

---

**McKINLEY VILLAGE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

**SCH No. 2008082049**

**ERRATA (REVISED): April 14, 2014**

The McKinley Village Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) has been released for public review. The City has provided copies of responses to written comments on the Draft EIR to persons and agencies submitting such comments.

The following changes are being made to the Final EIR as circulated. The discussion below identifies the changes and the affected sections of the Final EIR. Additions are shown in underline, and deletions in ~~strikethrough~~.

**Project Number**

The project number as shown on the cover of the Draft EIR and Final EIR is incorrect. The correct project number is P08-086.

**4.2 Biological Resources**

**Swainson's Hawk Foraging Habitat**

The Draft EIR identified significant effects for loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. See Impact 4.2-1, Draft EIR page 4.2-31. Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b) identified mitigation for the loss of foraging habitat via providing replacement habitat at a 1:1 ratio. The mitigation measure includes performance measures to ensure that adequate mitigation is provided.

The text of the Draft EIR, and Responses to Comments 11-5 and 11-6, indicated that replacement habitat would be located within 10 miles of the project site. Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b) does not include such a restriction, nor does guidance provided by CDFW require such a restriction. In Response to Comment 11-5, the Final EIR indicated that the applicant was proposing to utilize land in the Yolo Bypass to satisfy the mitigation measure. The applicant has indicated that it is evaluating several sites as candidates for mitigation and is not limiting the search to just this site. The Draft EIR does not discuss this particular site, or any other, as potential mitigation.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b) identifies the process that would be followed in confirming proposed mitigation in the event the project is approved. No approval for any specific mitigation site has been made, and the City has not reviewed any specific site to determine whether it satisfies the requirements of the mitigation measure.

The Draft EIR text and Responses to Comments 11-5 and 11-6 require clarification, and are corrected as follows.

**Draft EIR, page 4.2-34**

Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b) would provide compensation for the loss of foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk to ensure adequate foraging land is preserved ~~within 10 miles of the project site~~ at a location that will provide foraging habitat value to Swainson's hawks consistent with CDFW guidance. CDFW guidance provides that mitigation lands should be provided if an active nest is located within a 10-mile radius of the project site. It is anticipated that the value of this habitat would be ~~significantly~~ equal to or higher than what currently occurs on the project site.

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce impacts to the Swainson's hawk and other raptors from the loss of foraging habitat.

**Draft EIR, page 4.2-43**

Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b) would mitigate the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by ensuring that land is preserved at a 1:1 ratio ~~within 10 miles of the project site.~~ and consistent with CDFW guidance. This would allow foraging raptors to still have access to foraging land for survival. This mitigation would reduce the cumulative impact to a less-than-significant impact. Habitat preserved under this measure would also mitigate potential impacts to white-tailed kite and burrowing owl.

**Response to Comment 11-5**

The comment states that the alleged understatement of the value of foraging habitat on the project site undermines the significance finding and mitigation.

Please see Response to Comment 11-3 with respect to the value of the project site as foraging habitat for Swainson's hawks. Regarding mitigation, as noted in Response to Comment 11-4, because of the disturbed, fragmented, and heavily managed nature of the project site, it is unlikely used as a primary source of prey items by the Swainson's Hawks nesting near the project site. Page 4.2-34 of the Draft EIR notes that the City requires that the "loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat be mitigated through acquisition and/or preservation of similar or better habitat." Furthermore, as stated in the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b), would provide compensation for the loss of foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk to ensure adequate foraging land is preserved consistent with CDFW guidance ~~within 10 miles of the project site.~~ The land. A potential property proposed as a mitigation site for Swainson's hawk foraging habitat that would be lost through implementation of the proposed project is the "Notch" property, located in the Yolo Bypass just west of the City of West Sacramento (APN 033-300-021-000). This land comprises more than 100 acres, of which the applicant will provide 51.5 acres of mitigation: 50 acres

to mitigate for the loss of potential foraging habitat associated with on the project site and 1.5 acres to mitigate for the loss of foraging habitat due to the extension of A Street and construction of off-site detention basins. Per CDFW guidance, mitigation lands shall be habitat that is This land consists of habitat considered by the CDFW as suitable as foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk. The mitigation land eventually identified and approved will be located within a 10-mile radius of the project site (per CDFW guidance), and will be managed as Swainson's hawk foraging habitat in perpetuity. Consequently, the selected mitigation land, which will require approval by, CDFW is expected to be substantially equal to or higher in value than what the project site currently provides and, therefore, would adequately reduce the impact associated with the loss of the project site as foraging habitat to less than significant. The City would evaluate any proposed mitigation, including the above site, to determine whether the proposed mitigation complies with Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b). With respect to the commenter's statement regarding the project's potential to adversely affect the function of the American River Parkway as a wildlife movement corridor, the project site is located well south and west of the American River Parkway, with the Capital City Freeway and an established neighborhood (River Park) serving to substantially fragment the project site from the Parkway, such that the project site is not considered as a component, geographically or ecologically, of the Parkway. Therefore, the loss of the project site would not adversely affect wildlife movement along the Parkway.

#### **Response to Comment 11-6**

The current Potential mitigation lands are proposed in the Yolo Bypass (see Response to Comment 11-5) where Swainson's hawks are far more abundant than in the vicinity of the project site. For this reason, CDFW guidance includes reference to management standards for Swainson's hawk habitat as set forth in the 1994 Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks in the Central Valley of California has concluded that providing Swainson's hawk foraging habitat in perpetuity within 10 miles of the project site is adequate mitigation to compensate for the loss of on-site foraging habitat. (FEIR, p. 3-153.) Mitigation Measure 4.2-1(b) would mitigate the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by ensuring that land is preserved at a 1:1 ratio consistent with CDFW guidance.

#### **4.7 Public Services**

Since release of the Draft EIR the Sacramento City Unified School district has accepted the territory transfer of the project site into the SCUSD. Therefore, the discussion in the Draft EIR pertaining to the Twin Rivers Unified School district is removed. The revised student generation estimate is provided below in Table 4.7-4. As shown in the table, the number of students has declined slightly with the reduction in single-family units and the addition of 24 multifamily units.

**Student Generation Estimates**

Unit Type	SCUSD Generation Rates		Number of Units		Increase of Student Enrollment Generated by the Proposed Project
	Single-Family	Multi-Family	Single-Family	Multi-Family	
Elementary School (K-6)	.44	<u>.19</u>	<u>312</u>	<u>24</u>	144 <u>142</u>
Middle School (7-8)	.12	<u>.03</u>	<u>312</u>	<u>24</u>	<del>39</del> <u>38</u>
High School (9-12)	.23	<u>.04</u>	<u>312</u>	<u>24</u>	<del>75</del> <u>73</u>
Total	.79	<u>.26</u>	<u>312</u>	<u>24</u>	<del>258</del> <u>253</u>

Source: SCUSD 20124.

**4.8, Public Utilities**

The following corrections are made to Tables 4.8-8, 4.8-9, and 4.8-10 on pages 4.8-26 and 4.8-27.

Page 4.8-26, Tables 4.8-8 and 4.8-9:

**Table 4.8-8  
Proposed Project Water Demand**

Proposed Use	Demand Factor (AFY)	Acres/Units of Proposed Development	Total Demand (AFY)
Residential – SF	<del>3.05</del> <u>.448</u>	<del>30.1</del> <u>312</u>	<del>91.8</del> <u>139.75</u>
Residential – MF	<u>.252</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>6.05</u>
Parks and Recreation <u>and landscaped common areas</u>	3.89	<del>3.4</del> <u>6.2</u>	<del>13.2</del> <u>24.12</u>
Public streets	.09	<del>11.7</del> <u>12</u>	1.05 <u>8</u>
Total			<del>106.05</del> <u>171</u>

Source: City of Sacramento 200614.

**Table 4.8-9  
Proposed Project Wastewater Generation**

Proposed Use	Units	ESD Equivalent Factor (1 ESD = 400 gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Average Wastewater (gpd)	Peak Flow (gpd) (Peaking Factor = 3.3) <sup>1</sup>
Single-Family Residential	<del>328</del> <u>336</u>	1.0 ESD	<del>131,200</del> <u>134,400</u>	<del>432,960</del> <u>443,520</u>
Recreation Center	1.0 acre	6.0 ESD/acre	2,400	7,920
Total			<del>133,600</del> <u>136,800</u> gpd	<del>440,880</del> <u>451,440</u>

Source: <sup>1</sup>Gulseth, pers. comm. 2013.

Page 4.8-27, Table 4.8-10:

**Table 4.8-10**  
**Proposed Project Solid Waste Generation**

Proposed Use	Unit of Measurement	Generation Rate	Waste Generated (Approx.)	Waste Sent to Landfills (Approx.)
Single-Family Residential <sup>1</sup>	<del>328</del> <u>336</u> units	1.1 tons/unit/year	<del>361</del> <u>397</u> tons/yr	<del>137</del> <u>151</u> tons/yr
Recreation Center <sup>2</sup>	1 acre (43,560 sf)	3.12 lb/100 sf/day	225 tons/yr	85 tons/yr
Total			<del>586</del> <u>595</u> tons/yr	<del>222</del> <u>236</u> tons/yr

**Sources:**

<sup>1</sup>City of Sacramento 2009b.

<sup>2</sup>CalRecycle 2013.

**Notes:**

1.0 acre was assumed for the recreation center, which represents a conservative estimate.

lb = pound

sf = square feet

Page 4.8-28, 1st paragraph:

Table 4.8-9, the development of the proposed project would result in a total water demand of ~~406.05~~ 171 AFY (0.~~095~~15 mgd). The City of Sacramento is the water service provider in the project area. Water to serve the project site would be supplied through surface water from the Sacramento and American rivers. As discussed earlier in the Environmental Setting section, the City's water supply entitlements currently exceed demand during the multiple-dry years through 2035. Development within the City and the associated increase in water demand was previously assumed in the City's MEIR, which concluded that the City has sufficient water supplies to meet the demand associated with buildout of the 2030 General Plan. Development within the City was also included in the analysis of water supply and demand included in the City's 2010 UWMP. Thus, the water demand associated with the proposed project, ~~406.05~~ 171 AFY as shown in Table 4.8-8 is slightly less than ~~.03~~ .05 % of the City's current available water supply of 346,800 AFY.

Page 4.8-29, 2nd paragraph:

The proposed project's estimated water demand of ~~406.05~~ 171 AFY (0.~~095~~15 mgd) would require treatment prior to delivery to the project site. As discussed in the Environmental

Setting section, the SRWTP and the FWTP have a combined reliable capacity of 295 mgd.

## **Section 4.9, Transportation and Circulation**

Page 4.9-90, Mitigation Measure 4.9-6:

- (a) The project applicant shall contribute its fair share to the City of Sacramento Traffic Operations Center to monitor and re-time the H Street/Alhambra Boulevard, H Street/30th Street, and H Street 29th Street traffic signals to optimize flow through the corridor, and contribute its fair share to the City of Sacramento to implement the following improvements:
- (b) The project applicant shall contribute its fair share to the City of Sacramento Traffic Operations Center to monitor and re-time the E Street/Alhambra Boulevard traffic signal to optimize flow, and contribute its fair share to the City of Sacramento to implement the following improvements:

## **Chapter 5, Project Alternatives**

The following revisions to Tables 5-1, 5-3, 5-4, and 5-5 in Chapter 6 reflect the new unit count and demand factors.

Page 5-19, first paragraph:

This alternative would have 102 fewer residential units, and approximately 204 fewer residents (assuming 2.0 residents per unit), although the footprint of the project (site area) would be the same. As shown in Table 5-1, the number of average daily project vehicle trips would be reduced under this alternative from ~~3,507~~ 3,513 to 2,423.

Page 5-19, last paragraph:

Public services and utilities impacts would be similar to the proposed project, although slightly less, due to the reduced density. Water demand would be ~~404.94~~ 110.13 AFY compared to ~~406.05~~ 171 for the proposed project (see Table 5-4). Wastewater flow would be 92,800 gpd, compared to 133,600 for the proposed project (see Table 5-5). Solid waste generation would be lower than the proposed project, at 474 tons/year compared to 586 tons/year (see Table 5-6), with a diversion rate of 62% (to recycling and composting rather than landfills). Energy demands would be slightly reduced to the lower number of housing units. Overall, public utilities impacts would be less than significant.

Page 5-22, 4th paragraph:

As shown in Table 5-1, the number of average daily project vehicle trips would be increased under this alternative from ~~3,507~~ 3,513 to 6,366.

Page 5-25, 4th paragraph:

Public services and utilities impacts would be similar to the proposed project, although overall service demand would be higher due to the increased density. ~~Water demand~~

~~would be 112.65 AFY compared to 106.5 AFY for the proposed project (see Table 5-4).~~

Page 5-26, 4th paragraph. The following sentence is added:

Under Alternative 4, the increase in water demand would be 262.7 AFY compared to 171 AFY for the proposed project (see Table 5-4). This would result in an increased demand for water compared to the proposed project.

**Table 5-1**  
**Trip Generation Comparison – Project Alternatives**

Land Use	Description	Trips		
		Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Proposed Project	328 <del>336</del> Residential Units	<del>3,507</del> <u>3,513</u>	266	<del>341</del> <u>342</u>
Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative	Site remains undeveloped	-	-	-
Alternative 2: No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative	Train Maintenance Yard -280 employees <sup>2</sup>	857	146	139
Alternative 3: Lower Density Alternative	226 Residential Units (+26 granny flats)	2,423	186	239
Alternative 4: Higher Density/Mixed Use Alternative	550 Residential Units; 20,000 sf commercial (+70 granny flats)	6,366	453	606

**Source:** Fehr & Peers, 2013.

**Note:**

<sup>1</sup> Trips calculated using rates published in Trip Generation Manual 9<sup>th</sup> Edition (ITE, 2012).

<sup>2</sup> Trips include employees and service/delivery trips.

**Table 5-3**  
**Operational ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> Emission Comparison – Project Alternatives**

Emission Source	Proposed Project (pounds/day)		Alternative 2 (pounds/day)		Alternative 3 (pounds/day)		Alternative 4 (pounds/day)	
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>
Area (excluding Consumer products)	10.99	0.36	1.41	Negligible	8.14	0.24	15.53	0.69
Area – Consumer Products	<del>13.03</del> <u>13.30</u>	0	3.82	0	8.93	0	21.79	0
Energy	Unmitigated: <del>0.34</del> <u>0.32</u> Mitigated: <del>0.23</del> <u>0.20</u>	Unmitigated: 2.66 Mitigated: 1.96	0.20	1.78	Unmitigated: 0.21 Mitigated: 0.13	Unmitigated: 1.83 Mitigated: 1.12	Unmitigated: 0.53 Mitigated: 0.32	Unmitigated: 4.50 Mitigated: 2.75
Mobile	Unmitigated: <del>39.46</del> <u>38.2</u> Mitigated: <del>37.24</del> <u>35.53</u>	Unmitigated: 37.69 Mitigated: 35.62	12.49	11.96	Unmitigated: 26.71 Mitigated: 25.19	Unmitigated: 25.50 Mitigated: 24.10	Unmitigated: 71.47 Mitigated: 67.37	Unmitigated: 68.38 Mitigated: 64.61
<b>Total</b>	Unmitigated: <del>63.79</del> <u>64.43</u> Mitigated: <del>61.42</del> <u>62.02</u>	Unmitigated: 40.71 Mitigated: 37.61	17.92	13.74	Unmitigated: 43.99 Mitigated: 42.39	Unmitigated: 27.57 Mitigated: 25.46	Unmitigated: 109.32 Mitigated: 105.01	Unmitigated: 73.67 Mitigated: 68.05

**Note:** Values represent winter emissions only, as winter emissions are slightly higher than summer emissions.



**Table 5-4**  
**Water Demand Comparison – Project Alternatives**

Proposed Use	Demand Factor (AFY)	Acres/Units	Demand (AFY)	Acres/Units	Demand (AFY)	Acres/Units	Demand (AFY)	Acres/Units	Demand (AFY)
		<i>Proposed Project</i>		<i>Alternative 2</i>		<i>Alternative 3</i>		<i>Alternative 4</i>	
Residential - SF	<del>3.05</del> <u>.448</u>	<del>30.1</del> <u>312</u>	<del>91.8</del> <u>139.75</u>	0	0	<del>32.3</del> <u>226</u>	<del>98.5</del> <u>101.25</u>	<del>30.6</del> <u>550</u>	<del>93.3</del> <u>246.4</u>
Residential - MF	<u>.252</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>6.05</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Parks and Recreation	3.89	<del>3.4</del> <u>6.2</u>	<del>13.2</del> <u>24.12</u>	0	0	2	7.78	3.2	12.5
Commercial	2.78	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	2.78
Industrial	3.70	0	0	33.5	123.9	0	0	0	0
Public streets	.09	<del>11.7</del> <u>12</u>	<del>1.05</del> <u>8</u>	3.8	0.34	11.9	1.1	11.4	1.02
<b>Total</b>			<del>106.05</del> <u>171</u>		124		<del>107.4</del> <u>110.13</u>		<del>109.6</del> <u>262.7</u>

**Source:** City of Sacramento 2006; City of Sacramento 2010.

**Note:** Alternative 1, No Development, would not generate water demand

**Table 5-5**  
**Wastewater Generation – Project Alternatives**

Proposed Use	ESD Equivalent Factor (1 ESD = 400 gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Units	Average Waste-water (gpd)	Units	Average Waste-water (gpd)	Units	Average Waste-water (gpd)	Units	Average Waste-water (gpd)
		<i>Proposed Project</i>		<i>Alternative 2</i>		<i>Alternative 3</i>		<i>Alternative 4</i>	
Single-Family Res.	1.0 ESD	<del>328</del> <u>336</u>	<del>131,200</del> <u>134,400</u>	0	0	226	90,400	550	220,000
Rec. Center	6.0 ESD/acre	1.0 acre	2,400	0	0	1.0 acre	2,400	1.0 acre	2,400
Commercial and Industrial	0.2 ESD/1000 sf	0	0	153,500 sf building area <sup>2</sup>	12,280	0	0	20,000 sf	1,600
<b>Total</b>			<del>133,600</del> <u>136,800</u>		12,280		92,800		224,000

**Source:** <sup>1</sup>Gulseth, pers. comm. 2013; City of Sacramento 2010.

**Note:** <sup>2</sup> Process water, while not necessarily entering sanitary sewer, would require filtration before entering storm water system and/or recycled for on-site use.

1.0 acre was assumed for the recreation center which represents a conservative estimate.

Peak factor is 3.3 times average wastewater

Alternative 1, No Development, would not generate waste water flows.

**Table 5-6**  
**Solid Waste Generation – Project Alternatives**

Proposed Use	Generation Rate	Units	Waste (tons/year)	Units	Waste (tons/year)	Units	Waste (tons/year)	Units	Waste (tons/year)
		<i>Proposed Project</i>		<i>Alternative 2</i>		<i>Alternative 3</i>		<i>Alternative 4</i>	
Single-Family Residential	1.1 tons/unit/year	<del>328</del> <u>336</u>	<del>361</del> <u>397</u>	0	0	226	249	550	605
Recreation Center	3.12 lb/100 sf/day	1.0 acre	225	0	0	1.0 acre	225	1.0 acre	225
Commercial Industrial	10.8 lbs/Employee/day			280 emp.	393 <sup>1</sup>	0	0	30 emp.	59
<b>Total</b>			<del>586</del> <u>595</u>		<b>393</b>		<b>474</b>		<b>889</b>

**Source:** City of Sacramento 2009b; City of Sacramento 2010; CalRecycle 2013.

**Notes:** <sup>1</sup> Standard generation rate may underestimate waste generated from servicing of coaches

1.0 acre was assumed for the recreation center which represents a conservative estimate.

For the industrial uses, 260 working days per year are assumed, for retail uses, 365 days per year are assumed.

lb = pound, sf = square feet, 1 ton = 2000 lb

Alternative 1, No Development, would not generate solid waste.

**Response to Comment 31-151**

The project proposes a density of approximately 11.2 residential units per acre, which City staff finds to be an appropriate balance between the densities envisioned in the Blueprint for a Low-Density Mixed-Use Center or Corridor (~12.65 du/ac) and Single-Family Small Lot (~7.63 du/ac). The Lower Density Alternative proposes approximately 7.5 residential units per acre, which falls below the densities envisioned in the Blueprint for either the Low-Density Mixed-Use Center or Corridor or Single-Family Small Lot designations.

**Master Response 2**

Page 3-21, 3rd paragraph:

Since the publication of the Draft EIR, the number of housing units in the proposed project has been revised to 336; 312 single-family and 24 multifamily units. Using SCUSD student generation rates, this yields ~~265~~ 253 students. Of these, ~~448~~ 142 would be elementary school students, ~~40~~ 38 middle school students, and ~~77~~ 73 high school students. The slight ~~increase~~ decrease in projected students does not change the results of the analysis in the Draft EIR. As discussed below, the number of potential new students would not exceed the capacity of the affected schools.

Page 3-22, 3rd paragraph:

The actual enrollment effect to Theodore Judah is likely to be much less than the sudden introduction of ~~148~~142 students in addition to the current 581 students. Not all of the elementary school students living within the project area would be expected to attend Theodore Judah. As an “open enrollment” district, students have the option to attend schools other than the school in their attendance area, in addition to the choice of private schools. To illustrate the potential effect of open enrollment, 65.8% of the eligible students within the Theodore Judah attendance area attended the school in 2012/2013. In the 2013/2014 school year that percentage rose to 71% (385 out of 542 potential students). Applying the higher percentage to the revised student generation figures yields ~~405~~ 101 elementary school students (~~40~~ 6 more than the Draft EIR estimate).

### **Final EIR and Recirculation**

The changes made to the Draft EIR text, Master Response 2 and Responses to Comments 11-5, 11-6, 31-151 as set forth above do not constitute significant new information, but clarify and correct text that may be misleading to the reader. These changes do not show that a new significant effect would occur, or that an increase in severity of impact would occur. None of the conditions identified in CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 are present, and recirculation of the EIR is not required.