSM requires minor and major office tenants to prepare and implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP). As described in the TMP, the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) shall achieve the following objectives:....

Table ES-3, page ES-21 is revised as follows:

3.3-9: Transportation and Circulation – Unacceptable LOS on the City of Sacramento Third Street/J Street Intersection under Existing Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. Traffic generated by cumulative development alone, without implementation of the proposed project, would cause the Third Street/J Street intersection in the City of Sacramento to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Traffic added by the proposed project would increase the peak period average vehicle delay by more than 5 seconds. This impact is considered significant.

Table ES-3, pages ES-33 and ES-34 are revised as follows:

- Before approval of the updated development agreement (DA) for the proposed project, the project applicants, the City, and the fire department shall complete a fire protection services funding agreement. The funding agreement shall identify the equipment needed to provide fire protection services to the proposed project. The full cost of the equipment, and the project applicants’ fair share of this cost, shall be determined. Methods to fully fund the acquisition of equipment shall be identified, including fees and other mechanisms. The fire protection services funding agreement shall act as a mechanism to ensure that the project applicants pay an appropriate portion of needed funding, that the City of West Sacramento fire Department shall provide fire protection equipment to serve the proposed project, and that the City shall ensure
the measures in the plan are implemented as scheduled before occupation of project facilities. The fire protection services funding agreement shall be completed and approved by all parties before approval of the DA for the proposed project and shall be included in the DA. Funding for additional fire department personnel shall not be the responsibility of the project applicants. Sufficient funding for ongoing operations, including the cost of additional fire department personnel associated with the proposed project, would be available from property and sales taxes and from pass-through payments from the Redevelopment Agency to the general fund.

Table ES-3, page ES-35 is revised as follows:

- Before approval of the updated DA for the proposed project, the project applicants, the City, and the police department shall complete a police protection services funding agreement. The funding agreement shall identify the equipment needed to provide police protection services to the proposed project. The full cost of the equipment, and the project applicants’ fair share of this cost, shall be determined. Methods to fully fund the acquisition of equipment shall be identified, including fees and other mechanisms. The police protection services funding agreement DA shall act as a mechanism to ensure that the project applicants pay an appropriate portion of needed funding, that the City of West Sacramento Police Department shall provide police protection equipment to serve the proposed project, and that the City shall ensure the measures in the plan are implemented as scheduled before occupation of project facilities. The police protection services funding agreement shall be completed and approved by all parties before approval of the DA for the proposed project and shall be included in the DA. Funding for additional police department personnel shall not be the responsibility of the project applicants. Sufficient funding for ongoing operations, including the cost of additional police department personnel associated with the proposed project, would be available from property and sales taxes and from pass-through payments from the Redevelopment Agency to the general fund.

Table ES-3, pages 47 and 48 is revised as follows:

3.10-2: Obtain Authorization for Construction Activity with the Central Valley Regional Water Board and Implement Erosion and Sediment Control Measures as Required

Each general contractor involved with construction activities at the project site shall obtain authorization for construction activity from the Central Valley Regional Water Board through the NPDES stormwater general permit for construction activity. If groundwater elevations are high enough to require dewatering during excavations, general contractors also shall obtain authorization under the construction dewatering NPDES permit or waiver of discharges for dewatering discharge to land. General contractors or representative engineers shall develop and implement a SWPPP for the NPDES permit and submit the appropriate NOIs for all applicable permit processes to the regional water board before beginning construction activities. The SWPPP shall identify, at a minimum:

- the activities that may cause pollutant discharge (including sediment);
- construction BMPs, consistent with requirements of the NPDES permit, to reduce the potential for contaminated runoff, such as limiting ground-disturbing activities during the winter rainfall period, minimizing exposure of disturbed areas and soil stockpiles to rainfall, and minimizing construction work near or within drainage facilities;
- erosion and sedimentation control measures to be implemented, such as soil stabilization, mulching, silt fencing, or temporary desilting basins; good housekeeping practices such as road sweeping and dust control; and diversion measures such as use of berms to prevent clear runoff from contacting disturbed areas; and
- hazardous materials spill prevention and response measure requirements, including lists of materials proposed for use, handling and storage practices, identification of spill response equipment, spill containment and cleanup procedures, and identified regulatory notification protocols and contact phone numbers to be followed in the event of a spill.
All general contractors shall implement measures for construction dewatering activities that ensure that the applicable water quality standards and permit limits are maintained. All applicable NOI(s) and SWPPP(s) shall be prepared before construction is initiated, and implementation shall be ongoing through the construction phase of the project(s). All SWPPPs and plans and specifications for construction of water quality BMPs shall be submitted to the City of West Sacramento for approval. The City of West Sacramento shall inspect for compliance with SWPPP and NPDES permit measures during all construction activities.

Consistent with Mitigation Measure 3.9-2d, described previously in Section 3.9, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," groundwater pumped from project excavation shall be containerized in appropriate tanks and sampled for potential site analytes of concern. Following results confirming nonhazardous classification, the water shall be disposed of or discharged in one of the following means: on-site treatment/recycling, discharge to the storm sewer under appropriate permit, discharge to the local sanitary sewer district under appropriate permit, or discharge to ground surface (i.e., for construction dust control) under the approval of appropriate agencies. This approach shall be subject to review and approval by the Yolo County Environmental Health Department.

Chapter 1, "Introduction," second paragraph on page 1-1 is revised as follows:

At buildout, the proposed project would contain approximately 900 multifamily residential units, 845,000 gross square feet of office space, 102,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, and possibly 100–300 hotel rooms with a 7,000- to 15,000-square-foot conference center; it would provide between $4,354$ and $4,651$ and $4,648$ on-site parking spaces, including surface and multilevel parking spaces. The project is similar in type, size, and location to a mixed-use development project, also known as the Raley’s Landing project, that was approved by Yolo County (County) nearly 20 years ago. The development agreement prepared for the previous project was executed in 1996.

Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project," pages 2-5 and 2-6 are revised as follows:

The City proposes to annex the Washington Street property to the PD-30 zone so that it can share residential entitlements associated with the PD-30 zone. The proposed project consists of residential, commercial, office, and open space features oriented toward the Sacramento River waterfront on the east and toward West Capitol Avenue, a major thoroughfare and entryway to West Sacramento, on the south. Under the proposed project, residences would be located near a large number of workplaces, as well as near present and future public transit systems. At buildout, the proposed project would contain approximately 900 multifamily residential units, 845,000 gross square feet of office space, 102,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses, and possibly 100–300 hotel rooms with a 7,000- to 15,000-square-foot conference center; it would provide between $4,354$ and $4,651$ and $4,648$ on-site parking spaces, including surface and multilevel parking spaces.

Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project," second full paragraph on page 2-9 is revised as follows:

The River 3 area is bordered by E Street on the north, Third Street on the west, the Sacramento River on the east, and F Street and the River 2 area on the south. Proposed development in the 5.6-acre River 3 area includes approximately 600,000 gross square feet of office space, 20,000 gross square feet of commercial space, and structured parking for 2,148 vehicles. The development would consist of a common podium of lobby and parking uses with two towers rising from the shared podium. The towers would be oriented on the eastern and western portions of the podium. The eastern portion of the development would be constructed before the western portion. Commercial and project amenity spaces would line the east, south, and west facades of the project. Specifically, a cafeteria and terrace garden, designed as project amenities for the owner/tenant, are proposed for the east facade; the south facade would have one story of owner/tenant amenity space and a lobby on the west end; and two stories are planned for the entire west facade, along Third Street. Retail/commercial space is planned for the first story; the story above is planned for parking. The step back for the facade would be located at or below the mandated stepback height of 36 feet. At that point, the west facade would step back 20 feet before rising to its full height. The east tower would have approximately 14 stories of office space above a five-story lobby and parking podium. Approximately 400,000 gross square feet of office space are planned, with a typical office floor of
approximately 24,000 gross square feet. The parking structure would accommodate approximately 1,426 cars on four levels of covered parking and one open deck on the roof; additional surface parking might be available. The east tower would have approximately 19 stories, including the podium levels, and an overall height of approximately 300 feet.

Section 3.2, "Population, Employment, and Housing," page 3-10 is revised as follows:

The proposed project would include office uses, commercial/retail uses, and up to 900 multifamily residential units. Construction of higher density housing in association with commercial/retail land uses would ensure consistency with City General Plan Housing Element Goal D and Policies D.1 and D.3 and with Washington Specific Plan Policy 2.C.1, which encourage residential development in proximity to commercial services and employment centers.

City General Plan Housing Element Goal F and Policies A.1, A15, and F.1 and Land Use Element Policy B.2 discuss the provision of affordable housing for individuals with disabilities, very low- and low-income households, large families, senior citizens, farmworkers and their families, female-headed households with children, and others with special needs. The City’s affordable housing ordinance (Chapter 15.10 of the City’s Municipal Code) provides more specific guidance regarding the provision of affordable housing in the city. The ordinance calls for at least 15% of new and substantially rehabilitated dwelling units developed in the General Plan area to be affordable to low- and moderate-income households, and 40% of these units would be available at a cost affordable to very low income households. Several options are available for meeting the City’s affordable housing requirements: Some units on the project site may qualify as affordable housing; some affordable units may be constructed off-site, and the developer would construct them or fund their construction; or the developer may pay a fee to the City to fund the future construction of affordable housing or the redevelopment of existing housing into affordable housing. The Raley’s Landing project applicants are currently coordinating with the City and will continue to coordinate with the City to ensure compliance with the City’s affordable housing policy satisfaction of the 15% affordable housing requirement through one or more of these mechanisms. For these reasons, the proposed project is considered consistent overall with the City’s housing policies. This impact would be considered less than significant.
Section 3.3, “Transportation and Circulation,” first full paragraph on page 3.3-13 is revised as follows:

Table 3.3-21 provides a calculation of project parking demand and a comparison to parking supply for each area and for the project as a whole. In the project description, parking supply was given as a range for the Washington Street property and the River 1 area, and this is reflected in the table. A total of 4,354 to 4,654 spaces are proposed as part of the project. The demand estimate is 3,280 to 3,982 spaces. The comparison of project parking demand to parking supply shows that overall, the project provides from 374 to 1,368 more spaces than the demand estimate. The lower figure assumes 85th percentile parking demand and the minimum parking supply indicated in the project description. The upper figure assumes average parking demand and the higher parking supply figure. Therefore, overall, the project includes more than sufficient parking to meet estimated demands.

Section 3.3, “Transportation and Circulation,” page 3.3-16 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Provide Improvements along Third Street between E Street and West Capitol Avenue (Existing Plus Project)

Mitigation for this impact would be upgrading Third Street from its current class (residential collector) and configuration (two or three travel lanes) to an arterial street, with four travel lanes (two lanes in each direction) between West Capitol Avenue and G Street, and two travel lanes (one lane in each direction) north of G Street. This improvement would include some access limitations to driveways fronting on Third Street and raised medians to prevent left turns out of the driveways, and other operational improvements to this section of Third Street.

Project access points on Third Street shall be limited to the following:

- one driveway on Third Street for the River 1 project area, allowing right turns in and out and left turns in from Third Street southbound;
- one driveway on Third Street for the Washington property, allowing right turns in and out (left turns into the driveway can be allowed if the developer provides, at its sole cost and expense, a turn pocket on northbound Third Street that the City determines meets City standards); and
- no driveway access to Third Street for either the River 2 or River 3 areas.

The project applicants shall implement the Third Street fronting improvements on the Washington Street property and in the River 1 area during project construction. The City shall be responsible for restriping Third Street.

With implementation of this mitigation measure, daily traffic volumes on these segments of Third Street would meet City daily volume standards under existing plus project conditions; therefore, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Section 3.3, “Transportation and Circulation,” third paragraph on page 3.3-18 is revised as follows:

The project applicants have already contributed $100,000 of the cost of signalizing the Fifth Street/G Street intersection. In accordance with the Public Facilities Agreement, the project applicants shall contribute $100,000 of the remaining cost of signalization shall be funded through the Traffic Impact Fee Program, with the project applicants also paying fees into this program as appropriate. The City shall be responsible for implementing this improvement. This improvement is not currently programmed, although funds are dedicated within the Traffic Impact Fee Program for improvements to various unspecified intersections as needed. The Fifth Street/G Street intersection would fall within this category. The City shall monitor traffic volumes and delays at this location through its regular traffic engineering data collection and shall program the improvement when the signal is warranted.
Section 3.3, “Transportation and Circulation,” fifth paragraph on page 3.3-18 is revised as follows:

Implementation of mitigation at the Third Fifth Street/G Street and Fifth Street/F Street intersections would involve payment into the Traffic Impact Fee Program. Because the Traffic Impact Fee Program is being updated and the project includes two development options for the River 1 area (900 residential units or 850 residential units and hotel and conference center), the specific amount of the fee that the project applicants would pay into the Traffic Impact Fee Program is uncertain. If the fees were calculated based on the current fee schedule and based on the land use square footage and the number of dwelling units identified in the current description of the project, the project applicants would contribute approximately $7.3–7.4 million to the City’s Traffic Impact Fee Program (Pascoe, pers. comm., 2005). As stated earlier, however, the City is updating its Traffic Impact Fee Program and will be approving a new fee schedule in fall 2005. If the fees were calculated based on the fee schedule currently being considered by the City Council, the project applicants would contribute approximately $8.2–8.3 million to the Traffic Impact Fee Program (Bermudez, pers. comm., 2005). The actual amount that the Raley’s Landing project applicants would pay toward the program would be determined based on the fee schedule in place as building permits are issued for each building. The fees would be calculated based on the square footage of the various land uses and the number of dwelling units identified in the ultimate submittal to the City.

Section 3.3, “Transportation and Circulation,” page 3.3-19 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.3-6: Reduce Vehicle Trip Generation from the Proposed Project (Cumulative Plus Project)

The Third Street/Tower Bridge Gateway intersection is included as part of the City’s planned conversion of Tower Bridge Gateway from its current classification as a freeway with no at-grade intersections, to an arterial street, with three at-grade intersections. The Third Street/Tower Bridge Gateway intersection configuration and infrastructure included in the City’s planned Tower Bridge Gateway conversion are the same intersection characteristics used in this analysis. There are no opportunities for further improvements to this intersection because of site constraints and other factors. Therefore, the only opportunity for the proposed Raley’s Landing project to mitigate this impact is to reduce the number of trips generated by the project and, consequently, minimize the number of trips contributed to this intersection. This would be achieved by both minor and major office tenants as defined in the City’s Transportation Systems Management (TSM) provision included in the City’s Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17.67). The TSM requires minor and major office tenants to prepare and implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP). As described in the TMP, the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) shall achieve the following objectives:

Section 3.3, “Transportation and Circulation,” page 3.3-22 is revised as follows:

**IMPACT**

**3.3-9** Transportation and Circulation – Unacceptable LOS on the City of Sacramento Third Street/J Street Intersection under Existing Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. Traffic generated by cumulative development alone, without implementation of the proposed project, would cause the Third Street/J Street intersection in the City of Sacramento to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Traffic added by the proposed project would increase the peak period average vehicle delay by more than 5 seconds. This impact is considered significant.
Section 3.3, “Transportation and Circulation,” the last two rows in Table 3.3-21 on page 3.3-41 are revised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Subarea</th>
<th>Parking Demand</th>
<th>Demand Adjustment</th>
<th>Adjusted Parking Demand</th>
<th>Perking Supply</th>
<th>Parking Surplus (Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Avg. 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River 3 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>4,239</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3.6, “Public Services,” page 3.6-6 (fourth bullet in Mitigation Measure 3.6-1) is revised as follows:

Before approval of the updated development agreement (DA) for the proposed project, the project applicants, the City, and the fire department shall complete a fire protection services funding agreement. The funding agreement shall identify the equipment needed to provide fire protection services to the proposed project. The full cost of the equipment, and the project applicants' fair share of this cost, shall be determined. Methods to fully fund the acquisition of equipment shall be identified, including fees and other mechanisms. The fire protection services funding agreement DA shall act as a mechanism to ensure that the project applicants pay an appropriate portion of needed funding, that the City of West Sacramento Fire Department shall provide fire protection equipment to serve the proposed project, and that the City shall ensure the measures in the plan are implemented as scheduled before occupation of project facilities. The fire protection services funding agreement shall be completed and approved by all parties before approval of the DA for the proposed project and shall be included in the DA. Funding for additional fire department personnel shall not be the responsibility of the project applicants. Sufficient funding for ongoing operations, including the cost of additional fire department personnel associated with the proposed project, would be available from property and sales taxes and from pass-through payments from the Redevelopment Agency to the general fund.

Section 3.6, “Public Services,” page 3.6-8 (second bullet in Mitigation Measure 3.6-3) is revised as follows:

Before approval of the updated DA for the proposed project, the project applicants, the City, and the police department shall complete a police protection services funding agreement. The funding agreement shall identify the equipment needed to provide police protection services to the proposed project. The full cost of the equipment, and the project applicants' fair share of this cost, shall be determined. Methods to fully fund the acquisition of equipment shall be identified, including fees and other mechanisms. The police protection services funding agreement DA shall act as a mechanism to ensure that the project applicants pay an appropriate portion of needed funding, that the City of West Sacramento Police Department shall provide police protection equipment to serve the proposed project, and that the City shall ensure the measures in the plan are implemented as scheduled before occupation of project facilities. The police protection services funding agreement shall be completed and approved by all parties before approval of the DA for the proposed project and shall be included in the DA. Funding for additional police department personnel shall not be the responsibility of the project applicants. Sufficient funding for ongoing operations, including the cost of additional police department personnel associated with the proposed project, would be available from property and sales taxes and from pass-through payments from the Redevelopment Agency to the general fund.
Section 3.10, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” page 3.10-14 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 3.10-2: Obtain Authorization for Construction Activity with the Central Valley Regional Water Board and Implement Erosion and Sediment Control Measures as Required

Each general contractor involved with construction activities at the project site shall obtain authorization for construction activity from the Central Valley Regional Water Board through the NPDES stormwater general permit for construction activity. If groundwater elevations are high enough to require dewatering during excavations, general contractors also shall obtain authorization under the construction dewatering NPDES permit or waiver of discharges for dewatering discharge to land. General contractors or representative engineers shall develop and implement a SWPPP for the NPDES permit and submit the appropriate NOIs for all applicable permit processes to the regional water board before beginning construction activities. The SWPPP shall identify, at a minimum:

- the activities that may cause pollutant discharge (including sediment);
- construction BMPs, consistent with requirements of the NPDES permit, to reduce the potential for contaminated runoff, such as limiting ground-disturbing activities during the winter rainfall period, minimizing exposure of disturbed areas and soil stockpiles to rainfall, and minimizing construction work near or within drainage facilities;
- erosion and sedimentation control measures to be implemented, such as soil stabilization, mulching, silt fencing, or temporary desilting basins; good housekeeping practices such as road sweeping and dust control; and diversion measures such as use of berms to prevent clear runoff from contacting disturbed areas; and
- hazardous materials spill prevention and response measure requirements, including lists of materials proposed for use, handling and storage practices, identification of spill response equipment, spill containment and cleanup procedures, and identified regulatory notification protocols and contact phone numbers to be followed in the event of a spill.

All general contractors shall implement measures for construction dewatering activities that ensure that the applicable water quality standards and permit limits are maintained. All applicable NOI(s) and SWPPP(s) shall be prepared before construction is initiated, and implementation shall be ongoing through the construction phase of the project(s). All SWPPPs and plans and specifications for construction of water quality BMPs shall be submitted to the City of West Sacramento for approval. The City of West Sacramento shall inspect for compliance with SWPPP and NPDES permit measures during all construction activities.

Consistent with Mitigation Measure 3.9-2d, described previously in Section 3.9, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” groundwater pumped from project excavation shall be containerized in appropriate tanks and sampled for potential site analyses of concern. Following results confirming nonhazardous classification, the water shall be disposed of or discharged in one of the following means: off-site treatment/recycling, discharge to the storm sewer under appropriate permit, discharge to the local sanitary sewer district under appropriate permit, or discharge to ground surface (i.e., for construction dust control) under the approval of appropriate agencies. This approach shall be subject to review and approval by the Yolo County Environmental Health Department.

With implementation of this mitigation measure, the project would include BMPs to prevent construction-related soil erosion and the release of soil, and construction-related contaminants, and contaminated groundwater to storm drains and ultimately to the Sacramento River; therefore, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.