

# Final Program EIR for the Capital SouthEast Connector Project, Vol. 2

## Additional Changes and Errata to the PEIR

(August 12, 2011)

---

The JPA has made additional revisions since publication of the Final PEIR on July 19, 2011. These changes represent minor clarifications only and are shown in errata format below. The revisions have been made to the PEIR either as corrections or updates. Underlining indicates where additions were made to the original text. ~~Strikeout~~ indicates where the original text was deleted.

## Changes to Final PEIR

### Chapter 1, Introduction

**Page 1-1 of the Final PEIR, under *Proposed Action under Evaluation*.** Following last sentence, insert the following sentence:

“The Final EIR is a program EIR developed to assess the impacts of the project. The project being approved is the preferred general alignment and right-of-way preservation for the Connector route. This document will not provide environmental clearance for project design. Subsequent project-level analyses will be completed in the future, at which point the actual project design components will be developed and adopted. The ultimate project size and design components will be determined at the project level and will be subject to additional environmental review.”

### Chapter 2, Responses to Written and Oral Comments Received on the Draft PEIR—Local Organizations

**Page 2-96 of the Final PEIR, Response to Comment L04-1, second sentence has been corrected as follows:**

As shown in figure 5-1 of Chapter 5 of the Draft PEIR, “Biological Resources”, the proposed Connector Alignment at Kammerer Road would begin ~~on the~~ at Hood Franklin Road...”

### Chapter 3, Changes and Errata to the Draft PEIR

**Page 3-15 of the Final PEIR, Mitigation Measures POP-1 has been corrected as follows:**

#### **Mitigation Measure POP-1: Require Consistency with the JPA’s Planning Principles**

The JPA or local agency, in developing the final design of any component of the Connector Project, will ensure that such design is consistent with the planning principles set forth in the Joint Powers Agreement that established the JPA, including:

- a. Improve access to, and connections between, residential and employment areas within and outside of the Connector Project corridor;

- b. Acknowledge that the Connector Project is in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and further support the transportation and land use principles in the general plans of the local jurisdictions and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan;
  - c. Relieve demand on (i) local streets and roads, and (ii) regional freeway facilities (US-50, SR-99, and I-5);
  - d. Strategically apply access control and capacity characteristics to preserve and enhance regional functionality while discouraging growth in areas not designated for growth as determined by the local jurisdiction's general plan;
  - e. Enhance regional mobility and preserving the livability of communities;
  - f. Provide efficient and safe facilities for automobile, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian options for multi-modal travel;
  - g. Minimize direct and indirect physical impacts on the natural and built environments;
  - h. Preserve open space to reinforce and support approved land use plans; and
  - i. Permit phased implementation with respect to (i) funding, (ii) location, and (iii) design characteristics.
- **Capacity and Cross-Section:** The Connector roadway should be designed and constructed to serve the demand projected in the MTP and adopted local plans.
  - **Access Characteristics:** To maximize the efficiency of the roadway, access to the Connector should be allowed only at a limited number of access points; principally, existing primary facilities and new facilities included in the MTP. Access should be limited to the greatest extent possible to retain efficiency, reduce congestion, and enhance mobility. New access to the Connector from areas not designated for growth in the general plans, especially those in sensitive habitat, should not be permitted.
  - **Profile:** The Connector profile, where feasible, practicable, and consistent with acceptable design standards, should emulate the profiles of existing roadways to the greatest extent possible. The design of the Connector corridor should recognize impacts to sensitive habitats, including elevation adjustments to allow for passage of wildlife.
  - **Design Aesthetics, Materials, and Maintenance:** To minimize the impact on the livability of communities, the Connector should be designed with due consideration to aesthetics for users and adjacent property owners (residents, employers, and employees).
  - **Transit Services:** Transit service in the corridor (coverage and frequency) should be maximized to the extent feasible. The design of the Connector project should accommodate appropriate transit facilities.
  - **Non-Motorized Facilities:** The Connector should provide flexible and efficient modes of use, including automobile, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian.
  - **Open Space Preservation:** Concurrently with the environmental review and design process, the sponsors will develop an open space preservation plan, and associated phasing and funding plan for the corridor consistent with the Sacramento Transportation Authority Measure A expenditure plan.
  - **Other Facilities:** In order to meet the goals of the MTP and the Connector, complementary projects may be phased in over time as conditions necessitate.
  - **Phasing and Interim Use:** The Connector should be implemented in a phased manner. The design of temporary sections (if any), should provide for widening in accordance with the MTP and local adopted plans at minimal cost and impact.
  - **Funding Coordination:** Investments in the Connector should be coordinated and balanced with other transportation investments in a manner that maximizes benefits to the public while minimizing costs.

# Changes to Draft PEIR

## Summary

**Page S-3 of the Draft PEIR, Section S.5.1, fifth bullet.** Text has been revised as follows:

a four-lane thoroughfare segment on White Rock Road from the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line to Latrobe Road, and a six-lane thoroughfare segment from Latrobe Road to the US 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange; and

## Chapter 2, Project Description

**Page 2-9, Section 2.5.1 of the Draft PEIR, fifth bullet.** Text has been revised as follows:

a four-lane thoroughfare segment on White Rock Road from the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line to Latrobe Road, and a six-lane thoroughfare segment from Latrobe Road to the US 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange; and

## Chapter 5, Biological Resources

Page 5-3 Table 5-1 of the Draft PEIR has been revised as follows:

**Revised Table 5-1. Summary of Land Cover and Biological Communities in the 400-Foot Corridor (Areas of Potential Direct Impacts)**

Land Cover and Biological Communities	Project Corridor Resource Acreage	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path (50 feet wide)	Optional Project Component Resource Acreage				
			Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway Option 1	Deer Creek Causeway Option 2	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway
<b>Uplands</b>							
Annual grassland	<del>1,717.3</del> <u>833.1</u>	119.8	<del>95.4</del> <u>22.2</u>	<del>68.2</del> <u>28.4</u>	<del>75.1</del> <u>26.8</u>	<del>45.8</del> <u>1.0</u>	<del>39.5</del> <u>0.2</u>
Blue oak woodland	<del>1.4</del> <u>0</u>	15.8	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>3.3</del> <u>1.3</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>
Riparian woodland	<del>18.4</del> <u>7.7</u>	22.3	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>61.7</del> <u>28.0</u>	<del>32.5</del> <u>11.0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>
<b>Uplands Subtotal</b>	<b><del>1,737.1</del> <u>840.8</u></b>	<b>157.8</b>	<b><del>95.4</del> <u>22.2</u></b>	<b><del>133.1</del> <u>57.7</u></b>	<b><del>107.6</del> <u>37.8</u></b>	<b><del>45.8</del> <u>1.0</u></b>	<b><del>39.5</del> <u>0.2</u></b>
<b>Wetlands and Waters</b>							
Seasonal wetland	<del>0.6</del> <u>0.6</u>	0.2	<del>0</del> <u>0.8</u>	<del>1.1</del> <u>0.8</u>	<del>1.1</del> <u>0.8</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>
Swale	<del>12.4</del> <u>5.2</u>	0.3	<del>5</del> <u>0.1</u>	<del>0.4</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.4</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.2</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.2</del> <u>0</u>
Vernal pool	<del>26.8</del> <u>11.2</u>	0.3	<del>2</del> <u>0.1</u>	<del>0.8</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.8</del> <u>0</u>	<del>1.0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>1.0</del> <u>0</u>
Freshwater marsh	<del>10.2</del> <u>6.3</u>	1.4	<del>7.2</del> <u>0.7</u>	<del>1.1</del> <u>0.4</u>	<del>1.7</del> <u>0.5</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>
Stream	<del>9.4</del> <u>4.3</u>	5.2	<del>1.6</del> <u>0.1</u>	<del>2.8</del> <u>1.0</u>	<del>1.5</del> <u>0.5</u>	<del>0.3</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.3</del> <u>0</u>
Seasonal pond	<del>11.5</del> <u>6.0</u>	0.1	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.1</del> <u>0.1</u>	<del>0.2</del> <u>0.1</u>	<del>1.4</del> <u>0</u>	<del>1.5</del> <u>0</u>
Open water	<del>4.0</del> <u>1.5</u>	0.5	<del>0.03</del> <u>0</u>	<del>1.9</del> <u>0.4</u>	<del>1.9</del> <u>0.3</u>	<del>0.3</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.3</del> <u>0</u>
<b>Wetlands and Waters Subtotal</b>	<b><del>75.0</del> <u>35.1</u></b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b><del>10.4</del> <u>1</u></b>	<b><del>8.2</del> <u>2.5</u></b>	<b><del>7.6</del> <u>2.2</u></b>	<b><del>3.1</del> <u>0</u></b>	<b><del>3.2</del> <u>0</u></b>
<b>Agricultural</b>							
Irrigated pasture	<del>186.0</del> <u>92.50</u>	0	<del>140.6</del> <u>26.1</u>	<del>101.8</del> <u>51.3</u>	<del>9.4</del> <u>4.0</u>	<del>2.8</del> <u>0</u>	<del>3.2</del> <u>0</u>
Cropland	<del>389.9</del> <u>183.7</u>	6.2	<del>164.5</del> <u>54.0</u>	<del>250.2</del> <u>120.3</u>	<del>321.8</del> <u>161.2</u>	<del>10.8</del> <u>0.5</u>	<del>10.4</del> <u>0.5</u>
Vineyard	<del>74.0</del> <u>35.1</u>	0	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>337.3</del> <u>167.3</u>	<del>298.2</del> <u>146.8</u>	<del>32.6</del> <u>2.2</u>	<del>29.7</del> <u>2.2</u>
Orchard	<del>22.7</del> <u>10.6</u>	0	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>0</u>
<b>Agricultural Subtotal</b>	<b><del>672.6</del> <u>321.9</u></b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b><del>305.2</del> <u>80.1</u></b>	<b><del>689.3</del> <u>338.9</u></b>	<b><del>629.4</del> <u>312</u></b>	<b><del>46.2</del> <u>2.7</u></b>	<b><del>43.3</del> <u>2.7</u></b>
<b>Developed</b>							

Land Cover and Biological Communities	Project Corridor Resource Acreage	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path (50 feet wide)	Optional Project Component Resource Acreage				Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway
			Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway Option 1	Deer Creek Causeway Option 2			
Major roads	<del>149.8</del> <u>137.7</u>	8.3	<del>6.0</del> <u>0.3</u>	<del>4.1</del> <u>0</u>	<del>5.3</del> <u>0.6</u>	<del>14.1</del> <u>0</u>	<del>14.3</del> <u>0</u>	
Landscaped	0	5.6	0	0	0	0	0	
Low-density development	<del>412.1</del> <u>201.8</u>	1.3	<del>36.6</del> <u>5.3</u>	<del>37.4</del> <u>6.4</u>	<del>29.3</del> <u>12.0</u>	<del>204.5</del> <u>4.8</u>	<del>211.6</del> <u>4.9</u>	
High-density development	<del>162.6</del> <u>70.4</u>	17.4	0	<del>1.4</del> <u>0</u>	<del>1.7</del> <u>0</u>	0	0	
Dredge tailings	<del>2.8</del> <u>0.3</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Disturbed	<del>22.6</del> <u>5.9</u>	6.0	0	0	0	0	0	
Aqueduct	<del>1.8</del> <u>0.7</u>	34.2	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Developed Subtotal</b>	<del>751.7</del> <u>416.8</u>	<del>72.7</del>	<del>42.6</del> <u>5.6</u>	<del>42.9</del> <u>6.4</u>	<del>36.3</del> <u>12.6</u>	<del>218.7</del> <u>4.8</u>	<del>226.0</del> <u>4.9</u>	
<b>Total Acreage</b>	<del>3,236.3</del> <u>1614.6</u>	<del>244.7</del>	<del>453.5</del> <u>131.1</u>	<del>873.4</del> <u>405.5</u>	<del>780.8</del> <u>364.6</u>	<del>313.8</del> <u>8.5</u>	<del>312.0</del> <u>7.8</u>	

**Page 5-23 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-3, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text revised as follows:

There are ~~18.4~~ 7.7 acres of riparian woodlands within the area of potential direct effects.

**Page 5-24 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-4, first paragraph, second and third sentences** revised as follows:

Specific wetland delineations and mapping of waters the state have not yet been conducted for the project because it has not been designed in sufficient detail to identify a specific footprint. In general, typical habitats that would be considered under the jurisdiction of the USACE or the RWQCB would include up to 75 35 acres of streams, swales, seasonal wetlands, vernal pools, freshwater marshes, seasonal ponds, open waters, irrigated pastures (186 92.5 acres) and aqueducts (1.8 0.7 acre).

**Page 5-26 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-5, first paragraph, fourth bullet.** Text revised as follows:

- loss of breeding and foraging habitat resulting from the filling of up to ~~75~~ 35 acres of seasonal or perennial wetlands;

**Page 5-33 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-5, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text revised as follows:

This option would introduce a potential for direct impacts to ~~0.2~~ 0.1 acre of vernal pools.

**Page 5-33 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-1, first paragraph, first sentence.** Text revised as follows:

Construction of this option would not reduce or avoid impacts of the proposed project on special-status plants and would likely introduce new impacts because, as shown in Table 5-1, this option would result in the direct conversion of an additional ~~133.1~~ 57.7 acres of uplands habitat, ~~8.2~~ 2.5 acres of wetland and other waters habitat, and ~~689.3~~ 338.9 acres of agricultural habitat, all of which have the potential to support special-status plants.

**Page 5-34 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-3, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text revised as follows:

There are ~~61.7~~ 28.0 acres of riparian woodland within the area of potential direct effects.

**Page 5-34 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-4, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text revised as follows:

There are ~~8.2~~ 2.5 acres of wetlands and waters within the area of potential direct effects that could be under the jurisdiction of the USACE or RWQCB.

**Page 5-35 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-1, first paragraph, first sentence.** Text revised as follows:

Construction of this option would not reduce or avoid impacts of the proposed project on special-status plants and would likely introduce new impacts because, as shown in Table 5-1, this option would result in the direct conversion of additional ~~107.6~~ 37.8 acres of uplands habitat, ~~7.6~~ 2.2 acres of wetland and other waters habitat, and ~~629.4~~ 312 acres of agricultural habitat, all of which have the potential to support special-status plants.

**Page 5-35 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-3, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text revised as follows:

There are ~~32.5~~ 11.0 acres of riparian woodland within the area of potential direct effects.

**Page 5-35 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-4, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text revised as follows:

There are ~~7.6~~ 2.2 acres of wetlands and waters within the area of potential direct effects that could be under the jurisdiction of the USACE or RWQCB.

**Page 5-37 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-4, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text added as follows:

There are ~~3.1~~ 0 acre wetlands and open waters within the area of potential direct effects that could be under the jurisdiction of the USACE or RWQCB; however, depending on the ultimate option selected, the alignment could result in indirect disturbance of up to 4.3 acres of wetlands and open waters.

**Page 5-38 of the Draft PEIR, Impact BIO-4, first paragraph, second sentence.** Text added as follows:

There are ~~3.2~~ 0 acre of wetlands and open waters within the area of potential direct effects that could be under the jurisdiction of the USACE or RWQCB; however, depending on the ultimate option selected, the alignment could result in indirect disturbance of up to 5.0 acres of wetlands and open waters.

## Chapter 16, Traffic and Transportation

**Table 16-13 of the Draft PEIR, Page 2 of 4, “Assumed Travel Lanes and Access to Connector for Proposed Project” following page 16-34.** Change the text in “Comments on Assumed Access for 2035 Proposed Project” column for Glory Lane and Cordova Hills to state:

~~No connections (ff~~rontage road to Douglas Road, or other potential design option that would ensure an acceptable LOS and meet performance standards for the Connector, as determined by the JPA).

**Table 16-13 of the Draft PEIR, “Assumed Travel Lanes and Access to Connector for Proposed Project” following page 16-34.** This heading is footnoted to reflect that:

“Other connections may be allowed along the Proposed Project so long as the design would ensure an acceptable LOS and meet performance standards for the Connector, as determined by the JPA.”