

6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an environmental impact report shall describe and analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to a project. These alternatives should feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor is it required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The discussion of alternatives shall focus on those which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if they impede the attainment of the project objectives to some degree or would be more costly [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)].

In accordance with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the following alternatives are evaluated at a qualitative level of detail:

- Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2 - Modification of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map Alternative
- Alternative 3 - Farmland Preservation Alternative
- Alternative 4 - Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative
- Alternative 5 - Increased Density of Development Alternative

6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

OFF-SITE ALTERNATIVE

Given the nature of the project (adoption of the first City of Elk Grove General Plan) and the fact that this alternative would not meet the basic project objectives, an off-site alternative is considered infeasible pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(c).

6.3 ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Under this alternative, the proposed Elk Grove General Plan and its associated Land Use Policy Map would not be adopted and the existing City of Elk Grove General Plan (1993 Sacramento County General Plan) policy document would remain in effect. This would include General Plan amendments that have been approved by the City since incorporation. Buildout under the existing General Plan Land Use Map could result in approximately 70,047 residential dwelling units and an associated population of 215,046, as well as commercial, industrial, open space and recreation uses as shown in **Figure 6.0-1**. Given that the General Plan's intent is to look at land use conditions and patterns to the year 2025, similar land uses identified in the proposed General Plan for the Agriculture-Urban Reserve area designated under the 2000 City of Elk Grove General Plan in the southern portion of the City (Southeast and a portion of the Laguna Ridge Policy Areas) were assumed for the No Project Alternative. This analysis of the No Project Alternative is consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(e)(3)(A), which specifically identify that when the project under evaluation is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, that the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Agriculture

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant agriculture impact identified in Section 4.1 (Agriculture).

Project and Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Land (Impact 4.1.1 and 4.1.3)

As described under Impacts 4.1.1 and 4.1.3, the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the loss of agricultural lands under project and cumulative conditions. While policies under the 2000 City of Elk Grove General Plan would require mitigation of important farmlands (Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance) over 50 acres, the No Project Alternative would result in the same project impacts associated with agricultural land loss. However, the No Project Alternative would have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Project and Cumulative Land Use Conflicts with Agricultural Uses (Impact 4.1.2 and 4.1.3)

Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 identify that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable land use conflicts with agricultural uses. While policies and implementation measures under the 2000 City of Elk Grove General Plan would require mitigation for land use conflicts, the No Project Alternative would result in the same project impacts associated with agricultural land use conflicts. However, the No Project Alternative would have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Land Use

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant land use impact identified in Section 4.2 (Land Use).

Consistency with the Sacramento County General Plan Regarding the Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 identifies that under cumulative conditions the potential development of the Urban Study Area west of SR 99 would conflict with Sacramento County General Plan policies associated with restricting urban development outside of the Urban Services Boundary. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would avoid this cumulative impact.

Population/Housing/Employment

As noted in Section 4.3 (Population/Housing/Employment), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with population, housing and employment. The No Project Alternative would result in worse job/housing ratio than the proposed General Plan.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant hazard impact identified in Section 4.4 (Human Health/Risk of Upset).

Insert figure 6.0-1

Potential Hazard Exposure (Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5)

Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5 identifies that the proposed General Plan could expose people to known and unknown hazardous materials in the Planning Area as well as airport safety hazards associated with the eastern Urban Study Area and the Sunset Sky Ranch Airport. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan. However, this alternative would avoid potential airport safety conflicts.

Hazards Associated with At-Grade Railroad Crossings (Impact 4.4.4)

As described in Impact 4.4.4, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would expose residents to hazards associated with at-grade roadway crossings of railroad lines at Calvine Road, Sheldon Road, Elk-Grove Florin Road, Bond Road, Elk Grove Boulevard, and Grant Line Road. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Transportation and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant traffic impact identified in Section 4.5 (Transportation and Circulation).

Project Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.1 and 4.5.2)

Impacts 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 identify significant and unavoidable impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan. **Table 6.0-1** and **6.0-2** identify traffic impacts associated with No Project Alternative. As shown in these tables, the No Project Alternative would result in greater traffic impacts during the A.M. peak hour and reduced traffic impacts during the P.M. peak hour as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.6)

Impact 4.5.6 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative traffic impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.6 (Noise).

Construction Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

As described in Impact 4.6.1, the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts associated with development under the proposed General Plan. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

**TABLE 6.0-1
NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE A.M. PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE**

	Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
1e	Big Horn Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	338	712	-200	512	774	574	0.29	A
2w	Big Horn Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	317	634	-250	384	735	485	0.25	A
3n	Big Horn Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	395	1,094	-500	594	1,601	1,101	0.56	A
4s	Big Horn Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	370	1,134	-500	634	1,389	889	0.45	A
5n	Big Horn Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			845		0.43	A
6s	Big Horn Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,141		0.58	A
7e	Bilby Rd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	2	18,000	990	143 /27	75			575		0.58	A
8w	Bilby Rd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	2	18,000	990	110 /39	26			540		0.55	A
9e	Bond Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	892/ 894	1,758	-500	1,258	2,061	1,561	0.79	C
10w	Bond Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	1231 / 1061	1,797	-400	1,397	2,386	1,986	1.00	F
11e	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	442/479/538	508			1,204		0.61	B
12w	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	321/616/652	572			1,399		0.71	C
13e	Bond Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	287	315			558		0.28	A
14w	Bond Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	279	265			462		0.23	A
15n	Bradshaw Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	509	636			1,803		0.61	B
16s	Bradshaw Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	374	473			1,836		0.62	B
17n	Bradshaw Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	312 /448	394			1,233		0.62	B
18s	Bradshaw Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	212 /305	372			1,788		0.90	E
19n	Bradshaw Rd.	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	124 /215	239			861		0.43	A
20s	Bradshaw Rd.	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	105 /194	232			1,638		0.83	D

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
21	n	Bruceville Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		366			1,058		0.36	A
22	s	Bruceville Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		360			647		0.22	A
23	n	Bruceville Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1,044	552	400	952	1,189	1,589	0.54	A
24	s	Bruceville Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	745	418	300	718	813	1,113	0.37	A
25	n	Bruceville Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	348 / 578	357			2,164		0.73	C
26	s	Bruceville Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	317 / 465	331			1,404		0.47	A
27	n	Bruceville Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bilby Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	68 / 164	126			596		0.20	A
28	s	Bruceville Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bilby Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	60 / 191	212			594		0.20	A
29	n	Bruceville Rd.	Bilby Rd.	Eschinger Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	60	74			1		0.00	A
30	s	Bruceville Rd.	Bilby Rd.	Eschinger Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	60	79			1		0.00	A
31	e	Calvine Rd.	Power Inn Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	974	1,051			1,451		0.49	A
32	w	Calvine Rd.	Power Inn Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1,667	1,672			2,500		0.84	D
33	e	Calvine Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	523 / 998	728			1,334		0.45	A
34	w	Calvine Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	558 / 953	598			2,073		0.70	B
35	e	Calvine Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	386	467			518		0.17	A
36	w	Calvine Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	435	212			373		0.13	A
37	n	Center Pkwy.	Sheldon Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		506			1,130		0.38	A
38	s	Center Pkwy.	Sheldon Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		632			1,112		0.37	A
39	e	Elk-Grove Blvd.	I-5	Franklin	6	54,000	2,970	371 / 433	428			739		0.25	A
40	w	Elk-Grove Blvd.	I-5	Franklin	6	54,000	2,970	948 / 1195	476	400	876	1,397	1,797	0.60	B
41	e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	692	709			1,391		0.47	A
42	w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	979	406	400	806	1,204	1,604	0.54	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

	Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
43e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1035 /922	915			1,628		0.55	A
44w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	978 / 835	608	300	908	1,273	1,573	0.53	A
45e	Elk Grove Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1010/ 1172				3,136		1.06	F
46w	Elk Grove Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1360 /1498				2,984		1.00	F
47e	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	960 /1194	1,666	-400	1,266	2,044	1,644	0.83	D
48w	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	1063 / 1228	1,357			2,092		1.06	F
49e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Waterman Rd.	2	15,000	825	495	523			635		0.77	C
50w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Waterman Rd.	2	15,000	825	660	510			866		1.05	F
51e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Waterman Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	237	250			477		0.24	A
52w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Waterman Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	248	308			797		0.40	A
53n	Elk-Grove Florin Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		1,332			2,345		0.79	C
54s	Elk-Grove Florin Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		1,384			2,354		0.79	C
55n	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	979 /1092	1,168			1,678		0.56	A
56s	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1058/ 1043	1,454	-400	1,054	2,382	1,982	0.67	B
57n	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	774 /772	1,004	-300	704	1,251	951	0.48	A
58s	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	780/ 791	1,246	-400	846	1,879	1,479	0.75	C
59n	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	860	244	600	844	472	1,072	0.54	A
60s	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	736	463	300	763	675	975	0.49	A
61e	Eschinger Rd.	SR99	Carroll Rd.	2	18,000	990					0		0.00	A
62w	Eschinger Rd.	SR99	Carroll Rd.	2	18,000	990					42		0.04	A
63n	Excelsior Road	Gerber Rd.	Calvine Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		447			880		0.44	A
64s	Excelsior Road	Gerber Rd.	Calvine Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		80			452		0.23	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
65	n	Excelsior Road	Calvine Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	421	296			902		0.46	A
66	s	Excelsior Road	Calvine Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	106	75			668		0.34	A
67	n	Franklin Blvd.	Calvine Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970		1,015			2,036		0.69	B
68	s	Franklin Blvd.	Calvine Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970		672			1,590		0.54	A
69	n	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	156 / 477	472			2,108		0.71	C
70	s	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	194 / 333	306			1,686		0.57	A
71	n	Franklin Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	158/ 196	75			1,144		0.39	A
72	s	Franklin Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	201/ 76	53			1,351		0.45	A
73	n	Franklin Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	South of Hood Franklin	4	36,000	1,980	73				776		0.39	A
74	s	Franklin Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	South of Hood Franklin	4	36,000	1,980	49				712		0.36	A
75	e	Grant Line Rd.	SR99	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	303/ 270				3,265		1.10	F
76	w	Grant Line Rd.	SR99	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	472 /366				3,205		1.08	F
77	n	Grant Line Rd.	East Stockton Blvd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	269 /550	587			2,143		0.72	C
78	s	Grant Line Rd.	East Stockton Blvd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	329 /597	410			2,759		0.93	E
79	n	Grant Line Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	342 /536	535			1,325		0.45	A
80	s	Grant Line Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	341 /565	356			1,734		0.58	A
81	n	Grant Line Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		697			1,599		0.54	A
82	s	Grant Line Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		419			1,490		0.50	A
83	n	Grant Line Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Sloughhouse Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		991			1,966		0.66	B
84	s	Grant Line Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Sloughhouse Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		464			1,558		0.52	A
85	n	Harbor Point Dr.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	122 /631	294			653		0.33	A
86	s	Harbor Point Dr.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	250/ 246	152			513		0.26	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
87	n	I-5	-	South of Hood Franklin	4	80,000	4,400					3,018		0.69	B
88	s	I-5	-	South of Hood Franklin	4	80,000	4,400					2,016		0.46	A
89	n	I-5	Hood Franklin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					3,018		0.69	B
90	s	I-5	Hood Franklin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					2,016		0.46	A
91	n	I-5	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					3,492		0.53	A
92	s	I-5	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					2,098		0.32	A
93	n	I-5	Laguna Blvd.	Meadow View/Pocket Road	8	160,000	8,800					5,552		0.63	B
94	s	I-5	Laguna Blvd.	Meadow View/Pocket Road	8	160,000	8,800					3,576		0.41	A
95	e	Kammerer (Hood Fr)	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	67	96			648		0.22	A
96	w	Kammerer (Hood Fr)	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	97	62			1,198		0.40	A
97	e	Kammerer Rd.	Franklin Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970					894		0.30	A
98	w	Kammerer Rd.	Franklin Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970					509		0.17	A
99	e	Kammerer Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	43	93			1,788		0.60	B
100	w	Kammerer Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	48	104			1,436		0.48	A
101	e	Laguna Blvd.	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	586	1,210	-600	610	1,487	887	0.30	A
102	w	Laguna Blvd.	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1,696	1,874			2,044		0.69	B
103	e	Laguna Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	773/954/702	1,675	-500	1,175	1,792	1,292	0.43	A
104	w	Laguna Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1056/1030/1201	1,307			1,880		0.63	B
105	e	Laguna Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1467 / 1286 /1037/ 1689	2,327	-500	1,827	2,464	1,964	0.66	B
106	w	Laguna Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1511/ 1383 /1124 / 2074	1,594			2,135		0.72	C
107	e	Laguna Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	7	63,000	3,465	1,086				2,879		0.83	D
108	w	Laguna Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	7	63,000	3,465	1,147				2,686		0.78	C

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
109	n	Laguna Springs Dr.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Ridge Drive	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			665		0.34	A
110	s	Laguna Springs Dr.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Ridge Drive	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			872		0.44	A
111	n	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Big Horn Blvd.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			391		0.20	A
112	s	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Big Horn Blvd.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			515		0.26	A
113	n	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			367		0.19	A
114	s	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			783		0.40	A
115	n	Power Inn Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Elsie Ave.	6	54,000	2,970		1,404			2,040		0.69	B
116	s	Power Inn Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Elsie Ave.	6	54,000	2,970		1,284			1,448		0.49	A
117	e	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Franklin Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,224		0.62	B
118	w	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Franklin Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,016		0.51	A
119	e	Sheldon Rd.	Center Parkway	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	496	708			1,228		0.41	A
120	w	Sheldon Rd.	Center Parkway	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	359	794	-300	494	1,422	1,122	0.38	A
121	e	Sheldon Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	6	54,000	2,970	585		-300	-300	1,321	1,021	0.34	A
122	w	Sheldon Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	6	54,000	2,970	289				1,971		0.66	B
123	e	Sheldon Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		730			1,450		0.73	C
124	w	Sheldon Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		714			2,039		1.03	F
125	e	Sheldon Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	349	628	-300	328	1,201	901	0.45	A
126	w	Sheldon Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	363	596			1,611		0.81	D
127	e	Sheldon Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	390	282			1,439		0.73	C
128	w	Sheldon Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	348	288			938		0.47	A
129	n	State Route 99	Eschinger Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	80,000	4,400					4,337		0.99	E
130	s	State Route 99	Eschinger Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	80,000	4,400					3,341		0.76	C

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
131	n	State Route 99	Grant Line Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					2,528		0.57	A
132	s	State Route 99	Grant Line Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					2,910		0.66	B
133	n	State Route 99	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					3,866		0.59	A
134	s	State Route 99	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					3,719		0.56	A
135	n	State Route 99	Laguna Blvd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,595		0.70	B
136	s	State Route 99	Laguna Blvd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,392		0.67	B
137	n	State Route 99	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,577		0.69	B
138	s	State Route 99	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,428		0.67	B
139	n	State Route 99	Calvine Rd.	Stockton Blvd.	8	160,000	8,800					4,673		0.53	A
140	s	State Route 99	Calvine Rd.	Stockton Blvd.	8	160,000	8,800					4,054		0.46	A
141	n	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		10			197		0.10	A
142	s	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		36			553		0.28	A
143	n	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		222			766		0.39	A
144	s	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		340			1,254		0.63	B
145	n	Waterman	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	201/ 215	263			683		0.35	A
146	s	Waterman	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	275 /265	390			1,255		0.63	B
147	n	Wilton Rd.	Grant Line Road	Dillard Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		453			684		0.35	A
148	s	Wilton Rd.	Grant Line Road	Dillard Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		166			250		0.13	A

**TABLE 6.0-2
NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE P.M. PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE**

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
1	e	Big Horn Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	461	888	-200	688	935	735	0.37	A
2	w	Big Horn Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	432	977	-250	727	979	729	0.37	A
3	n	Big Horn Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	491	1,381	-500	881	1,686	1,186	0.60	A
4	s	Big Horn Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	574	1,339	-500	839	1,696	1,196	0.60	B
5	n	Big Horn Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,267		0.64	B
6	s	Big Horn Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,027		0.52	A
7	e	Bilby Rd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	2	18,000	990	76 /37	71			476		0.48	A
8	w	Bilby Rd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	2	18,000	990	100 /31	150			508		0.51	A
9	e	Bond Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	1605 /1534	2,129	-500	1,629	2,585	2,085	1.05	F
10	w	Bond Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	1688 /1288	2,020	-400	1,620	2,382	1,982	1.00	F
11	e	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	351/532/635	632			1,559		0.79	C
12	w	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	377/486/613	628			1,474		0.74	C
13	e	Bond Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	277	334			543		0.27	A
14	w	Bond Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	288	332			631		0.32	A
15	n	Bradshaw Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	386	563			1,963		0.66	B
16	s	Bradshaw Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	503	714			1,914		0.64	B
17	n	Bradshaw Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	209 / 285	451			1,848		0.93	E
18	s	Bradshaw Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	336/ 561	478			1,582		0.80	C
19	n	Bradshaw Rd.	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	198/ 97	285			1,649		0.83	D
20	s	Bradshaw Rd.	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	254 / 142	254			1,080		0.55	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
21	n	Bruceville Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		916			453		0.15	A
22	s	Bruceville Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		943			302		0.10	A
23	n	Bruceville Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	992	522	400	922	2,032	2,432	0.82	D
24	s	Bruceville Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1,225	672	300	972	2,345	2,645	0.89	D
25	n	Bruceville Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	61 8 / 482	423			2,140		0.72	C
26	s	Bruceville Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	818 /466	427			2,425		0.82	D
27	n	Bruceville Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bilby Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	85 / 167	219			912		0.31	A
28	s	Bruceville Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bilby Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	76 / 156	166			916		0.31	A
29	n	Bruceville Rd.	Bilby Rd.	Eschinger Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	71	69			197		0.10	A
30	s	Bruceville Rd.	Bilby Rd.	Eschinger Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	68	124			56		0.03	A
31	e	Calvine Rd.	Power Inn Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	2,020	1,566	400	1,966	2,710	3,110	1.05	F
32	w	Calvine Rd.	Power Inn Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1,248	1,758	-400	1,358	2,200	1,800	0.61	B
33	e	Calvine Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	426 / 776	690			2,203		0.74	C
34	w	Calvine Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	495 /861	1,002			1,950		0.66	B
35	e	Calvine Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	339	280			582		0.20	A
36	w	Calvine Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	382	580			786		0.26	A
37	n	Center Pkwy.	Sheldon Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		772			1,655		0.56	A
38	s	Center Pkwy.	Sheldon Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		618			1,294		0.44	A
39	e	Elk-Grove Blvd.	I-5	Franklin	6	54,000	2,970	915 / 1069	573	400	973	1,634	2,034	0.68	B
40	w	Elk-Grove Blvd.	I-5	Franklin	6	54,000	2,970	329 / 435	623			1,135		0.38	A
41	e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1,075	688	300	988	1,532	1,832	0.62	B
42	w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	694	996			1,670		0.56	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
43	e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1107 / 1092	932			1,726		0.58	A
44	w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1080 / 1192	1,232			2,070		0.70	B
45	e	Elk Grove Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1163 / 1518				3,136		1.06	F
46	w	Elk Grove Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1597 / 1784				7,460		2.51	F
47	e	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	1411 / 1426	1,836	-400	1,436	2,348	1,948	0.98	E
48	w	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	1296 / 1330	2,046	-600	1,446	2,324	1,724	0.87	D
49	e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Waterman Rd.	2	15,000	825	662	565			960		1.16	F
50	w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Waterman Rd.	2	15,000	825	714	580			724		0.88	D
51	e	Elk Grove Blvd.	Waterman Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	275	314			898		0.45	A
52	w	Elk Grove Blvd.	Waterman Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	257	287			648		0.33	A
53	n	Elk-Grove Florin Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		1,383			2,524		0.85	D
54	s	Elk-Grove Florin Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		1,483			2,469		0.83	D
55	n	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1092 / 988	1,640	-500	1,140	2,590	2,090	0.70	C
56	s	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1557 / 961	1,384			2,163		0.73	C
57	n	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	1116 / 918	1,425	-300	1,125	1,976	1,676	0.85	D
58	s	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	1171 / 828	1,379	-200	1,179	1,639	1,439	0.73	C
59	n	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	768	506	200	706	824	1,024	0.52	A
60	s	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	815	410	400	810	751	1,151	0.58	A
61	e	Eschinger Rd.	SR99	Carroll Rd.	2	18,000	990					50		0.05	A
62	w	Eschinger Rd.	SR99	Carroll Rd.	2	18,000	990					34		0.03	A
63	n	Excelsior Road	Gerber Rd.	Calvine Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		163			603		0.30	A
64	s	Excelsior Road	Gerber Rd.	Calvine Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		687			978		0.49	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
65	n	Excelsior Road	Calvine Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	84	172			1,120		0.57	A
66	s	Excelsior Road	Calvine Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	152	387			1,183		0.60	A
67	n	Franklin Blvd.	Calvine Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970		930			1,998		0.67	B
68	s	Franklin Blvd.	Calvine Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970		1,128			2,233		0.75	C
69	n	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	167 /493	463			2,028		0.68	B
70	s	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	136 /698	529			2,402		0.81	D
71	n	Franklin Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	147 /160	81			1,498		0.50	A
72	n	Franklin Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	150 /97	82			1,471		0.50	A
73	n	Franklin Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	South of Hood Franklin	4	36,000	1,980	62				653		0.33	A
74	n	Franklin Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	South of Hood Franklin	4	36,000	1,980	75				743		0.38	A
75	e	Grant Line Rd.	SR99	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	264 /175				3,839		1.29	F
76	w	Grant Line Rd.	SR99	East Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	598 /510				3,852		1.30	F
77	n	Grant Line Rd.	East Stockton Blvd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	533 /257	522			3,034		1.02	F
78	s	Grant Line Rd.	East Stockton Blvd.	Bradshaw Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	600 /345	564			2,550		0.86	D
79	n	Grant Line Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	376/ 587	468			1,992		0.67	B
80	s	Grant Line Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	366/ 499	542			1,556		0.52	A
81	n	Grant Line Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		504			1,618		0.54	A
82	s	Grant Line Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		663			1,685		0.57	A
83	n	Grant Line Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Sloughhouse Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		606			1,816		0.61	B
84	s	Grant Line Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Sloughhouse Rd.	6	54,000	2,970		994			2,104		0.71	C
85	n	Harbor Point Dr.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	175/ 336	203			756		0.38	A
86	s	Harbor Point Dr.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	153 /746	308			844		0.43	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
87	n	I-5	-	South of Hood Franklin	4	80,000	4,400					2,447		0.56	A
88	s	I-5	-	South of Hood Franklin	4	80,000	4,400					2,970		0.68	B
89	n	I-5	Hood Franklin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					2,447		0.56	A
90	s	I-5	Hood Franklin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					2,970		0.68	B
91	n	I-5	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					2,663		0.40	A
92	s	I-5	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					3,499		0.53	A
93	n	I-5	Laguna Blvd.	Meadow View/Pocket Road	8	160,000	8,800					4,325		0.49	A
94	s	I-5	Laguna Blvd.	Meadow View/Pocket Road	8	160,000	8,800					5,723		0.65	B
95	e	Kammerer (Hood Fr)	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	115	109			1,294		0.44	A
96	w	Kammerer (Hood Fr)	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	90	94			1,167		0.39	A
97	e	Kammerer Rd.	Franklin Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970					821		0.28	A
98	w	Kammerer Rd.	Franklin Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970					1,214		0.41	A
99	e	Kammerer Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	55	134			1,854		0.62	B
100	w	Kammerer Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	57	121			2,090		0.70	C
101	e	Laguna Blvd.	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1,933	1,584	400	1,984	2,186	2,586	0.87	D
102	w	Laguna Blvd.	I-5	Franklin Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	792	1,999	-600	1,399	1,709	1,109	0.37	A
103	e	Laguna Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1726/1831/1979	1,728			2,119		0.71	C
104	w	Laguna Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	6	54,000	2,970	1249/1531/1075	1,898	-300	1,598	2,028	1,728	0.58	A
105	e	Laguna Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	1779/1788/1587/1666	2,239	-500	1,739	2,572	2,072	0.70	B
106	w	Laguna Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	2283/1911/1216/2130	2,384			2,523		0.85	D
107	e	Laguna Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	7	63,000	3,465	1,945				3,422		0.99	E
108	w	Laguna Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	7	63,000	3,465	1,844				2,826		0.82	D

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
109	n	Laguna Springs Dr.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Ridge Drive	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			857		0.43	A
110	s	Laguna Springs Dr.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Ridge Drive	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			883		0.45	A
111	n	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Big Horn Blvd.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,550		0.78	C
112	s	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Big Horn Blvd.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			603		0.30	A
113	n	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,024		0.52	A
114	s	Laguna Ridge Dr.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Kammerer Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			645		0.33	A
115	n	Power Inn Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Elsie Ave.	6	54,000	2,970		1,479			2,022		0.68	B
116	s	Power Inn Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Elsie Ave.	6	54,000	2,970		1,571			2,146		0.72	C
117	e	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Franklin Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,346		0.68	B
118	w	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Franklin Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	4	36,000	1,980	N/A	N/A			1,496		0.76	C
119	e	Sheldon Rd.	Center Parkway	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	494	708	-300	408	1,760	1,460	0.49	A
120	w	Sheldon Rd.	Center Parkway	West Stockton Blvd.	6	54,000	2,970	904	1,023			1,726		0.58	A
121	e	Sheldon Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	6	54,000	2,970	693	806			2,535		0.85	D
122	w	Sheldon Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	6	54,000	2,970	549	883			2,257		0.76	C
123	e	Sheldon Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		677			2,271		1.15	F
124	w	Sheldon Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		759			1,858		0.94	E
125	e	Sheldon Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	224	351			1,810		0.91	E
126	w	Sheldon Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	393	363			1,548		0.78	C
127	e	Sheldon Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	252	501			1,050		0.53	A
128	w	Sheldon Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	453	365			1,140		0.58	A
129	n	State Route 99	Eschinger Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	80,000	4,400					3,674		0.84	D
130	s	State Route 99	Eschinger Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	80,000	4,400					4,564		1.04	F

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

		Roadway	From	To	Lanes	24-Hour Capacity	Peak Hour 1-Way Capacity	Counts	Existing Model	Modify	Existing Modified	2025 Model	2025 Model Modified	V/C	LOS
131	n	State Route 99	Grant Line Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					2,979		0.68	B
132	s	State Route 99	Grant Line Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	4	80,000	4,400					3,462		0.79	C
133	n	State Route 99	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					3,866		0.59	A
134	s	State Route 99	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	6	120,000	6,600					3,719		0.56	A
135	n	State Route 99	Laguna Blvd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,595		0.70	B
136	s	State Route 99	Laguna Blvd.	Sheldon Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,392		0.67	B
137	n	State Route 99	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,464		0.68	B
138	s	State Route 99	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	6	120,000	6,600					4,931		0.75	C
139	n	State Route 99	Calvine Rd.	Stockton Blvd.	8	160,000	8,800					4,282		0.49	A
140	s	State Route 99	Calvine Rd.	Stockton Blvd.	8	160,000	8,800					4,356		0.49	A
141	n	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		34			606		0.31	A
142	s	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		21			469		0.24	A
143	n	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		274			1,406		0.71	C
144	s	Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		307			1,143		0.58	A
145	n	Waterman	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	285 /230	467			1,345		0.68	B
146	s	Waterman	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	4	36,000	1,980	194 /237	315			972		0.49	A
147	n	Wilton Rd.	Grant Line Road	Dillard Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		254			369		0.19	A
148	s	Wilton Rd.	Grant Line Road	Dillard Rd.	4	36,000	1,980		492			671		0.34	A

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Traffic Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.2)

Impact 4.6.2 identifies that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts on noise-sensitive land uses along area roadways. The No Project Alternative traffic impact noise impacts are shown in **Table 6.0-3**. As shown in **Table 6.0-3**, the No Project Alternative would generally reduce traffic noise along area roadways and state highways as compared to the proposed General Plan.

**TABLE 6.0-3
COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND FUTURE (CUMULATIVE) TRAFFIC NOISE
LEVELS WITH BUILDOUT OF THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

Roadway	From	To	Existing Ldn	Ldn with Buildout of Current G.P.	Difference
Big Horn Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	65.0	65.3	0.3
Big Horn Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	67.3	68.3	1.0
Big Horn Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Kammerer Rd.	0.0	66.4	N/A
Bilby Rd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	51.7	62.6	10.9
Bond Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove Florin Blvd.	69.2	70.3	1.0
Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	63.3	67.8	4.5
Bond Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	60.4	63.3	2.9
Bradshaw Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	64.1	69.0	4.9
Bradshaw Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	62.5	68.7	6.2
Bradshaw Rd.	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	60.3	67.4	7.1
Bruceville Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	60.2	65.0	4.8
Bruceville Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	64.9	68.0	3.2
Bruceville Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	61.6	68.6	6.9
Bruceville Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Bilby Rd.	53.8	64.2	10.4
Bruceville Rd.	Bilby Rd.	Eschinger Rd.	50.6	52.1	1.5
Calvine Rd.	Power Inn Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	67.0	69.1	2.1
Calvine Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	64.4	68.5	4.1
Calvine Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	61.1	62.4	1.3
Center Pkwy.	Sheldon Rd.	Jacinto Rd.	64.0	66.5	2.5
Elk-Grove Blvd.	I-5	Franklin	62.6	65.7	3.1
Elk Grove Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	65.1	67.2	2.1
Elk Grove Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	65.4	67.5	2.2
Elk Grove Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	67.9	70.2	2.2
Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	68.0	69.5	1.6
Elk Grove Blvd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Waterman Rd.	63.6	65.1	1.5
Elk Grove Blvd.	Waterman Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	60.0	64.5	4.5
Elk-Grove Florin	Vintage Park Rd.	Calvine Rd.	67.4	70.1	2.7
Elk Grove-Florin	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	67.6	69.4	1.8
Elk Grove-Florin	Bond Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	66.8	68.3	1.5
Elk Grove-Florin	Elk Grove Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd.	61.2	63.9	2.7
Eschinger Rd.	SR99	Carroll Rd.	48.4	51.3	3.0
Excelsior Road	Gerber Rd.	Calvine Rd.	60.6	63.5	2.9
Excelsior Road	Calvine Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	59.3	64.3	5.1
Franklin Blvd.	Calvine Rd.	Laguna Blvd.	65.2	68.6	3.3
Franklin Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	62.3	68.9	6.6
Franklin Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	54.4	67.0	12.6

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Roadway	From	To	Existing Ldn	Ldn with Buildout of Current G.P.	Difference
Franklin Blvd.	Hood Franklin Rd.	S. of Hood Franklin	50.6	65.3	14.7
Grant Line Rd.	SR99	East Stockton Blvd.	66.3	71.5	5.2
Grant Line Rd.	East Stockton Blvd.	Bradshaw Rd.	63.3	69.2	5.9
Grant Line Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	62.4	67.6	5.2
Grant Line Rd.	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	63.0	68.0	4.9
Grant Line Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Sloughhouse Rd.	64.1	68.5	4.3
Harbor Point Dr.	Laguna Blvd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	59.5	64.3	4.8
I-5	-	S.of Hood Franklin	72.7	73.6	0.9
I-5	Hood Franklin Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	72.5	73.6	1.1
I-5	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	72.2	73.9	1.8
I-5	Laguna Blvd.	Meadow View/Pocket	74.3	75.4	1.1
Kammerer	I-5	Franklin Rd.	55.3	64.9	9.6
Kammerer Rd.	Franklin Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	53.2	64.7	11.6
Kammerer Rd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	55.8	68.7	12.9
Laguna Blvd.	I-5	Franklin Rd.	67.6	68.2	0.6
Laguna Blvd.	Franklin Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	67.9	68.5	0.6
Laguna Blvd.	Bruceville Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	69.3	70.0	0.7
Laguna Blvd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	69.0	69.7	0.7
Laguna Springs	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Ridge Drive	0.0	65.3	N/A
Laguna Ridge Dr.	Big Horn Blvd.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	0.0	63.1	N/A
Laguna Ridge Dr.	Poppy Ridge Rd.	Kammerer Rd.	0.0	64.1	N/A
Power Inn Rd.	Calvine Rd.	Elsie Ave.	65.7	67.9	2.2
Poppy Ridge Rd.	Franklin Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	0.0	66.3	N/A
Sheldon Rd.	Center Parkway	West Stockton Blvd.	65.4	67.0	1.6
Sheldon Rd.	West Stockton Blvd.	East Stockton Blvd	66.4	67.6	1.2
Sheldon Rd.	East Stockton Blvd	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	65.1	68.6	3.5
Sheldon Rd.	Elk Grove-Florin Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	64.5	67.7	3.3
Sheldon Rd.	Bradshaw Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	61.0	65.8	4.8
State Route 99	Eschinger Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	73.0	75.0	2.0
State Route 99	Grant Line Rd.	Elk Grove Blvd.	72.8	74.2	1.4
State Route 99	Elk Grove Blvd.	Laguna Blvd.	72.7	74.9	2.2
State Route 99	Laguna Blvd.	Sheldon Rd.	74.0	75.1	1.1
State Route 99	Sheldon Rd.	Calvine Rd.	74.4	75.4	1.0
State Route 99	Calvine Rd.	Stockton Blvd.	74.3	75.7	1.4
Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Vintage Park Rd.	49.5	60.5	10.9
Waterman	Calvine Rd.	Bond Rd.	60.3	66.5	6.1
Waterman	Bond Rd.	Grant Line Rd.	61.2	66.2	5.0
Wilton Rd.	Grant Line Road	Dillard Rd.	61.1	62.8	1.6

Source: Bollard and Brennan, 2003

Cumulative Airport Noise Impacts with Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.6.7)

As described in Impact 4.6.7, potential development of the eastern Urban Study Area could result in noise impacts associated with the operation of the Sunset Sky ranch Airport. The No Project Alternative would avoid this impact.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Cumulative Regional Traffic Noise (Impact 4.6.8)

Impact 4.6.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic noise impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative traffic noise impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Air Quality).

Construction Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.1)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction air quality impacts. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Operational Air Quality Emissions (Impact 4.7.2)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable operational air quality impacts, given the region's air quality status as a severe nonattainment area for ozone. Given that the No Project Alternative would result in more residential development than the proposed General Plan, it would have greater air quality impacts than the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

Impact 4.7.3 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative air quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Operational Surface Water and Groundwater Quality Impacts (Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3)

As described in Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3, the proposed General Plan would result in significant water quality impacts from operational effects of City land uses. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.4)

The proposed General Plan could result in significant flooding impacts as a result of development of the City. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land

pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Environmental Effects of Increased Water Demand (Impact 4.8.5)

Impact 4.8.5 describes significant and unavoidable impacts from anticipated water demand of the proposed General Plan and the associated environmental effects of providing adequate water supplies to the City. Since the No Project Alternative would result in more residential development than the proposed General Plan (an additional 6,707 dwelling units over the proposed General Plan), it would result in increased water demand impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Surface Water and Groundwater (Impact 4.8.6)

Impact 4.8.6 identifies cumulative water quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative water quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.7)

Impact 4.8.7 identifies cumulative flooding impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative flooding impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.8)

Impact 4.8.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative water supply impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative water supply impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Geology and Soils

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant geology and soil impact identified in Section 4.9 (Geology and Soils).

Expansive and Soil Stability Impacts (Impact 4.9.2)

As described in Impact 4.9.2, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could expose residences and structures to unstable soil conditions. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant biological resource impact identified in Section 4.10 (Biological Resources).

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Disturbance to Special-Status Plant Species (Impact 4.10.1)

As described in Impact 4.10.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant impacts to special-status plant species. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan. However, it is noted that the 2000 City of Elk Grove General Plan does include more extensive biological resource protection policies than the proposed General Plan.

Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species and Sensitive Habitats (Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3)

As described in Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special-status wildlife species and their habitats and sensitive habitats. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan. However, it is noted that the 2000 City of Elk Grove General Plan does include more extensive biological resource protection policies than the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts (Impact 4.10.4)

Impact 4.10.4 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative biological resource impact from the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative biological resource impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As noted in Section 4.11 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts. The No Project Alternative would have reduced impacts under cumulative conditions since it would not include potential development outside the current City limits.

Public Services

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant public service impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services).

Cumulative Wastewater Service (Impact 4.12.5.4)

As described in Impact 4.12.5.4, buildout of the City as well as development of the Urban Study Areas would result in cumulative impacts to wastewater service. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative wastewater service impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Infrastructure Extension Impacts (Impact 4.12.8.2)

Impact 4.12.8.2 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant environmental effects from the extension of infrastructure facilities. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Visual Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource impact identified in Section 4.13 (Visual Resources).

Alteration of Views (Impact 4.13.1)

As described in Impact 4.13.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in the alteration of the visual characteristics of the Planning Area. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Daytime Glare Impacts (Impact 4.13.2)

Impact 4.13.2 identifies that subsequent nonresidential development under the proposed General Plan could result in the generation of daytime glare conditions. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Nighttime Lighting Impacts (Impact 4.13.3)

As described in Impact 4.13.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in increased nighttime lighting impacts in the Planning Area. Given that the No Project Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Visual Resource Impacts (Impact 4.13.4)

Impact 4.13.4 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan as well as potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative visual impacts to the Planning Area. Since the No Project Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative visual impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

6.4 ALTERNATIVE 2 - MODIFICATION OF THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICY MAP ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Under this alternative, a series of land use designation modifications would be made to the proposed General Plan Land Use Policy Map. This includes consideration of land uses under the previous 2000 City of Elk Grove General Plan. These modifications are summarized and evaluated in **Table 6.0-4** and shown in **Figure 6.0-2a** and **b**. All other aspects of the General Plan and its associated Land Use Policy Map would remain as proposed. While environmental benefits and detriments for each land use modification request is noted in **Table 6.0-4**, the changes associated with each request do not result in substantial environmental impacts or benefits as compared to the proposed General Plan given the minor effects of each land use change.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

6.5 ALTERNATIVE 3 - FARMLAND PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

This alternative would involve the elimination of the proposed Urban Study Areas identified in the General Plan Planning Area Land Use Concept Map and in Policy LU-15 and its associated Action. In addition, this alternative would also re-designate a portion of the Laguna Ridge Policy Area and the entire Southeast, and South Pointe Policy areas identified in the proposed General Plan Land Use Policy Map for agricultural/rural residential uses in order to retain large areas of existing Prime and Farmland of Statewide Importance farmlands (see **Figure 6.0-3**). This alternative would reduce potential residential development in the City by approximately 7,700 units as well as office and commercial development. All other aspects of the General Plan and its associated Land Use Policy Map would remain as proposed.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Agriculture

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant agriculture impact identified in Section 4.1 (Agriculture).

Project and Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Land (Impact 4.1.1 and 4.1.3)

As described under Impacts 4.1.1 and 4.1.3, the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the loss of agricultural lands under project and cumulative conditions. The Farmland Preservation Alternative would result in reduced agricultural land conversions as compared to the proposed General Plan. In addition, this alternative would also have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Project and Cumulative Land Use Conflicts with Agricultural Uses (Impact 4.1.2 and 4.1.3)

Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 identify that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable land use conflicts with agricultural uses. The Farmland Preservation Alternative would result in reduced agricultural land use conflicts as compared to the proposed General Plan. Farmland Preservation Alternative would also have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Land Use

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant land use impact identified in Section 4.2 (Land Use).

Consistency with the Sacramento County General Plan Regarding the Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 identifies that under cumulative conditions the potential development of the Urban Study Area west of SR 99 would conflict with Sacramento County General Plan policies associated with restricting urban development outside of the Urban Services Boundary. Implementation of the Farmland Preservation Alternative would avoid this cumulative impact.

Insert Figure 6.0-2 a

6.0-2 b 11x17

6.0-3 11x17

TABLE 6.0-4
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE LAND USE REQUESTS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Impact	Alternatives																												
	1	2	4	5	6	9	12	13	16	17	18	19	22	23	24	25	31	33	35	36	37	38	40	41	14	15	21	30	29
Agriculture Impact 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 - Loss of agricultural land Impact 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 - Conflicts with agricultural uses	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Land Use Impact 4.2.3- Consistency with plans	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Population/Housing/Employment	B	S	B	S	S	B	B	B	W	W	W	B	B	W	B	B	B	W	B	B	B	B	B	S	S	W	W	W	W
Human Health and Hazards Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5 - Hazard exposure Impact 4.4.4 - At-grade railroad crossings	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Transportation and Circulation Impact 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 - LOS conditions Impact 4.5.6 - Cumulative LOS conditions	B	W	W	W	S	W	W	W	W	W	W	B	W	S	W	S	W	B	W	B	W	W	W	S	W	W	W	B	W
Noise Impact 4.6.1 - Construction noise Impact 4.6.2 - Traffic noise Impact 4.6.7 - Cumulative airport noise Impact 4.6.8 - Cumulative traffic noise	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Air Quality Impact 4.7.1- Construction air quality Impact 4.7.2 - Operational emissions Impact 4.7.3 - Cumulative regional	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Hydrology and Water Quality Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3 - Water quality Impact 4.8.4 - Flooding Impact 4.8.5 - Water supply Impact 4.8.6 - Cumulative water quality Impact 4.8.7 - Cumulative flooding Impact 4.8.8 - Cumulative water supply	S	W	S	S	S	S	S	W	W	W	W	S	S	S	W	S	S	S	B	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Geology and Soils Impact 4.9.1 - Soil stability	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Biological Resources Impact 4.10.1 - Special-status plant species Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3 - Special-status spec/habitat Impact 4.10.4 - Cumulative biological impacts	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Public Services Impact 4.12.5.4 - Cumulative wastewater Impact 4.12.8.2 - Infrastructure extension	B	W	S	B	S	B	B	B	W	W	W	B	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	B	B	B	B	S	S	W	W	B	W
Visual Resources/Light and Glare Impact 4.13.1 - Alteration of views Impact 4.13.2 - Daytime glare Impact 4.13.3 - Nighttime lighting Impact 4.13.4 - Cumulative visual resource impacts	B	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	B	S	S	W	W	S	S	S	B	S	S	S	S	S	W	W	S	W

S: Environmental effect is similar to the proposed General Plan.
B: Environmental effect is better as compared to the proposed General Plan.
W: Environmental effect is worse as compared to the proposed General Plan.

ALTERNATIVES

- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Rural Residential on Brown Road (proposed by Shirley Peters)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Commercial/Multi-Family at Sheldon Road/Bruceville Road (proposed by Eddie Kno)
- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Commercial at 9059 Bruceville Road (proposed by Jim Hunter and Terry Furmanek)
- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Commercial/Multi-Family at 9124 and 9140 Bruceville Road (proposed by Vidya Shergill)
- Proposed change from Office to Commercial/Office at the northwest corner of Laguna Boulevard and Big Horn Boulevard (proposed by Donald Fraser)
- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Commercial at East Stockton Boulevard (proposed by Donnie Spangler)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Commercial at 9007 Elk Grove-Florin Road (proposed by Eric and Susan DuCray)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Commercial on Elk Grove-Florin Road (proposed by Gil Albiani)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential on Campbell Road (proposed by Gil Albiani)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential at 9083 Campbell Road (proposed by Ken and Etha Nemson)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential at 9090 Campbell Road (proposed by Marc and Dennis Albiani)
- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Rural Residential, Public Open Space/Recreation and Estate Residential (proposed by Shirley Peters)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Commercial at Grant Line Road and Wilton Road (proposed by Joe Devlin)
- Proposed change from Light Industrial to Medium Density Residential at 9720 Webb Street (proposed by Richard Kerr)
- Proposed change from Estate Residential to Commercial at Bradshaw Road and Elk Grove Boulevard (proposed by William Hughes)
- Proposed change from Elk Grove Triangle Policy Area to Commercial and Estate Residential at Elk Grove Boulevard and Grant Line Road (proposed by Jerry Cookson)

- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Commercial/Multi-Family at northwest corner of Bond Road and Waterman Road (proposed by Lux Taylor)
- Proposed change from Office/Multi-Family to Low Density Residential - proposed Arcadian Village No. 3 project.
- Proposed change from Medium Density Residential to Commercial at 8386, 8422 and 8400 Sheldon Road (proposed by Kathy Wolfe and Kathy Newland)
- Proposed change from Estate Residential to Rural Residential (proposed by Lisa Dixon)
- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Commercial at the southwest corner of Elk Grove-Florin Road and Calvine Road
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Commercial on Grant Line Road
- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Commercial on Bond Road
- Proposed change from Office/Multi-Family to Commercial/Office/Multi-Family at northwest corner of Laguna Boulevard and Bruceville Road
- Proposed change from Light Industrial/Public Open Space/Recreation to Intensive Industrial based on 2000 Elk Grove General Plan at Dixon Pit Landfill (proposed by Gyan Kalwani)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential based on 2000 Elk Grove General Plan (proposed by Gyan Kalwani)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential based on 2000 Elk Grove General Plan (proposed by Gyan Kalwani)
- Proposed change from Public Schools to Low Density Residential based on 2000 Elk Grove General Plan (proposed by Elk Grove Unified School District)
- Proposed change from Rural Residential and Estate Residential to Low Density Residential based on 2000 Elk Grove General Plan (proposed by Russell Newland)

Alternatives based on technical information and analyses provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.13 and the June 30, 2003 staff report to the Planning Commission regarding alternative land use requests for the General Plan.

Population/Housing/Employment

As noted in Section 4.3 (Population/Housing/Employment), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with population, housing and employment. The Farmland Preservation Alternative would result in a worse job/housing ratio as a result of reduced residential, commercial, and office development.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant hazard impact identified in Section 4.4 (Human Health/Risk of Upset).

Potential Hazard Exposure (Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5)

Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5 identifies that the proposed General Plan could expose people to known and unknown hazardous materials in the Planning Area as well as airport safety hazards associated with the eastern Urban Study Area and the Sunset Sky Ranch Airport. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would have a similar land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan. However, it is noted that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development that could have contamination issues. In addition, this alternative would avoid potential airport safety conflicts.

Hazards Associated with At-Grade Railroad Crossings (Impact 4.4.4)

As described in Impact 4.4.4, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would expose residents to hazards associated with at-grade roadway crossings of railroad lines at Calvine Road, Sheldon Road, Elk-Grove Florin Road, Bond Road, Elk Grove Boulevard, and Grant Line Road. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would have a similar land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Transportation and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant traffic impact identified in Section 4.5 (Transportation and Circulation).

Project Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.1 and 4.5.2)

Impacts 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 identify project significant and unavoidable impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would result in significant reductions in residential, commercial and office development, it would result in reduced traffic impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.6)

Impact 4.5.6 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative traffic impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.6 (Noise).

Construction Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

As described in Impact 4.6.1, the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts associated with development under the proposed General Plan. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would have a similar land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Traffic Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.2)

Impact 4.6.2 identifies that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts on noise-sensitive land uses along area roadways. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would result in significant reductions in residential, commercial and office development, it would result in reduced traffic noise impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Airport Noise Impacts with Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.6.7)

As described in Impact 4.6.7, potential development of the eastern Urban Study Area could result in noise impacts associated with the operation of the Sunset Sky ranch Airport. The Farmland Preservation Alternative would avoid this impact.

Cumulative Regional Traffic Noise (Impact 4.6.8)

Impact 4.6.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic noise impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative traffic noise impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Air Quality).

Construction Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.1)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction air quality impacts. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced construction air quality impacts.

Operational Air Quality Emissions (Impact 4.7.2)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable operational air quality impacts, given the region's air quality status as a severe nonattainment area for ozone. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would result in

significant reductions in residential, commercial and office development, it would result in reduced air quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

Impact 4.7.3 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative air quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Operational Surface Water and Groundwater Quality Impacts (Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3)

As described in Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3, the proposed General Plan would result in significant water quality impacts from operational effects of City land uses. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced water quality impacts.

Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.4)

The proposed General Plan could result in significant flooding impacts as a result of development of the City. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced drainage/flooding impacts.

Environmental Effects of Increased Water Demand (Impact 4.8.5)

Impact 4.8.5 describes significant and unavoidable impacts from anticipated water demand of the proposed General Plan and the associated environmental effects of providing adequate water supplies to the City. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would result in significant reductions in residential, commercial and office development, it would result in reduced water supply impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Surface Water and Groundwater (Impact 4.8.6)

Impact 4.8.6 identifies cumulative water quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and would result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative water quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.7)

Impact 4.8.7 identifies cumulative flooding impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

would result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative drainage and flooding impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.8)

Impact 4.8.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative water supply impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and would result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative water supply impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Geology and Soils

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant geology and soil impact identified in Section 4.9 (Geology and Soils).

Expansive and Soil Stability Impacts (Impact 4.9.2)

As described in Impact 4.9.2, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could expose residences and structures to unstable soil conditions. Given that the Farmland Preservation Alternative would have a similar land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant biological resource impact identified in Section 4.10 (Biological Resources).

Disturbance to Special-Status Plant Species (Impact 4.10.1)

As described in Impact 4.10.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant impacts to special-status plant species. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced biological resource impacts associated with special-status plant species.

Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species and Sensitive Habitats (Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3)

As described in Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special-status wildlife species and their habitats and sensitive habitats. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced biological resource impacts associated with special-status wildlife species and their habitats and sensitive habitat conditions.

Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts (Impact 4.10.4)

Impact 4.10.4 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative biological resource impact from the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and would result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative biological resource impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As noted in Section 4.11 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts. The Farmland Preservation Alternative would have reduced impacts under project cumulative conditions since it would reduce the development area of the City and would not include potential development outside the current City limits.

Public Services

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant public service impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services).

Cumulative Wastewater Service (Impact 4.12.5.4)

As described in Impact 4.12.5.4, buildout of the City as well as development of the Urban Study Areas would result in cumulative impacts to wastewater service. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative wastewater service impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Infrastructure Extension Impacts (Impact 4.12.8.2)

Impact 4.12.8.2 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant environmental effects from the extension of infrastructure facilities. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced environmental effects associated with infrastructure extensions.

Visual Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Farmland Preservation Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource impact identified in Section 4.13 (Visual Resources).

Alteration of Views (Impact 4.13.1)

As described in Impact 4.13.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in the alteration of the visual characteristics of the Planning Area. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced visual resource impacts.

Daytime Glare Impacts (Impact 4.13.2)

Impact 4.13.2 identifies that subsequent nonresidential development under the proposed General Plan could result in the generation of daytime glare conditions. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced daytime glare impacts.

Nighttime Lighting Impacts (Impact 4.13.3)

As described in Impact 4.13.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in increased nighttime lighting impacts in the Planning Area. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would reduce land area for development, it would have reduced nighttime lighting impacts.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Cumulative Visual Resource Impacts (Impact 4.13.4)

Impact 4.13.4 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan as well as potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative visual impacts to the Planning Area. Since the Farmland Preservation Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas and would result in reduced development, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative visual impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

6.6 ALTERNATIVE 4 - ELIMINATION OF THE URBAN STUDY AREAS ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

This alternative would involve the elimination of the proposed Urban Study Areas identified in the General Plan Planning Area Land Use Concept Map and in Policy LU-15 and its associated Action. These areas would be identified as maintaining existing land use conditions (rural residential, agricultural and open space uses). New urban development under the General Plan would be limited to within the City's existing limits. All other aspects of the General Plan and its associated Land Use Policy Map would remain as proposed.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Agriculture

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant agriculture impact identified in Section 4.1 (Agriculture).

Project and Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Land (Impact 4.1.1 and 4.1.3)

As described under Impacts 4.1.1 and 4.1.3, the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the loss of agricultural lands under project and cumulative conditions. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would result in the same project impacts associated with agricultural land loss. However, the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Project and Cumulative Land Use Conflicts with Agricultural Uses (Impact 4.1.2 and 4.1.3)

Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 identify that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable land use conflicts with agricultural uses. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would result in the same project impacts associated with agricultural land use conflicts. However, the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Land Use

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant land use impact identified in Section 4.2 (Land Use).

Consistency with the Sacramento County General Plan Regarding the Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 identifies that under cumulative conditions the potential development of the Urban Study Area west of SR 99 would conflict with Sacramento County General Plan policies associated with restricting urban development outside of the Urban Services Boundary. Implementation of the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would avoid this cumulative impact.

Population/Housing/Employment

As noted in Section 4.3 (Population/Housing/Employment), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with population, housing and employment. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would result in the same job/housing ratio as the proposed General Plan.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant hazard impact identified in Section 4.4 (Human Health/Risk of Upset).

Potential Hazard Exposure (Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5)

Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5 identifies that the proposed General Plan could expose people to known and unknown hazardous materials in the Planning Area as well as airport safety hazards associated with the eastern Urban Study Area and the Sunset Sky Ranch Airport. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan. In addition, this alternative would avoid potential airport safety conflicts.

Hazards Associated with At-Grade Railroad Crossings (Impact 4.4.4)

As described in Impact 4.4.4, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would expose residents to hazards associated with at-grade roadway crossings of railroad lines at Calvine Road, Sheldon Road, Elk-Grove Florin Road, Bond Road, Elk Grove Boulevard, and Grant Line Road. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Transportation and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant traffic impact identified in Section 4.5 (Transportation and Circulation).

Project Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.1 and 4.5.2)

Impacts 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 identify project significant and unavoidable impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same impact as the proposed General Plan.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Cumulative Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.6)

Impact 4.5.6 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative traffic impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.6 (Noise).

Construction Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

As described in Impact 4.6.1, the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts associated with development under the proposed General Plan. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Traffic Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.2)

Impact 4.6.2 identifies that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts on noise-sensitive land uses along area roadways. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same impact as the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Airport Noise Impacts with Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.6.7)

As described in Impact 4.6.7, potential development of the eastern Urban Study Area could result in noise impacts associated with the operation of the Sunset Skyranch Airport. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would avoid this impact.

Cumulative Regional Traffic Noise (Impact 4.6.8)

Impact 4.6.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic noise impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative traffic noise impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Air Quality).

Construction Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.1)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction air quality impacts. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Operational Air Quality Emissions (Impact 4.7.2)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable operational air quality impacts, given the region's air quality status as a severe nonattainment area for ozone. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same impact as the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

Impact 4.7.3 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative air quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Operational Surface Water and Groundwater Quality Impacts (Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3)

As described in Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3, the proposed General Plan would result in significant water quality impacts from operational effects of City land uses. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.4)

The proposed General Plan could result in significant flooding impacts as a result of development of the City. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Environmental Effects of Increased Water Demand (Impact 4.8.5)

Impact 4.8.5 describes significant and unavoidable impacts from anticipated water demand of the proposed General Plan and the associated environmental effects of providing adequate water supplies to the City. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would result in the same extent of development under the proposed General Plan, it would result in same impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Surface Water and Groundwater (Impact 4.8.6)

Impact 4.8.6 identifies cumulative water quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative water quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Cumulative Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.7)

Impact 4.8.7 identifies cumulative flooding impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative flooding impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.8)

Impact 4.8.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative water supply impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative water supply impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Geology and Soils

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant geology and soil impact identified in Section 4.9 (Geology and Soils).

Expansive and Soil Stability Impacts (Impact 4.9.2)

As described in Impact 4.9.2, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could expose residences and structures to unstable soil conditions. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant biological resource impact identified in Section 4.10 (Biological Resources).

Disturbance to Special-Status Plant Species (Impact 4.10.1)

As described in Impact 4.10.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant impacts to special-status plant species. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species and Sensitive Habitats (Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3)

As described in Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special-status wildlife species and their habitats and sensitive habitats. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts (Impact 4.10.4)

Impact 4.10.4 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative biological resource impact from the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative biological resource impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As noted in Section 4.11 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts. The Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have reduced impacts under cumulative conditions since it would not include potential development outside the current City limits.

Public Services

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant public service impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services).

Cumulative Wastewater Service (Impact 4.12.5.4)

As described in Impact 4.12.5.4, buildout of the City as well as development of the Urban Study Areas would result in cumulative impacts to wastewater service. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative wastewater service impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Infrastructure Extension Impacts (Impact 4.12.8.2)

Impact 4.12.8.2 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant environmental effects from the extension of infrastructure facilities. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Visual Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative are provided below for each significant visual resource impact identified in Section 4.13 (Visual Resources).

Alteration of Views (Impact 4.13.1)

As described in Impact 4.13.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in the alteration of the visual characteristics of the Planning Area. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Daytime Glare Impacts (Impact 4.13.2)

Impact 4.13.2 identifies that subsequent nonresidential development under the proposed General Plan could result in the generation of daytime glare conditions. Given that the

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Nighttime Lighting Impacts (Impact 4.13.3)

As described in Impact 4.13.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in increased nighttime lighting impacts in the Planning Area. Given that the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would have the same land pattern and mix as the proposed General Plan, it would have the same impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Visual Resource Impacts (Impact 4.13.4)

Impact 4.13.4 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan as well as potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative visual impacts to the Planning Area. Since the Elimination of the Urban Study Areas Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative visual impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

6.7 ALTERNATIVE 5 - INCREASED DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Summary of the SACOG "Blueprint" Process

Beginning in mid-2002, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), the regional planning agency for the Sacramento region,¹ embarked on a planning process entitled the "Blueprint." The overall purpose of the Blueprint process is to collect information on projected growth in the Sacramento region; to develop alternative "scenarios" which provide for different growth patterns; and to determine the effects of these scenarios on such factors as:

- Urbanization of presently agricultural or otherwise vacant land
- Travel patterns and the use of private motor vehicles
- Biotic resources
- Air pollution

The ultimate goal of the Blueprint is the creation of a preferred growth scenario for the region. SACOG's intent is to "permanently enhance local planning and create a long-range regional context for local decision making."² SACOG staff has also indicated that the resulting preferred land use plan would be used in the planning and funding of regional public transportation improvements, including light rail and bus rapid transit.

The Blueprint process has involved SACOG staff, members of the public, representatives of the various cities and counties in the SACOG region. To date, elected officials in these jurisdictions have not taken formal action to select or indicate a preference for (or against) any of the scenarios.

As of the writing of this Draft EIR, SACOG's work has proceeded through two major phases:

¹ The SACOG region includes the area within the counties of Sacramento, ElDorado, Placer, Sutter, and Yolo

² Source: www.sacregionblueprint.org

- Data collection and the creation of computerized mapping and land use models
- A series of public workshops at various cities throughout the region, at which participants provided input on how they would apply “smart growth” principles to sites selected by SACOG staff

Underlying the Blueprint process is a forecast for growth in the SACOG region that projects approximately one million new residents and 900,000 new jobs beyond the time frame of the proposed General Plan. The “base case” and other scenarios being examined in the Blueprint process all examine various methods to accommodate this growth; no scenario is being developed which envisions a lower level of residential or employment growth.

Rather than seek controls on the ultimate amount of growth, the Blueprint process promotes “smart growth” principles, including:

- Housing Diversity, which promotes greater variety in the types of housing offered in the region.
- Building on Existing Assets, which promotes the re-use of existing buildings, particularly in the region’s older urban areas.
- Mixed-Use Development, which promotes land use planning which mixes various land uses.
- Protecting Farmland and Natural Resources.
- Provide Transportation Choices, which promotes a variety of options that emphasizes an increase in public transit.
- Encourage Pedestrian-Friendly Communities, which promotes land use patterns that would enable residents to walk to shopping and other daily needs.

At this time, SACOG staff has developed five growth scenarios for Sacramento County, all of which include the City of Elk Grove and other cities in the SACOG region. These include:

- A “base case” scenario, which assumes continuation of current development and land use patterns and trends;
- A “holding capacity” scenario, which assumes a shift to higher density development under existing city and county general plans;
- Two “compact growth” scenarios which focus new development within the area currently planned by County of Sacramento for urban development; and
- A “land use balance” scenario that divides Sacramento County into ten “nodes,” each of which is intended to be balanced in terms of jobs per housing unit.

(Note: A sixth scenario is, as of this writing, under preparation, but has not yet been clearly defined by SACOG.)

As discussed in more detail below, all of the scenarios (other than those which continue current trends and/or land use plans) would result in significant, wholesale changes in the types of new development that take place in the region, including a shift to higher-density, attached residential housing units in place of detached, single-family homes. Although Elk Grove does not

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

have large commercial corridors suitable for redevelopment or revitalization, the scenarios generally seek to direct a significant portion of new development (up to 30 percent of new housing units) into older commercial corridors.

The scenarios are summarized below:

"Base Case"

The so-called "base case" scenario presents SACOG's estimate of the pattern of land use in the region if cities and counties continued to approve land use developments at current densities. The "base case," according to SACOG, represents a "worst-case" scenario, resulting in the expansion of urbanization into new areas not currently planned for growth. In Sacramento County, the "base case" would extend urban growth past the County's "Urban Service Boundary," which currently represents the currently planned limit of urban land uses. (The City of Elk Grove and a portion of the Planning Area examined in the General Plan are within the County of Sacramento's Urban Service Boundary; the portion of the Planning Area south of Kammerer Road is outside the County's USB.) According to SACOG projections, approximately 240,000 acres of land would be urbanized in Sacramento County under the "base case," compared to approximately 123,000 existing urbanized acres (an increase of 117,000 acres). Overall residential density for new growth under the "base case" scenario would be approximately 4.85 dwelling units per acre, according to SACOG (roughly equivalent to the current overall residential density of Sacramento County as a whole).

"Holding Capacity"

This scenario examines the effect on urbanization and other factors in the SACOG region if all local agencies (cities and counties) maximized the intensity of development by ensuring that all new residential and non-residential growth occurs at the maximum density provided in current general plans (e.g., if a city's general plan provided for a range of residential density of four to seven units per acre, the "holding capacity" scenario assumes that all future residential growth in the category takes place at a density of seven units per acre). Overall residential density for new growth over the next 50 years would be approximately 13.2 dwelling units per acre, according to SACOG (compared to a current overall 2003 density of approximately 5 units per acre).

The "holding capacity" scenario reduces the need for land to accommodate future urban growth in the region but, according to SACOG, requires the urbanization of some areas beyond Sacramento County's currently planned Urban Service Boundary. According to SACOG projections, the "holding capacity" scenario would result in the urbanization of a total of approximately 199,500 acres of land, an increase of approximately 75,000 acres from current levels.

"Compact Growth 48 Percent" and "Compact Growth 65 Percent"

The "compact growth" scenarios incorporate several assumptions:

- Depending on the scenario, either 48 percent or 65 percent of future growth in the region (over the 50-year time scenario examined in the Blueprint process) would occur entirely within Sacramento County (both in the unincorporated area and in incorporated cities such as Elk Grove).

- Development would not occur on areas defined as wetlands, vernal pools, woodlands, floodways, or floodplains (and generally within the County of Sacramento's Urban Service Boundary).

The "compact growth" scenarios focus most growth along existing and planned light rail and transit corridors. Both also assume a sharp increase in the density of new residential development in the region—the "65 percent" scenario assumes an average density of 16.9 dwelling units per acre; the "48 percent" scenario projects 18.3 units per acre. (As noted above, current residential development is averaging approximately five units per acre, according to SACOG; this figure is a good approximation of the type of growth occurring in Elk Grove, which is predominated by single-family homes at a density of 4-7 units per acre.) Because of the constraints built into these scenarios, both would require less land for new development—the "65 percent" scenario would increase existing developed land in Sacramento County by approximately 58,000 acres to a total of approximately 182,000; the "48 percent" scenario would increase developed land to a total of approximately 167,000 acres.

"Land Use Balance"

The "land use balance" scenario is based on the idea of balancing the number of jobs with the number of households in ten SACOG-defined "nodes" within Sacramento County. Assumptions of the "land use balance" scenario include:

- Achieving a ratio of approximately 1.2 jobs per household within each of the ten "node" subareas (with minor exceptions for the nodes which include Citrus Heights and Folsom; these nodes are projected to remain "out of balance" under this scenario due to the influence of land uses in Placer County);
- Approximately doubling the density of new residential development to approximately ten units per acre;
- Development on some lands not currently planned by Sacramento County for urban development; and
- An increase in the number of jobs created in Elk Grove—this scenario envisions the creation of a total of 125,000 retail and non-retail jobs in Elk Grove, compared to a projected employment of approximately 61,482 under the proposed General Plan.

Implications for the City of Elk Grove

As noted above, all of the various planning scenarios being examined by SACOG would result in substantial shifts in the type and location of new development. Although all of Elk Grove and a portion of the Planning Area have long been planned for urban development (including by Sacramento County prior to the incorporation of the city), the scenarios would all result in an increase in the intensity of residential development—as noted above, the density of new residential development would at least double on a county-wide basis compared to current levels, and would almost quadruple under the most aggressive planning scenario. Because it includes large areas of "Greenfield" lands (that is, lands which have not been previously developed), Elk Grove can be expected to reflect the overall trends in these scenarios if any of the scenarios were implemented. Thus, for the purposes of the alternatives analysis below, it is assumed that potential residential development under the General Plan was doubled within the current City limits. This alternative would result in the City buildout of approximately 126,680

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

dwelling units (approximately 8 dwelling units per gross acre of designated residential areas under the proposed General Plan) and a population of approximately 388,000 persons. No development is assumed to occur within the Urban Study Areas identified in the proposed General Plan. It is acknowledged that depending on the ultimate outcome of the “Blueprint” process, the recommended density and land use mix for the City of Elk Grove could be substantially higher.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

The following analysis is provided of this alternative. As evaluated below, this intensity of development would result in greater environmental effects for the City than the proposed General Plan. However, it is acknowledged that this alternative may have environmental benefits for the region beyond 2025 in regards to agricultural land preservation, regional traffic, air quality and biological resources.

Agriculture

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant agriculture impact identified in Section 4.1 (Agriculture).

Project and Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Land (Impact 4.1.1 and 4.1.3)

As described under Impacts 4.1.1 and 4.1.3, the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the loss of agricultural lands under project and cumulative conditions. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would result in similar project impacts associated with agricultural land loss. However, the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Project and Cumulative Land Use Conflicts with Agricultural Uses (Impact 4.1.2 and 4.1.3)

Impacts 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 identify that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable land use conflicts with agricultural uses. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would result in similar project impacts associated with agricultural land use conflicts. However, the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have reduced cumulative impacts given that no development would be considered outside of the City limits (Urban Services Boundary).

Land Use

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant land use impact identified in Section 4.2 (Land Use). The Increased Density of Development Alternative would result in land use conflicts with the Sunset Sky ranch Airport as a result of the increased density of residential development.

Consistency with the Sacramento County General Plan Regarding the Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 identifies that under cumulative conditions the potential development of the Urban Study Area west of SR 99 would conflict with Sacramento County General Plan policies associated with restricting urban development outside of the Urban Services Boundary.

Implementation of the Increased Density of Development Alternative would avoid this cumulative impact.

Population/Housing/Employment

As noted in Section 4.3 (Population/Housing/Employment), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with population, housing and employment. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would result in a worse job/housing ratio than the proposed General Plan.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant hazard impact identified in Section 4.4 (Human Health/Risk of Upset). The Increased Density of Development Alternative would result in land use conflicts and potential safety conflicts with the Sunset Sky Ranch Airport as a result of the increased density of residential development.

Potential Hazard Exposure (Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5)

Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5 identifies that the proposed General Plan could expose people to known and unknown hazardous materials in the Planning Area as well as airport safety hazards associated with the eastern Urban Study Area and the Sunset Sky Ranch Airport. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan. However, this alternative would avoid potential airport safety impacts.

Hazards Associated with At-Grade Railroad Crossings (Impact 4.4.4)

As described in Impact 4.4.4, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would expose residents to hazards associated with at-grade roadway crossings of railroad lines at Calvine Road, Sheldon Road, Elk-Grove Florin Road, Bond Road, Elk Grove Boulevard, and Grant Line Road. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would have more severe safety impacts associated with increased population and traffic as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Transportation and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant traffic impact identified in Section 4.5 (Transportation and Circulation).

Project Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.1 and 4.5.2)

Impacts 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 identify project significant and unavoidable impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate more traffic locally and result in more severe traffic impacts to local roadways as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Traffic Impacts to Local Roadways and State Highways (Impact 4.5.6)

Impact 4.5.6 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to local roadways and SR 99 associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

development of the Urban Study Areas. Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate more traffic locally and result in more severe cumulative traffic impacts to local roadways as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.6 (Noise).

Construction Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.1)

As described in Impact 4.6.1, the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts associated with development under the proposed General Plan. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Traffic Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.2)

Impact 4.6.2 identifies that the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts on noise-sensitive land uses along area roadways. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate more traffic locally and result in more severe traffic noise impacts to local roadways as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Airport Noise Impacts with Urban Study Areas (Impact 4.6.7)

As described in Impact 4.6.7, potential development of the eastern Urban Study Area could result in noise impacts associated with the operation of the Sunset Sky Ranch Airport. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would avoid this impact associated with the Urban Study Areas.

Cumulative Regional Traffic Noise (Impact 4.6.8)

Impact 4.6.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic noise impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate more traffic locally and result in more severe cumulative traffic noise impacts to local roadways as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Air Quality).

Construction Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.1)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable construction air quality impacts. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Operational Air Quality Emissions (Impact 4.7.2)

Subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable operational air quality impacts, given the region's air quality status as a severe nonattainment area for ozone. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate more air emissions associated with increased density of development and would result in more severe air quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.7.3)

Impact 4.7.3 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate more air emissions associated with increased density of development and would result in more severe cumulative air quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Operational Surface Water and Groundwater Quality Impacts (Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3)

As described in Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3, the proposed General Plan would result in significant water quality impacts from operational effects of City land uses. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.4)

The proposed General Plan could result in significant flooding impacts as a result of development of the City. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would have an increased drainage and flooding impact as compared to the proposed General Plan as a result of increased impervious surfaces.

Environmental Effects of Increased Water Demand (Impact 4.8.5)

Impact 4.8.5 describes significant and unavoidable impacts from anticipated water demand of the proposed General Plan and the associated environmental effects of providing adequate water supplies to the City. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate substantially higher water demand associated with increased density of development and would result in more severe environmental effects associated with providing adequate water supply as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Surface Water and Groundwater (Impact 4.8.6)

Impact 4.8.6 identifies cumulative water quality impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Increased Density of Development Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative water quality impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Cumulative Flooding Impacts (Impact 4.8.7)

Impact 4.8.7 identifies cumulative flooding impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would have an increased drainage and flooding impact as compared to the proposed General Plan as a result of increased impervious surfaces.

Cumulative Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.8)

Impact 4.8.8 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative water supply impacts associated with the proposed General Plan, which includes consideration of the potential development of the Urban Study Areas. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate substantially higher water demand associated with increased density of development and would result in more severe cumulative environmental effects associated with providing adequate water supply as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Geology and Soils

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant geology and soil impact identified in Section 4.9 (Geology and Soils).

Expansive and Soil Stability Impacts (Impact 4.9.2)

As described in Impact 4.9.2, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could expose residences and structures to unstable soil conditions. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant biological resource impact identified in Section 4.10 (Biological Resources).

Disturbance to Special-Status Plant Species (Impact 4.10.1)

As described in Impact 4.10.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant impacts to special-status plant species. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species and Sensitive Habitats (Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3)

As described in Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special-status wildlife species and their habitats and sensitive habitats. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts (Impact 4.10.4)

Impact 4.10.4 identifies significant and unavoidable cumulative biological resource impact from the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Urban Study Areas. Since the Increased Density of Development Alternative would not include development of the Urban Study Areas, this alternative would result in reduced cumulative biological resource impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As noted in Section 4.11 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources), the proposed General Plan would not result in any significant impacts. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would have reduced impacts under cumulative conditions since it would not include potential development outside the current City limits.

Public Services

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant public service impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services). However, it should be noted that the density of development associated with this alternative exceeds current planning assumptions for infrastructure and services of the public service providers (e.g., Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and the Elk Grove Community Services District) and would result in more severe public service impacts than the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Wastewater Service (Impact 4.12.5.4)

As described in Impact 4.12.5.4, buildout of the City as well as development of the Urban Study Areas would result in cumulative impacts to wastewater service. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate substantially higher wastewater demand associated with increased density of development and would result in more severe cumulative service impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Infrastructure Extension Impacts (Impact 4.12.8.2)

Impact 4.12.8.2 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan could result in significant environmental effects from the extension of infrastructure facilities. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would generate substantially higher infrastructure service demands associated with increased density of development and would result in more severe impacts as compared to the proposed General Plan.

Visual Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Increased Density of Development Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource impact identified in Section 4.13 (Visual Resources).

Alteration of Views (Impact 4.13.1)

As described in Impact 4.13.1, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in the alteration of the visual characteristics of the Planning Area. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would result in greater visual resource impacts than the proposed General Plan, especially in areas currently planned to maintain their rural character.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Daytime Glare Impacts (Impact 4.13.2)

Impact 4.13.2 identifies that subsequent nonresidential development under the proposed General Plan could result in the generation of daytime glare conditions. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar non-residential development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Nighttime Lighting Impacts (Impact 4.13.3)

As described in Impact 4.13.3, subsequent development under the proposed General Plan would result in increased nighttime lighting impacts in the Planning Area. Given that the Increased Density of Development Alternative would have a similar development pattern as the proposed General Plan, it would have similar impacts as the proposed General Plan.

Cumulative Visual Resource Impacts (Impact 4.13.4)

Impact 4.13.4 identifies that subsequent development under the proposed General Plan as well as potential development of the Urban Study Areas would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative visual impacts to the Planning Area. The Increased Density of Development Alternative would result in greater cumulative visual resource impacts than the proposed General Plan, especially in areas currently planned to maintain their rural character.

6.8 CONCLUSIONS

Table 6.0-5 provides a summary of the potential impacts of the alternatives evaluated in this section (with the exception of the Modification of the General Plan Land Use Policy Map Alternative that is evaluated in **Table 6.0-4**), as compared with the potential impacts of the proposed General Plan.

Based upon the evaluation described in this section, the Farmland Preservation Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, it should be noted that this alternative would reduce the extent of housing and job development potential available to the City to meet future demands (including affordable housing) and may be considered inconsistent with guiding and economic policies of the proposed General Plan.

**TABLE 6.0-5
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN**

Impact	Alternatives			
	1	3	4	5
Agriculture Impact 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 - Loss of agricultural land Impact 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 – Conflicts with agricultural uses	B B	B B	B B	B B
Land Use Impact 4.2.3- Consistency with plans	B	B	B	B
Population/Housing/Employment	W	W	S	W
Human Health and Hazards Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.5 – Hazard exposure Impact 4.4.4 – At-grade railroad crossings	B S	B S	B S	B W

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Impact	Alternatives			
	1	3	4	5
Transportation and Circulation Impact 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 -LOS conditions Impact 4.5.6 – Cumulative LOS conditions	S B	B B	S B	W W
Noise Impact 4.6.1 - Construction noise Impact 4.6.2 - Traffic noise Impact 4.6.7 – Cumulative airport noise Impact 4.6.8 – Cumulative traffic noise	S B B B	S B B B	S S B B	S W B W
Air Quality Impact 4.7.1- Construction air quality Impact 4.7.2 - Operational emissions Impact 4.7.3 - Cumulative regional	S W B	B B B	S S B	S W W
Hydrology and Water Quality Impact 4.8.2 and 4.8.3 - Water quality Impact 4.8.4 - Flooding Impact 4.8.5 – Water supply Impact 4.8.6 - Cumulative water quality Impact 4.8.7 – Cumulative flooding Impact 4.8.8 - Cumulative water supply	S S W B B B	B B B B B B	S S S B B B	S W W B W W
Geology and Soils Impact 4.9.2 – Soil stability	S	S	S	S
Biological Resources Impact 4.10.1 – Special-status plant species Impact 4.10.2 and 4.10.3 – Special-status wildlife species and critical habitat Impact 4.10.4 – Cumulative biological impacts	S S B	B B B	S S B	S S B
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	B	B	B	B
Public Services Impact 4.12.5.4 – Cumulative wastewater Impact 4.12.8.2 – Infrastructure extension	B S	B B	B S	W W
Visual Resources/Light and Glare Impact 4.13.1 - Alteration of views Impact 4.13.2 - Daytime glare Impact 4.13.3 – Nighttime lighting Impact 4.13.4 – Cumulative visual resource impacts	S S S B	B B B B	S S S B	W S S W

*S: Environmental effect is similar to the proposed General Plan.
 B: Environmental effect is better as compared to the proposed General Plan.
 W: Environmental effect is worse as compared to the proposed General Plan.*