



CITY OF EUREKA
TRAFFIC/SIGNALS DIVISION
Dan Moody, Traffic Operations Manager

531 K Street • Eureka, California 95501-1146
Ph (707) 441-4180 • Fx (707) 441-4202 • dmoody@ci.eureka.ca.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Kurt Gierlich, City Engineer
From: Dan Moody, Traffic Operations
Subject: Ridgewood Village Development
Date: August 12, 2010

The Traffic Division of the Engineering Department has reviewed Section 10.0 “Traffic, Circulation and Parking” of the Ridgewood Village Draft Environmental Impact Report dated April 2010, and have the following comments:

General Comments

1. The City of Eureka still has concerns with the use of the Greater Eureka Area Traffic Model (GEATM) which was used to analyze traffic impacts through estimation of the magnitude of new trips and routing of new trips due to the proposed project. Appendix “L” describes how the model was used for this project and deficiencies of the model. Deficiencies included trip generation, land use inconsistencies and internal project traffic capture rate percentages.
 - a. Trip generation – Appendix “L” page 9 states that “On average fewer trips were generated using the model trip generation functions than using the ITE method.” This is an understatement as some of the TAZ’s showed up to 90% less trips using the model. The report indicates that ITE-based trips were redistributed back into the origin-destination matrix in the model but it does little to inspire confidence in the model. Many of the intersections show only minor volume increases between the 2013 and 2030 Baseline Scenarios in one or more approaches.
 - b. Land Use – Appendix “L” page 10 states that “A 1995 ECP scenario was developed jointly by TJKM and the County Staff...”, and “The land use so developed, however, bears some inconsistency issues.” It also states that, “More realistic 1995 ECP employment data are needed to refine the land use.”
 - c. Internal Capture Rate – Appendix “L” page 14 shows an internal capture rate for the 2005 Plus Project of 23.7% AM and 31.3% PM. The text explains that “The Ridgewood Villages project contains large quantities of housing, employment and shopping uses. This will enable many of the Ridgewood Villages residents to potentially work locally within the retail and business components of the project.” This section goes on to say

that the internal capture rate reduces to 16.5% AM and 22.8% PM under the 2030 plus project conditions because “The availability of the north project access (*through Lunbar Hills subdivision*) makes it easier for project trips to travel longer distance, and thus reduces internal capture.” There should be no internal capture reductions made to traffic volumes until Phase 4 in 2020, when the retail and office components of the project are constructed. The internal capture rate should be based on ITE calculations.

2. Many of the comments and corrections submitted by the Traffic Division in January 2009, on the Traffic Impact Study Administrative Draft dated December 22, 2008, were never addressed. (See attached copy.)
3. The County, City and State will need to enter into an MOU regarding distribution and use of mitigation fees. The process for assessing fees using the Equivalent Dwelling Units appears adequate as long as sufficient funds are collected to design and construct the needed mitigation as development occurs.

The recommended Phase 1 mitigation costs total \$ 1.9 million. It appears that the Traffic Impact Fees will not be sufficient to cover these costs. It will be necessary for the developer to pay upfront costs for mitigation that is required at the completion of each project phase to assure the mitigation is in place when needed. It is also the developer’s responsibility to cover 100% of all direct costs associated with project access including the new traffic signals at Walnut Drive/Home Drive, Walnut Drive /Campton Road, Ridgewood Drive/Eggert Road, Fairway Drive/Lundblade Drive and Ridgewood Drive/Walnut Drive.

Page 75 of the Traffic Impact Study concludes that “Counting non-residential trips would result in double counting and would not be fair and equitable as required by law.” It is the City’s position that traffic impact fees should be spread to all new development within the ECP Area.

4. It is our understanding that at least two of the traffic analysis zones were not included in the modeling for the traffic study (TAZ 718 and 727). All cumulative impacts for the project area need to be included in the study to determine the extent of mitigation required and to properly determine a traffic impact fee necessary to pay for the mitigation.
5. The City of Eureka would like to participate in discussions regarding the development agreement for this project since much of the mitigation falls within our jurisdiction.

Specific Comments

1. Pg 10-1, para 3 “ECP Section 4202 allows exceptions for LOS D in certain locations where right-of-way and funding constraints exist.”
EPC Section 4202 states “There may be some locations where LOS D could be considered acceptable when right-of-way and funding are limited. This would be the exception rather than the planning criteria.” Section 4204 of the Eureka Community Plan states that at 100% build out and maximum allowable density, “LOS D conditions would be created along F Street and Campton Road

even with expansion of these facilities to four lanes. Future traffic demand could be reduced by a reduced density development in the City's vacant parcel."

For new developments, an LOS C or existing LOS should be maintained by reducing density or through mitigation.

2. Figure 10-1

Street segments on Hodgson, Harris and Henderson should have been included in the study. Harris Street is currently near capacity and any additional traffic will degrade the Level of Service. Were the Henderson Street intersections inadvertently left off the Study Intersections map? With Harris and Henderson Streets being parts of a one-way couplet, you would expect traffic using or crossing Harris Street while entering the City to be using or crossing Henderson Street exiting the City. Also, Hodgson Street is a major collector paralleling Harris Street. The intersections at Hodgson and "G", "H", "I", and "S" should be included in the traffic analysis.

3. Pg 10-10, para 2

"There are intermittent sidewalks on either side of Campton Road within the County and a continuous sidewalk along the east side within the city limits."

There are only partial sidewalks on the east side within the City Limits.

4. Pg 10-11, para 3

"Harris Street is an east-west principal arterial transecting both the City of Eureka and County from Broadway to Harrison Avenue..."

This portion of Harris only transects the City.

5. Pg 10-13, para 2

"The northbound approach on Lundblade Drive is a steep and sharply-curved, narrow road with limited sight distance."

The southbound approach on Fairway Drive also has limited sight distance due to being just southerly of a crest vertical curve.

6. Pg 10-14, para 7

This is one of the locations in which the GEATM has routed traffic in a location that it is unlikely to go. Manzanita is a low volume local street and should not be considered as a primary connection from "F" to "H" Street. The Manzanita and "H" Street intersection has limited sight distance as it falls within the dip of a vertical curve.

7. Pg 10-15, para 1

The Harris and "G" Street intersection is in an office/commercial area.

8. Pg 10-15, para 2

The Harris and "I" Street intersection is in an office/commercial area.

9. Pg 10-16, para 1

"The provision for a recessed bus pocket... is discussed within Section 10.4.2...)"

I could not find information regarding bus pockets.

10. Pg 10-20, para 5

"The project will retain a connection between Ridgewood Drive and Fairway Drive, as depicted on both the County General Plan Circulation Element ... and City of Eureka General Plan Circulation Element..."

The City's General Plan Circulation Element shows the Ridgewood/Fairway Drive connection north of Lundblade Drive and not running through the Lundbar Hills subdivision. The connection as shown in the Eureka General Plan took into consideration the potential access for several parcels to the south, east and west of the connection.

11. Pg 10-25

Intersection #26 Hodgson and "F" is shown to have a LOS D for the A.M. peak hour. If the intersection is separated into two intersections, since they are 80' apart, both have acceptable levels of service.

12. Pg 10-31, para 5 “Ridgewood Hills Drive is expected to experience no more than 5,000 vehicles per day in the residential area, at its connection to Lundblade Drive.”
The City has concerns relating to connecting this project to Fairway Drive through the Lunbar Hills subdivision. Adding 5,000 vehicles per day onto Lundblade Drive will adversely impact residents within the subdivision with excess noise and pollution created by the traffic. The Lundblade and Fairway intersection has limited sight distance for traffic queuing in the westbound lanes and the narrow steep portion of Lundblade Drive is inadequate for carrying the proposed volumes of traffic or any truck traffic. The traffic analysis does not take into consideration the potential for other parcels to the south and east of Lundbar Hills that may also need access to Fairway Drive.
13. Pg 10-32, para 2 “The project is proposed with narrower cross sections than county standards.”
The City would encourage County standards to be followed throughout the project. Streets with up to 5,000 trips per day would not be considered as “relatively low volume” streets and should not be reason for reducing standards. This area falls within the City of Eureka “sphere of influence” and minimum standards for the type of facility should not be reduced.
14. Pg 10-36 *Does the 2013 Baseline take the new Safeway at Harris and Walford into account? The LOS shown for Harris and Harrison “LOS B” is better than indicated in the Safeway Traffic study “LOS C”.*
15. Pg 10-38 *Table 10-9 shows the A.M. LOS improving from “C” to “A” at Broadway and Bayshore Mall South. Is there any improvement planned for this intersection which would cause the LOS to improve?*
16. Pg 10-38 *Table 10-9 shows considerable degradation to the Harris and Dolbeer LOS. It is unlikely that traffic will continue to choose this intersection and the traffic should be rerouted to other nearby intersections. With the proposed mitigation for Harris and Dolbeer were the existing and proposed project trips rerouted?*
17. Pg 10-45, para 2 *It appears the title of this section should be “Scenario 6: Scenario 5 + Reduced Density Alternative.*
18. Pg 10-47, para 2 *It appears the title of this section should be “Scenario 7: Scenario 5 + Proposed Project (Phase I + Subsequent Phases).*
19. Pg 10-52, para 5 “With the mitigation proposed in this report, either the new connection or the project without the connection results in acceptable LOS operations at the study intersections.”
Is this saying that the same mitigation is required with or without the Ridgewood Drive to Fairway Drive connection?
20. Pg 10-54, Impact 10-8 “Individual subsequent Project phases would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature...”
Proposed traffic signals at locations with limited sight distance and steep narrow approaches may increase hazards at those locations.
21. Pg 10-61, para 2 *What project traffic is expected to use the Harris and “G” Street intersection? One block to the north on “G” Street the area becomes*

single family residential. Placing a signal at Harris and “G” Street may encourage traffic through the residential area.

22. Pg 10-62, para 3 *The Fairway Drive/Lundblade Drive proposed signal is problematic at best. With limited sight distance, a narrow winding approach and impacts caused to the existing subdivision as well as sending Fairway Drive and “F” Street to LOS “D”, signalizing this intersection should be reconsidered.*
23. Pg 10-64, para 2 *The City believes Manzanita and “H” is the wrong intersection to consider signalizing. Manzanita is a local street with limited sight distance at “H” Street. Hodgson and “H” Street will likely receive greater amounts of project traffic and need mitigation.*
24. Pg 10-65, para 4 *Again we see no need for project traffic to use Manzanita at “F” and no need for mitigation.*
25. Pg 10-66, para 5 *Phase 8 mitigation is required to be completed before 2030 if Phase 1 through 8 are constructed, or when a cumulative Equivalent Dwelling Unit total meets or exceeds 1,059 units. On page 10-64 it says that Phase 5 mitigation needs to be completed when the cumulative EDU’s meet or exceed 1,986 units. These two requirements seem to be in conflict with each other.*
26. Pg 10-72, Table 10-23 *Phase 4 Daily Trips do not include all of the commercial, retail and office to be constructed in that phase. Should they be figured into the Equivalent Dwelling Units?*