

# FINAL EIR ERRATA

---

This chapter includes the revisions to the Final EIR. These revisions are corrections identified by staff, including grammatical corrections and clarifications. None of the revisions have an impact on the analysis included in the EIR. The revisions appear in the order they appear in the Draft EIR. Text additions are noted in underline and text deletions appear in ~~strikeout~~.

## CHAPTER 5 - AIR QUALITY

**Page 5-63, the second paragraph of Mitigation Measure AIR-2 is revised as follows:**

**Mitigation Measure AIR-2:** Implementing agencies shall require assessment of new and existing odor sources for individual land use projects to determine whether sensitive receptors would be exposed to objectionable odors and apply recommended applicable mitigation measures as defined by the applicable local air district and best practices.

~~Implementing agencies shall require assessment of new and existing odor sources for individual land use projects to determine whether sensitive receptors would be exposed to objectionable odors and apply recommended applicable mitigation measures as defined by the applicable local air district and best practices.~~

## CHAPTER 6 – BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**Page 6-69, Table 6.12 is revised as follows:**

**Table 6.12**  
**Examples of Minimum Replacement Ratios and Typical Mitigation for Wildlife Habitat**

Species	Creation/Restoration Mitigation Component
Vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole (would mitigate for other vernal pool species) <sup>1</sup>	Preservation: 2:1 (for direct or indirect impacts) in approved banks, 3:1 in non-bank.* Creation/ Restoration: 1:1 (2:1 if based on Service evaluation of site-specific conservation values) in approved banks, 2:1 in non-bank.* <i>*Mitigation ratios for non-bank mitigation may be adjusted to approach those for banks based on Service evaluation.</i>
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle <sup>2</sup>	Transplant directly affected shrubs to a USFWS approved conservation bank and purchase conservation credits depending on stem size and shrub location Plant seedlings and associated riparian at stem placement ratios from 1:1 to 8:1, depending on stem size and shrub location.
California tiger salamander	No net loss of habitat through restoration, preservation, or compensation.
California red-legged frog	No net loss of habitat through restoration, preservation, or compensation.
Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	No net loss of habitat through restoration, preservation, or compensation.
Giant garter snake <sup>3</sup>	Preservation: All replacement habitat must include both upland and aquatic habitat at a ratio of 2:1 upland acres to aquatic acres Creation/Restoration: From 1:1 to 3:1 depending on nature of impact.
Burrowing owl <sup>4</sup>	<del>6.5 acres of foraging habitat for each pair relocated on site; 9.75 to 19.5</del> Varies depending on site conditions, consultation with CDFW is required. Create artificial burrows if necessary. Prepare a mitigation management plan and vegetation management goals in consultation with CDFW.
Swainson’s hawk <sup>5</sup>	Depending on nest location with respect to project (typically 0.5:1 to 1.5:1), or participate in County sponsored Swainson’s Hawk Mitigation Program if developed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mitigation ratios are based on the Programmatic Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on Issuance of 404 Permits for Projects with Relatively Small Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans Within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office, California (Service file number 1-1-96-F-1) (USFWS, 1996).

<sup>2</sup> Conservation Guidelines for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (USFWS, 1999).

<sup>3</sup> Programmatic Consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 Permitted Projects with Relatively Small Effects on the Giant Garter Snake within Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Fresno, Merced, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter and Yolo Counties, California (Service file number 1-1-F-97-149) (USFWS, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG, 2012).

<sup>5</sup> Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (*Buteo swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California (CDFG, 1994).

Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2015.

## **CHAPTER 9 – GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY**

**Page 9-35, the first sentence of the second paragraph of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is revised as follows:**

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** Reduce soil erosion and loss of topsoil through erosion control mitigation and SWPPP.

The implementing agency ~~should~~shall require the development and implementation of detailed erosion control measures, consistent with the CBC and UBC regulations and guidelines and/or local NPDES, to address erosion control specific to the project site; revegetate sites to minimize soil loss and prevent significant soil erosion; avoid construction on unstable slopes and other areas subject to soil erosion where possible; require management techniques that minimize soil loss and erosion; manage grading to maximize the capture and retention of water runoff through ditches, trenches, siltation ponds, or similar measures; and minimize erosion through adopted protocols and standards in the industry. The implementing agency should also require land use and transportation projects to comply with locally adopted grading, erosion, and/or sediment control ordinances beginning when any preconstruction or construction-related grading or soil storage first occurs, until all final improvements are completed.