

Memorandum

June 15, 2006

TO: City Council

FROM: Michael Webb, Economic Development Coordinator *MAW*

SUBJECT: EIR Comments

At the June 13th hearing the City Council several comments were voiced during public comment regarding the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Report. Staff has compiled responses to add to the record.

Comment 1: The EIR is grossly inadequate. *No specific comment was provided.*

Response 1: No specific comment was provided. The EIR meets the standards of CEQA.

Comment 2: Why is there a significant air quality impact?

Response 2: Cumulative air quality impacts are identified in the EIR as significant and, with the adoption of mitigation measures, the impact remains significant and unavoidable. Page 4.4-9 of the Draft EIR provides the following criteria:

“Development projects are considered cumulatively significant under YSAQMD significance criteria if the following occur:

- The project requires a change in the existing land use designation (i.e., General Plan Amendment); and
- Projected emissions (ROG, NO_x or PM₁₀) of the Proposed Project are greater than the emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation.”

The EIR identifies that both of these significance criteria are met and so must conclude that there is a significant impact.

Comment 3: The EIR inadequately addresses noise impacts. Specifically, generators from Target delivery trucks were not analyzed.

- Response 3: Chapter 4.5 of the Draft EIR addresses noise impacts. Response to comment 10-107 in the Final EIR notes that the Target delivery trucks do not carry perishable goods; therefore they do not have refrigeration generators.
- Comment 4: EIR mitigations for biological are inadequate. *No specific comments were provided.*
- Response 4: Chapter 4.7 of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR address biological impacts and mitigation measures.
- Comment 5: The EIR does not adequately address impacts on existing businesses. *No specific comments were provided.*
- Response 5: Chapter 4.8 of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR address socio-economic impacts.
- Comment 6: The EIR states that the project will not impact the Downtown or local businesses.
- Response 6: Chapter 4.8 of the Draft EIR provides socio-economic analysis and discussion of potential impacts. Please also refer to response to comment 1-1 on page 4-4 of the Final EIR. Page 2-44 of the Final EIR states:
- “In the cumulative scenario, the development of Second Street Crossing combined with the other three proposed projects could result in diverted sales from existing primary market area retailers totaling \$10.8 million and it could take up to five years to mitigate this impact through population growth. The categories impacted include apparel, food stores, and “eating and drinking places.” Given the overall strength of the Davis retail market area, the market area’s low vacancy, strong retailer interest in locating in Davis, and good re-tenanting potential, proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to retailers because the new sales generated by the proposed project would still be capturing projected future sales tax leakage. As a result, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact to the primary and secondary market areas.”
- Comment 7: The economic study is irrational and nobody west of Highway 113 will shop at Target in Davis.
- Response 7: Chapter 4.8 of the Draft EIR addresses socio-economic impacts and includes definitions of market areas used in the analysis. That area of Davis west of Highway 113 and within City limits is included in the primary Market Area for the Second Street Crossing project; Yolo county as the secondary market. In defining the primary market, the

study did not include areas immediately adjacent to the City but in the unincorporated area, such as El Marcero, Willowbank and UC Davis (which were included in the secondary market). The study further assumed that residents in area south and west of the primary market area would be attracted to retailers in Dixon and Vacaville and residents to the north of the primary market area will be attracted to retailers in Woodland. Taken all together, the study used a conservative definition of primary market and accounts for some shoppers within the primary market shopping in Woodland and other areas outside of the City. No specific comment was made as to why the definitions used in the Study were improper or did not result in conservative and reasonable estimates.

Comment 8: Impacts on Longs and Rite Aid stores in Davis have not been evaluated.

Response 8: Chapter 4.8 of the Draft EIR provides socio-economic analysis. The socio-economic analysis incorporates specific references to both Longs and both Rite Aid stores in Davis as competing general merchandise retailers (see pages 4.8-2 and 4.8-21 of the Draft EIR).

Comment 9: Relocation of the EPA wells has not been adequately analyzed in the EIR. *No specific comment was provided.*

Response 9: Chapter 4.9 of the Draft EIR addresses hazards impacts and mitigation measures associated with the EPA wells. The Final EIR, on pages 2-1 and 2-44, 45, and 46 addresses revisions to the EIR in response to comments by the public and the EPA. Please also refer to page 4-186 of the Final EIR and response to comment 18-1 through 18-4 in the Final EIR. It is determined that a less-than-significant impact would result with mitigation measures.

Comment 10: Does the EIR allow for the possibility of the Target building being shifted further to the south?

Response 10: The EIR does provide adequate analysis for such a change, provided that all mitigation measures can be accommodated (i.e. adequate vehicular circulation).