This section provides an overview of the Project and the environmental analysis. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate section (Section 5.1 through 5.13) of Section 5.0, Introduction to the Environmental Analysis and Assumptions Used.

ES.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EIR

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) when there is substantial evidence that a project could have a significant effect on the environment. The purpose of an EIR is to provide decision-makers, public agencies, and the general public with an objective and informational document that fully discloses the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project. The term "proposed Project," as used in this Draft EIR, refers to the development of the Southeast Policy Area Strategic Plan Project. The EIR process is specifically designed to describe the objective evaluation of potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed Project, to identify alternatives that reduce or eliminate the Project's significant effects, and to identify feasible measures that mitigate significant effects of the Project. In addition, CEQA requires that an EIR identify those adverse impacts determined to remain significant after mitigation. This Draft EIR provides an analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of the Southeast Policy Area Strategic Plan Project, located in the City of Elk Grove.

This EIR has been prepared as a program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. A program EIR enables the lead agency to consider broad environmental implications of development on a conceptual basis, recognizing that a series of actions will occur prior to development. Because they are prepared relatively early on, program EIRs allow greater flexibility in dealing with overall development options, basic environmental issues, and cumulative impacts.

ES.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The Project includes the following components as directed by the City Council:

- A **Community Plan**, to be adopted as part of the General Plan, which provides policies for development of the Project area.
- The Community Plan would provide for the future development of approximately 1,200 acres in the southern portion of the City. The land use plan would allow for the development of mixed-use, commercial, office, and industrial/flex space that would generate approximately 23,410 new jobs, approximately 4,790 residential units of varying types and densities, three elementary schools, and parks.
- A **Special Planning Area (SPA)**, which is a regulatory tool authorized by Title 23 of the City's Municipal Code. The SPA would provide zoning regulations for the Project area.
- The SPA creates unique development standards for a project when the objectives of the project cannot be addressed through the application of standard zoning regulations as provided in Title 23 (Zoning) of the City's Municipal Code.
- The proposed SPA for the Project establishes the land use pattern, allowed uses, and development standards for land within the SPA. It also includes standards for pedestrian spaces, requirements for building orientation, and design standards for new buildings.

- The SPA includes a detailed land plan that illustrates the location and alignment of specific land use types that make up the SPA. All subsequent development within the SPA will be consistent with this land plan. This map is more detailed and specific than the land plan provided in the Community Plan.
- **Technical studies** covering the following topics, which identify the necessary on- and offsite infrastructure needed to serve the Project: traffic, water, sewer, and drainage.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been identified for the proposed Project:

- 1) Develop a comprehensive master plan for the Southeast Policy Area with a range of job opportunities that are supported by a mix of other land uses.
- 2) Provide land for new employment-generating land uses which will improve the City's jobs-to-housing ratio.
- 3) Provide for the orderly and logical growth and development of the City consistent with the vision in the General Plan.
- 4) Integrate with surrounding land uses through the incorporation of parks and open space, trails, and landscape buffers, and provide for a complete transportation network made up or roadways, sidewalks, trails, and transit (including light rail) to allow for the safe and effective movement of people and goods within the Project area and connect them with other parts of the City and region.

ES.3 Project Alternatives Summary

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and reduce the degree of environmental impact. Section 7.0, Project Alternatives, provides a qualitative analysis of two scenarios:

- Alternative 1 No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2 Reduced Residential/Increased Office Alternative
- Alternative 1 is the only alternative that would be environmentally superior to the proposed Project. However, because it does not meet any of the Project objectives, Alternative 2 was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, although its impacts would be similar, and in some cases worse, than the proposed Project.

ES.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City of Elk Grove was identified as the lead agency for the proposed Project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR on April 19, 2013. This notice was circulated to the public, local, State, and federal agencies, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the proposed Project. The NOP is presented in **Appendix A**.

Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during the preparation of the Draft EIR. Comment letters are presented in **Appendix B**.

Issues raised in comment letters on the NOP include:

- Request for the EIR to analyze the Project's consistency with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's State Implementation Plan.
- The need for a pump station, sewer trunk lines, and other sewer infrastructure to be constructed to serve the Project.
- The need for sewer studies to be prepared.
- On- and off-site impacts associated with the construction of sanitary sewers to provide service to development must be included in the EIR.
- Information on standards requirements for water quality protection.
- Concern regarding the potential impacts that could result from the development of a Soccer Field Complex—in particular concerns regarding late night noise and lighting at the facility, hours of operation, and measures to prevent unauthorized access of the complex, security, whether alcohol will be permitted at the facility, traffic, access to the complex, and parking.
- Concerns regarding the placement of multi-family housing on the south side of Poppy Ridge Road and the potential for impacts associated with number of units, income restrictions on units, height of the buildings, parking and access, and lighting at the site of the multi-family units.
- A Traffic Impact Study may be required.
- The need for the EIR to include an analysis of the Southeast Connector and possible fairshare contribution toward the connector.
- Potential traffic impacts on the State Highway System that may result from the possible sports complex.
- The need for the proposed drainage facilities to be designed with sufficient detention/retention capacity to ensure there is no net increase in runoff, specifically to prevent adverse changes to water service elevations in the vicinity of State Route 99 and Interstate 5.
- Information on the Project's estimated electricity demand and the need for new electrical distribution facilities.

ES.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table ES-1 presents a summary of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance of each environmental impact is indicated both before and after the application of the recommended mitigation measure(s).

For detailed discussions of all project impacts and mitigation measures, the reader is referred to the topical environmental analysis in Section 5.0.

TABLE ES-1
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|-----------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 5.1 Aesthetics | | | | | |
| Impact 5.1.1 | N | None required. | | | N |
| The Project area is not located in the vicinity of, or within view of, a scenic vista or designated state scenic highway. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.1.2 | SU | None available. | | | SU |
| The proposed Project would develop the Project area and permanently alter the character of the area from agricultural uses to a developed urban character with office, light industrial, housing, commercial, and park uses. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.1.3 | PS | MM 5.1.3a | | nd nonresidential project shall | PS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would introduce new sources of light and glare in and around the area. | | | | emonstrates consistency with the 6 of the City Municipal Code ining land uses. | |
| grare in and around the area. | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of improvement plans for all subsequent public and private projects | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; Elk Grove Unified School District | |
| | | MM 5.1.3b | minimize and reduce impacts allowed to use semi-reflective g | n all nonresidential buildings to from glare. Buildings that are glass must be oriented so that the ized. This requirement shall be | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|---------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | included in subsequent developr | ment applications. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final development plans | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.1.4 | CC | None available. | | | CC |
| Development of the proposed Project, in addition to other reasonably foreseeable projects in the region, would introduce new development into an undeveloped agricultural area and contribute to a cumulative increase in urban uses that result in changes in visual character. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.1.5 | CC | Implementation of m | itigation measures MM 5.1.3a and | MM 5.1.3b | CC/SU |
| Development of the proposed Project, in addition to other reasonably foreseeable projects in the region, would introduce new development into an agricultural area and increase nighttime lighting and glare and contribute to regional skyglow. | | | | | |
| 5.2 Agricultural Resources | | | | | |
| Impact 5.2.1 Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the conversion of approximately 1,184 acres of agricultural land, which includes approximately 325 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance and 106 acres of Unique Farmland. The Project would also result in conversion of | S | MM 5.2.1 | Future projects shall protect 1 as of equal or higher quality for each importance or Unique Farmland result of the Project. This pestablishment of a farmland condeed restriction, or other appropriate that ensures the perconversion in perpetuity, but compatible wildlife habitat conse | th acre of Farmland of Statewide I that would be developed as a protection may consist of the proservation easement, farmland propriate farmland conservation of that land from the tall that the state of the conservation of the conservation of the state of the conservation of the c | SU |

S – Significant CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| land under Williamson Act contract. | | hawk foraging habitat mitigation). In deciding whether to approve the land proposed for preservation by the Project applicant, the City shall consider the benefits of preserving farmlands in proximity to other protected lands. The preservation of off-site farmland may be done at one time, prior to the City's approval of the Project's first grading permit, or may be done in increments with the buildout of the Project, with preservation occurring prior to the approval of each grading permit. Grading plans shall include the acreage and type of farmland impacted. In addition, the City shall impose the following minimum conservation easement content standards: | |
| | | a) All owners of the agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation land shall execute the document encumbering the land. | |
| | | The document shall be recordable and contain an accurate legal description of the agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation land. | |
| | | c) The document shall prohibit any activity that substantially impairs or diminishes the agricultural productivity of the land. If the conservation easement is also proposed for wildlife habitat mitigation purposes, the document shall also prohibit any activity that substantially impairs or diminishes the wildlife habitat suitability of the land. | |
| | | d) The document shall protect any existing water rights necessary to maintain agricultural uses on the land covered by the document and retain such water rights for ongoing use on the agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation land. | |
| | | e) Interests in agricultural/habitat mitigation land shall be held in trust, in perpetuity, by the City and/or an entity acceptable to the City. Without the prior written approval of the City, the entity shall not sell, lease, or convey any interest in agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation land. | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|----------------|------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | f) | The applicant shall pay to the habitat mitigation monitoring administering, monitoring, and an amount determined by the exceed 10 percent of the exapplicant, or a different amount Council, not to exceed 15 perpaid by the applicant. | fee to cover the costs of d enforcing the document in the receiving entity, not to assement price paid by the bunt approved by the City | |
| | | | g) | The City shall be named a ben conveying the interest in the mitigation land to an entity according to the conveying the interest in the mitigation land to an entity according to the conveying the co | agricultural/wildlife habitat | |
| | | | h) | If any qualifying entity agricultural/wildlife habitat mit the duty to hold, administer interest shall be transferred to the City. | tigation land ceases to exist, monitor, and enforce the | |
| | | | i) | Before committing to the pre- farmland pursuant to this me shall obtain the City's approve for preservation. | asure, the Project applicant | |
| | | | Tim | ing/Implementation: | Prior to the issuance of grading permits | |
| | | | Enfo | orcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | _ |
| Impact 5.2.2 | LS | None required. | | | | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would place urban land uses adjacent to primarily agricultural uses, which may impair agricultural production and result in land use compatibility conflicts. | | | | | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---|-------|
| Impact 5.2.3 | CC | Implementation of m | itigation measure MM 5.2.1 | | CC/SU |
| The Project would convert approximately 325 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance and 106 acres of Unique Farmland to urban uses. The Project would also result in the conversion of one parcel under Williamson Act contract. This loss would contribute to the cumulative loss of farmland in the region. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.2.4 | LCC | None required. | | | LCC |
| Cumulative projects could result in impairment to agricultural productivity and land use compatibility impacts | | | | | |
| 5.3 Air Quality | | | | | |
| Impact 5.3.1 Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed Project could result in short-term construction emissions that could violate or | PS | MM 5.3.1a | MM 5.3.1a In order to comply with SMAQMD Rucontractors shall be required to water graded areas, storage piles, and haul ruconduction. This requirement note in all future construction plans. | | SU |
| substantially contribute to a violation of federal and state standards for ozone and coarse and fine particulate matter. | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all future grading and construction phases in the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMAQMD | |
| | | MM 5.3.1b | In order to comply with SMAQMD Rule 403, all construction contractors shall limit vehicle speed for on-site construction vehicles to 15 mph. This requirement shall be included as a note on the improvement plan submittal of future development. | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all future grading | |

S – Significant CC – Cumula

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | |
|--------|---|-----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | and construction phases in the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMAQMD | |
| | | MM 5.3.1c | In order to comply with SMAQM contractors shall wash dirt off equipment within the staging construction site. Wet power vacuused to remove any visible tracker public roads at least once a day. Uprohibited. This requirement shall plans of future development. | construction vehicles and area prior to leaving the num street sweepers shall be but mud or dirt on adjacent Use of dry power sweeping is | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all future grading and construction phases in the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMAQMD | |
| | | MM 5.3.1d | In order to comply with SMAQME soil or other materials by truck dur contractors shall maintain 2 feet of shall be covered. This requiremen improvement plans. | ing construction activities, all freeboard, and the materials | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all future grading and construction phases in the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMAQMD | |
| | | MM 5.3.1e | In order to reduce NOx emissi activities, all rubber-tired dozers, and tractors shall be California Air | graders, scrapers, excavators, | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | 3 Certified or better. ¹ | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all future grading and construction phases in the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMAQMD | |
| | | MM 5.3.1f | In order to reduce NOx emiss during all construction activiti prohibition of all on-site trucks under the Heavy-Duty Vehicl Program. | es stating the State-mandated idling in excess of 5 minutes | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all future grading and construction phases in the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; CARB | |
| | | MM 5.3.1g | In order to reduce NOx emissic shall maintain all construction condition according to manu equipment must be checked determined to be running in | equipment in proper working ufacturers' specifications. The by a certified mechanic and | |

S – Significant CC – Cumulatively Considerable LS – Less Than Significant SU – Significant and Unavoidable NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable CS – Cumulative Significant

¹ The Clean Air Act of 1990 directed the EPA to study, and regulate if warranted, the contribution of off-road internal combustion engines to urban air pollution. The first federal standards (Tier 1) for new off-road diesel engines were adopted in 1994 for engines over 50 horsepower and were phased in from 1996 to 2000. In 1996, a Statement of Principles pertaining to off-road diesel engines was signed between the EPA, CARB, and engine makers (including Caterpillar, Cummins, Deere, Detroit Diesel, Deutz, Isuzu, Komatsu, Kubota, Mitsubishi, Navistar, New Holland, Wis-Con, and Yanmar). On August 27, 1998, the EPA signed the final rule reflecting the provisions of the Statement of Principles. The 1998 regulation introduced Tier 1 standards for equipment under 50 horsepower and increasingly more stringent Tier 2 and Tier 3 standards for all equipment with phase-in schedules from 2000 to 2008. As a result, all off-road, diesel-fueled construction equipment manufactured in 2006 or later has been manufactured to Tier 3 standards.

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | operated. | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all future grading and construction phases in the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.3.2 The proposed Project could result in long-term operational emissions that could violate or substantially contribute to a violation of federal and state standards for ozone and coarse and fine particulate matter. | S | MM 5.3.2 | The City shall prepare an Air Quality Management Plan th demonstrates a 15 percent reduction in NOx equivalents for the Southeast Policy Area Project, compared to an unmitigate project. The Air Quality Management Plan shall be submitted the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management Distrifor review and endorsement. | | SU |
| matter. | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to final map approval | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District | |
| Impact 5.3.3 | LS | None required. | | | LS |
| The Project would not contribute to localized concentrations of mobile-source carbon monoxide that would exceed applicable ambient air quality standards. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.3.4 | PS | MM 5.3.4a | | cts within the Project area shall | LS |
| The proposed Project could result in increased exposure of existing or planned sensitive land uses to stationary or mobile-source TACs that would exceed applicable standards. | | | that the heavy-duty (50 horse vehicles to be used in the const owned, leased, and subcontra project-wide fleet-average 20 p percent particulate reduction | y the SMAQMD demonstrating epower [hp] or more) off-road truction of the Project, including actor vehicles, will achieve a percent NOx reduction and 45 compared to the most recent e options for reducing emissions | |

S – Significant CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | may include use of late model e products, alternative fuels, engine treatment products, and/or other available. | e retrofit technology, after- | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Plan shall be submitted to the SMAQMD for review and approval prior to approval of improvement plans and shall be implemented during all grading and construction within the Project area | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMAQMD | |
| | | MM 5.3.4b | Subsequent development projects ensure that emissions from all equipment used do not exceed 40 g 3 minutes in any one hour. Any eq percent opacity (or Ringelmanrimmediately. Noncompliant equipand a summary provided to the Cithe SMAQMD monthly. A visual equipment shall be made at leasummary of the visual survey throughout the duration of constructions summary shall not be required for no construction activity occurs. Tinclude the quantity and type of velof each survey. The SMAQMD conduct periodic site inspections Nothing in this measure shall supstate rules or regulations. | off-road diesel powered bercent opacity for more than uipment found to exceed 40 in 2.0) shall be repaired been shall be documented by Planning Department and survey of all in-operation ast weekly, and a monthly results shall be submitted tion, except that the monthly any 30-day period in which the monthly summary shall nicles surveyed and the dates and/or other officials may to determine compliance. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During all grading and | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitiga | Resulting Level of Significance | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----|--|--|
| | | | construction within the Project area | | | |
| | | Enforcement/Mo | nitoring: City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMAQMD | | | |
| Impact 5.3.5 | LS | None required. | | LS | | |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in increased exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions. | | | | | | |
| Impact 5.3.6 | CC | | mplement mitigation measures MM 5.3.1a through MM 5.3.1g, MM 5.3.2, MM 5.3.4a, | | | |
| The proposed Project in combination with growth throughout the air basin will exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter. | | and MM 5.3.4b . | | | | |
| 5.4 Biological Resources | | | | | | |
| Impact 5.4.1 Implementation of Project-related activities could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modification, to special-status plant species. | PS | Applicants for any subsequent projects shall retain qualified biologists to conduct a preliminary evaluation of the specific project site to determine whether wet meadow, freshwater emergent wetland, or irrigation/drainage ditch vegetative communities occur within the specific project site. If any of these habitats are identified within the specific project site, surveys in and adjacent to (within 100 feet, where appropriate) the proposed impact area, including new construction access routes, shall be conducted to determine the presence/absence of the following special-status plant species. Table 5.4-2 | | | | |
| | | SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT SPECIES (AND ASSOCIATED HABITAT) WITH THE POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN THE PROJECT AREA | | | | |
| | | Vegetative Community | Special-Status Plant Species Survey Requirements | | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitig | Resulting Level of Significance | |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | | dwarf downingia | |
| | | | Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop | |
| | | Wet Meadow | legenere | |
| | | | Heckard's pepper-grass | |
| | | | saline clover | |
| | | | bristly sedge | |
| | | | Peruvian dodder | |
| | | Farshausten Farshaust Westland | Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop | |
| | | Freshwater Emergent Wetland | woolly rose-mallow | |
| | | | Sanford's arrowhead | |
| | | | saline clover | |
| | | | bristly sedge | |
| | | | Peruvian dodder | |
| | | Irrigation/Drainage Ditch | woolly rose-mallow | |
| | | | Northern California black walnut | |
| | | | Sanford's arrowhead | |
| | | Surveys shall be for Surveying a Plant Population guidelines requiproper time of evident and identified with appropriate devite plant species | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | the City for review and approval. | |
| | | If none of the species identified in Table 5.4-2 are found in or adjacent to (within 100 feet) proposed impact areas, no further mitigation is required. | |
| | | If any of the species identified in Table 5.4-2 are found in or adjacent to (within 100 feet) proposed impact areas during the surveys, these plant species shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. Any special-status plant species that are identified adjacent to the Project area, but not proposed to be disturbed by the project, shall be protected by barrier fencing to ensure that construction activities and material stockpiles do not impact any special-status plant species. These avoidance areas shall be identified on site plans and/or, tentative subdivision maps. | |
| | | If Project-related impacts will result in the loss of greater than 10 percent of occupied habitat for a special-status plant species, mitigation shall be required for all impacts that exceed the 10 percent threshold. For example, if 18 percent of occupied habitat will be impacted, mitigation shall only be required for the 8 percent that exceeds the 10 percent threshold. Mitigation for permanent impacts to special-status plant species shall include the preservation of occupied habitat at a 1:1 ratio (i.e., 1 acre preserved for each acre impacted). Temporarily disturbed special-status plant species sites shall be restored to original function and value. | |
| | | Preservation areas may include undisturbed areas of the site that will be preserved and managed in perpetuity, off-site mitigation lands, or a combination of both. The preserved habitat shall be of equal or greater habitat quality to the areas impacted in terms of soil features, extent of disturbance, and vegetation structure, and contain extant populations of the same or greater size as the area impacted. | |
| | | Plans for avoidance, minimization, and mitigation (if | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|----|
| | | | appropriate) shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Elk Grove Planning Department at the time of application for the City's review and approval. Surveys shall occur no more than two years prior to ground breaking of the subsequent project. | | |
| | | | Alternatively if the SSHCP is imple participate in the SSHCP in lieu of SSHCP meets the intent of mitigation | this mitigation measure if the | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final map. Protection of plant resources and restoration of temporarily affected plant population shall occur throughout construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.2 Implementation of Project-related activities could result in impacts, either directly or through habitat modification, to vernal pool fairy shrimp and/or vernal pool tadpole shrimp. | PS | MM 5.4.2 | Applicants shall retain qualified biologists to conduct a preliminary evaluation of the specific project site to determine whether vernal pool fairy shrimp and/or vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat occurs on or within 250 feet of the project area. If habitat is not present, project applicants shall submit a letter of their findings to the City and the USFWS for concurrence. If the USFWS concurs with the negative survey findings, project applicants shall submit proof of concurrence to the City with their application, and no further mitigation is required. If the USFWS does not concur, applicants shall undertake surveys or assume presence based on the USFWS's direction. | | LS |
| | | | If it is determined that listed ve present, the following mitigation is | | |
| | | | For every acre of vernal pool had applicants shall replace the affected | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|----------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | creation for each acre of impac vernal pool creation credit(s) mitigation bank. | | |
| | | | For every acre of vernal pool habitat directly and indirectly affected, the project applicant shall replace the affected acreage at a 2:1 ratio (2 acres of preservation for every 1 acre of impact) through the dedication of vernal pool preservation credit(s) within a USFWS-approved mitigation bank. Other conservation measures may be required by the USFWS. | | |
| | | | Alternatively if the SSHCP is implemented, future projects may participate in the SSHCP in lieu of this mitigation measure if the SSHCP meets the intent of mitigation measure MM 5.4.2 . | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final map | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.3 Implementation of Project-related activities could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to VELB. | PS | MM 5.4.3 | Applicants shall retain a qualified biologist to survey for the presence of elderberry shrubs with stems measuring greater than 1-inch diameter at ground level. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the USFWS 1999 Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. If no elderberry shrubs with one or more stems measuring 1 inch or greater in diameter at ground level are documented, no further mitigation is required. Survey results shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. | | LS |
| | | | If an elderberry shrub(s) with one inch or greater in diameter at groun 100-foot avoidance buffer can be the following protective measures | nd level is documented, and a maintained around the shrub, | |
| | | | Fence and flag all areas to be activities. In areas where ence | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | buffer has been approved by the USFWS, provide a minimum setback of at least 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry plant. | |
| | | Brief contractors on the need to avoid damaging the elderberry plants and the possible penalties for not complying with these requirements. | |
| | | 3) Erect signs every 50 feet along the edge of the avoidance area with the following information: "This area is habitat of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, a threatened species, and must not be disturbed. This species is protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Violators are subject to prosecution, fines, and imprisonment." The signs should be clearly readable from a distance of 20 feet and must be maintained for the duration of construction. | |
| | | Instruct work crews about the status of the beetle and the need to protect its elderberry host plant. | |
| | | 5) Restore any damage done to the buffer area (area within 100 feet of elderberry plants) during construction. Provide erosion control and revegetate with appropriate native plants. | |
| | | 6) Continue to protect buffer areas after construction from adverse effects of the Project. Measures such as fencing, signs, weeding, and trash removal are usually appropriate. | |
| | | 7) Do not use insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers, or other chemicals that might harm the beetle or its host plant in the buffer areas or within 100 feet of any elderberry plant with one or more stems measuring 1 inch or more in diameter at ground level. | |
| | | 8) Project applicants shall provide a written description of how the buffer areas are to be restored, protected, and maintained after construction is completed to the USFWS | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | and the City of Elk Grove Planning Department. | |
| | | 9) Mowing of grasses/ground cover shall only occur from July through April to reduce fire hazard. No moving shall occur within 5 feet of elderberry plant stems. Mowing shall be done in a manner that avoids damaging plants (e.g., stripping away bark through careless use of mowing/trimming equipment). | |
| | | If elderberry plants cannot be avoided, they must be transplanted to a conservation area in accordance with the 1999 USFWS guidelines, with USFWS approval. A plant that is unlikely to survive transplantation because of poor condition or location, or a plant that would be extremely difficult to move because of access problems, may be exempted from transplantation through consultation with the USFWS. In addition to transplanting all elderberry shrubs, additional elderberry seedlings or cuttings shall be planted at a 1:1 ratio (new plantings to affected stems). Native plants shall also be planted at a 1:1 ratio (native tree/plant species to each elderberry seedling or cutting). Stock of saplings, cuttings, and seedlings shall be obtained from local sources. If the parent stock is obtained from a distance greater than 1 mile from the conservation area, the USFWS must approve the plant donor sites prior to initiation of revegetation work. Planting or seeding the conservation area with native herbaceous species is encouraged. | |
| | | Alternatively if the SSHCP is implemented, future projects may participate in the SSHCP in lieu of this mitigation measure if the SSHCP meets the intent of mitigation measure MM 5.4.3 . | |
| | | Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of final maps on parcels proposed for development that contain VELB habitat, as depicted on Figure 5.4-4 | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | of the Draft EIR. Construction minimization measures shall occur during construction activities | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.4 Implementation of Project-related activities could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to western pond turtle. | PS | MM 5.4.4a | Protective silt fencing shall be i habitats and the construction are disturbance and to protect water during construction. Timing/Implementation: | e installed between the aquatic area limits to prevent accidental | LS |
| | | MM 5.4.4b | Enforcement/Monitoring: Standard best management pracduring and after construction to prhabitat areas during construction. | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final map for development that contains western pond turtle habitat, as depicted on Figure 5.4-4 of the Draft EIR. Construction | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | minimization measures shall occur during construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.4.4c | Prior to implementation of constrapplicants with specific project sit features identified on Figure 5 biologists to conduct a survey for than 3 days prior to initiation of species is documented near any the individual(s) shall be moved at suitable habitat. If individuals are activities, all construction activities biologist shall be notified, and relocate the individual prior activities. | es within 100 feet of aquatic 5.4-4 shall retain qualified western pond turtle no more construction activities. If this proposed construction areas, least 500 feet downstream to observed during construction s shall be halted, a qualified the qualified biologist shall | |
| | | | If active nest sites are identified of applicant shall impose a construct active nest sites prior to comment activities to avoid construction or western pond turtles until the eggs an appropriate location as authorization. | tion setback of 100 feet for all neement of any construction access-related disturbances to hatch or the nest is moved to | |
| | | | Alternatively if the SSHCP is implementation participate in the SSHCP in lieu of SSHCP meets the intent of mitigation | this mitigation measure if the | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final map for development that contains western pond turtle habitat, as depicted on Figure 5.4-4 of the Draft EIR. Construction | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|-----------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | minimization measures shall occur during construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.5 Implementation of Project-related activities could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications to giant garter spake. | PS | MM 5.4.5a | All projects within the SEPA at shall implement the avoidance outlined in Appendix C Standard Measures During Construction A (Thamnophis gigas) Habitat (USF) | and minimization measures Avoidance and Minimization ctivities in Giant Garter Snake | LS |
| modifications, to giant garter snake. | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final map for proposed developments that contain giant garter snake habitat. Construction minimization measures shall occur during construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.4.5b | The Shed C Channel restoration guidelines for outlined in <i>Appendand/or Replacement of Giant C</i> 1997). | lix A Guidelines for Restoration | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | During the Shed C Channel restoration project. | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.4.5c | If USFWS determines that repla fulfilled in association with the | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | effort shall be implemented in accordance with Table 1 – Summary of Giant Garter Snake Conservation Measures found in Appendix C Standard Avoidance and Minimization Measures During Construction Activities in Giant Garter Snake (Thamnophis gigas) Habitat (USFWS 1997). | | |
| | | | Alternatively, if the SSHCP is implementation of the SSHCP in lieu of SSHCP meets the intent of mitigation | this mitigation measure if the | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final map for proposed developments that contain giant garter snake habitat | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.6 Implementation of Project-related activities could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to burrowing owl. | PS | MM 5.4.6 | Applicants shall retain a qualif whether suitable nesting habitat of specific project site. If suitable has must be performed by a qualified the CDFW's Staff Report on published March 7, 2012. Surveys activities are suspended or delayed nesting season. | ccurs within 500 feet of the abitat exists, focused surveys biologist in accordance with Burrowing Owl Mitigation, as shall be repeated if project | LS |
| | | | If no burrowing owls are detect required. If active burrowing owl project applicant shall implement and mitigation methodologies ou Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation related activities that may impact owl surveys are valid for one year for the surveys are year. | nest sites are detected, the the avoidance, minimization, tilined in the CDFW's <i>Staff</i> ion prior to initiating project- burrowing owls. Burrowing | |
| | | | Alternatively if the SSHCP is imple participate in the SSHCP in lieu of | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|-----------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | SSHCP meets the intent of mitigat | ion measure MM 5.4.6 . | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final maps. Construction minimization measures shall occur throughout construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.7 Implementation of Project-related activities could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to foraging and nesting Swainson's hawk, nesting white-tailed kites, and other protected raptor species. | PS | MM 5.4.7a | raptor nesting season (January 1 surveys to identify active raptor qualified biologist within 14 day specific project sites. Focused su qualified biologist for the presence/absence of active nest si area, including construction act buffer. If no active nests are for required. Surveys shall be repeated. | paring and/or construction activities would occur during the or nesting season (January 15–August 15), preconstruction eys to identify active raptor nests shall be conducted by a field biologist within 14 days of construction initiation in ific project sites. Focused surveys must be performed by a field biologist for the purposes of determining ence/absence of active nest sites within the proposed impact including construction access routes and a 1,000-foot er. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation is ired. Surveys shall be repeated if construction activities are yeld or postponed for more than 30 days. | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | measures shall occur throughout construction City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | MA | MM 5.4.7b | If active white-tailed kite or othe hawk) nest sites are identified activities, the applicant shall impactive nest sites prior to corconstruction activities to avoid disturbances to nesting raptors. | r raptor (excluding Swainson's within 1,000 feet of Project lose an 500-foot setback of all numencement of any Project construction or access-related | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | vegetation removal, earth moving, and construction) will not occur within the setback until the nest is deemed inactive. Activities permitted within setbacks and the size of setbacks may be adjusted through consultation with the CDFW and/or the City. If active Swainson's hawk nest sites are identified within 1,000 feet of project activities, the applicant shall impose a 1,000-foot setback of all active nest sites prior to commencement of any construction activities to avoid construction or access-related disturbances to nesting raptors. Project-related activities (i.e., vegetation removal, earth moving, and construction) will not occur within the setback until the nest is deemed inactive. Activities permitted within setbacks and the size of setbacks may be adjusted through consultation with the CDFW and/or the City. | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final maps. Minimization measures shall occur throughout construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.4.7c | Trees containing white-tailed kite Swainson's hawk) nests that must Project implementation shall be breeding season (September 1–Jan State and federally listed as a timpacts to Swainson's hawk nauthorization from the USFWS and | to be removed as a result of e removed during the non- uary 1). Swainson's hawks are hreatened species; therefore, est trees require regulatory | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final maps. Construction minimization measures shall occur throughout | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.4.7d | Project applicants shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat at a 1:1 ratio consistent with Elk Grove Municipal Code (EGMC) Chapter 16.130, Swainson's hawk Impact Mitigation Fees. Alternatively if the SSHCP is implemented, future projects may participate in the SSHCP in lieu of this mitigation measure if the SSHCP meets the intent of the Code Chapter 16.130. | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final maps | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.8 Implementation of Project-related activities could result loss of populations or essential habitat for tricolored blackbird and other special-status avian species. | PS | MM 5.4.8 | If clearing and/or construction activities would occur during the migratory bird nesting season (March 15–August 15), preconstruction surveys to identify active bird nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days of construction initiation on specific project sites. Focused surveys must be performed by a qualified biologist for the purpose of determining the presence/absence of active nest sites within the proposed impact area and a 200-foot buffer (if accessible). Surveys shall be repeated if construction activities are delayed or postponed for more than 30 days. | | LS |
| | | | If active nest sites are identified activities, project applicants shall all active nest sites prior to conconstruction activities to avoid disturbances to bird nesting activ (i.e., vegetation removal, earth mot occur within setbacks until | impose a 100-foot setback for mmencement of any project construction or access-related ities. Project-related activities oving, and construction) will | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|-----------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | Activities permitted within and the size (i.e., 100 feet) of setbacks may be adjusted through consultation with the CDFW and/or the City. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final maps. Construction minimization measures shall occur throughout construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.9 Implementation of Project activities could result in the loss of riparian vegetation, sensitive natural communities, and/or federally protected wetlands. | PS | MM 5.4.9a | determine if potentially jurisdict potentially jurisdictional features applicant shall submit a prelimina | Applicants shall retain a qualified wetland consultant to determine if potentially jurisdictional waters are present. If potentially jurisdictional features are identified, the project applicant shall submit a preliminary jurisdictional determination to the USACE for verification. The verified delineation will be submitted to the City for its records. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final maps | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | MM 5.4.9b Applicants shall ensure there is no net loss of riparian vegetation. Mitigation as required in regulatory permits issued through the CDFW, the USACE, or the RWQCB may be applied to satisfy this measure. | | | | |
| | | | Evidence of compliance with this provided to the City prior to cons for the proposed Project. | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of final maps. Construction minimization measures | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | shall occur throughout construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.4.9c | result in no net loss of federally avoidance, impact minimiz mitigation, as determined in CV and/or a 1602 Streambed Altocompliance with this mitigation | that their specific projects would protected waters through impact ration, and/or compensatory VA Section 404 and 401 permits reation Agreement. Evidence of measure shall be provided prior vities for each proposed project. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval final maps | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.4.10 | LS | None required. | | | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.4.11 | NI | None required. | | | NI |
| Development of the Project area could result in the loss of protected tree species and removal of Swainson's hawk habitat, which could conflict with the City's Municipal Code. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.4.12 | NI | None required. | | | NI |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of | | | | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. | | | | |
| Impact 5.4.13 | CC | Implementation of | mitigation measures MM 5.4.1 through MM 5.4.9.c | SU |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would contribute to the loss of biological resources in the region, as well as ongoing urbanization in southern Sacramento County. | | | | |
| 5.5 Cultural Resources | | | | |
| Impact 5.5.1 Construction of the proposed Project could adversely affect or result in the damage of potential or unknown cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, historic buildings/structures, and isolated artifacts) and human remains. | PS | MM 5.5.1a | If cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts) are discovered during grading or construction activities within the Project area, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City Planning Department shall be notified, and a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in archaeology and/or history shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. The City shall consider mitigation recommendations presented by a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in archaeology and/or history for any unanticipated discoveries. The City and the Project applicant of the site where the discovery is made | LS |
| | | | shall consult and agree on implementation of a measure or measures that the City deems feasible. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The Project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of cultural resources. Timing/Implementation: As a condition of Project | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|-----------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | approval and implemented during grading or construction activities | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.5.1b | If human remains are discovered activities within the Project area immediately within 50 feet of the Department shall be notified, and notified according to Section 509 Resources Code and Section 705 and Safety Code. If the remains a American, the coroner will notify the Commission, and the procedures 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be follower. | a, all work shall be halted discovery, the City Planning the County Coroner must be 7.98 of the California Public 0.5 of the California Health are determined to be Native the Native American Heritage outlined in CEQA Section | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | As a condition of Project approval and implemented during grading or construction activities | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.5.1c | Prior to the approval of subsequent the Project area that have not all presence of cultural resources, a de survey of the subject property sha and funded by the applicant. The of shall identify any cultural resour measures to mitigate any impacts the defined by CEQA, the California R and/or the National Historic F | ready been evaluated for the etailed cultural resources field all be conducted by the City cultural resources field survey tree finds and will set out to any significant resources as degister of Historic Resources, | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|-----------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | methods to be employed inclufollowing: | de, but are not limited to, the | |
| | | | the resource. The resource | t development project to avoid ce site shall be deeded to a approved by the City for | |
| | | | | to be infeasible by the City, the stabilized, and capped pursuant | |
| | | | | easible by the City, the resource orded to appropriate standards. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of each application | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| | | MM 5.5.1d | Prior to the approval of subseq include the residences at 780 Kammerer Road, a detailed significance of the structures at be conducted by the City and evaluation is negative (i.e., r further mitigation is required. | evaluation of the historical the two sites listed above shall funded by the applicant. If the | |
| | | | If the evaluation determines that historically significant, the sub will be redesigned to avoid the site(s) will be deeded to a nong the City for the maintenance determined to be infeasible by prepare a treatment plan to mi resources, if appropriate, documentation (in addition to the site of the sub- | historical site(s). The historical profit agency to be approved by of the site(s). If avoidance is y the City, the applicant will nimize adverse effects, relocate and conduct all required | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|----------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | with appropriate standards: | |
| | | | a. The development of a site-specific history and appropriate contextual information regarding the particular resource; in addition to archival research and comparative studies, this task could involve limited oral history collection. | |
| | | | b. Accurate mapping of the noted resource(s), scaled to indicate size and proportion of the structure(s). | |
| | | | c. Architectural description of affected structures. | |
| | | | d. Photo documentation of the designated resources, both in still and video format. | |
| | | | Recordation of measured architectural drawings, in the case of specifically designated buildings of higher architectural merit. | |
| | | | f. Any historical significant artifacts within buildings and the surrounding area shall be recorded and deposited with the appropriate museum. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of demolition permits or subsequent development projects involving the properties at 7809 Kammerer Road and 8011 Kammerer Road | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.5.2 Construction of the proposed Project could adversely affect or result in the damage of unknown paleontological resources (i.e., | PS | MM 5.5.2 | If any paleontological resources (fossils) are discovered during grading or construction activities within the Project area, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, and the City Planning Department shall be immediately notified. At that time, the City will coordinate any necessary investigation of | LS |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS - Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| fossils and fossil formations). | | the discovery with a qualified paleontologist. | |
| | | The City shall consider the mitigation recommendations of the qualified paleontologist for any unanticipated discoveries of paleontological resources. The City and the appropriate project applicant shall consult and agree on implementation of a measure or measures that the City deems feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of paleontological resources. | |
| | | Timing/Implementation: As a condition of project approval and implemented during ground-disturbing activities | |
| | | Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.5.3 | PCC | Implement mitigation measures MM 5.5.1a and MM 5.5.1b. | LCC |
| Development of the proposed Project could contribute to the cumulative disturbance of cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic buildings/structures, and isolated artifacts and features) and human remains. | | | |
| Impact 5.5.4 | CC | Implement mitigation measure MM 5.5.2. | LCC |
| Development of the proposed Project could contribute to the cumulative disturbance of paleontological resources (i.e., fossils and fossil formations). | | | |

S – Significant CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 5.6 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity | | | |
| Impact 5.6.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| The Project area is not located in an area that is susceptible to adverse impacts associated with seismic ground failure, including surface rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslides. | | | |
| Impact 5.6.2 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Future development resulting from the proposed Project, including buildings, pavement, and utilities, would require grading activities that could result in the potential for loss of topsoil and erosion. | | | |
| Impact 5.6.3 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Future development resulting from the proposed Project, including buildings, pavement, and utilities, could incur damage as a result of underlying expansive or unstable soil properties. All development is required to comply with applicable building codes and commonly accepted engineering practices that address these conditions. | | | |
| Impact 5.6.4 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would not contribute to cumulative geologic and soil impacts, as the impacts would be site-specific. | | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | | | |
| Impact 5.7.1 The proposed Project would result in a net increase in GHG emissions, yet would not result in a significant impact on the environment. | PCC | MM 5.7.1 | Prior to building permit approval, the City of Elk Grove Planning Department shall require that project applicants implement the following measures to reduce emissions of GHGs associated with the proposed Project, based on the referenced measures from the City's CAP and the City of Elk Grove Municipal Code: | LCC |
| | | | All buildings constructed shall achieve Tier 1 of Title 24, Part 1 green building standards to exceed minimum Title 24 energy efficiency standards by 15 percent, consistent with CAP Measure BE-6. | |
| | | b. Individual projects shall provide prewiring or conduit for solar photovoltaic (PV) in each future building, consistent with CAP Measure BE-10. The intent of prewiring for solar PV systems is to reduce barriers to later installation of onsite solar PVs. Future development under the proposed Project may also satisfy the intent of this mitigation by installing on-site solar PV systems. | | |
| | | | c. Future nonresidential land uses under the Project shall provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas, consistent with CAP Measure RC-1. Composting of a limited amount of food waste that may be generated as a byproduct of on-site food preparation shall be completed by agreement with a waste hauler. Cooking oils shall be directed off-site for reuse. | |
| | | | d. All parking lots for future shopping centers or office developments constructed as part of the proposed Project shall include designated carpool parking spaces near store entries, implementing CAP Measure TACM-3. | |
| | | | e. Future development under the Project shall provide bicycle parking at a ratio of 1 bicycle parking space per 20 vehicle | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | parking spaces, consistent with CAP Measure TACM-5. Provision of additional bicycle support facilities such as lockers and shower facilities, consistent with voluntary CAP Measure TACM-5, may qualify the applicant for eligibility to request a reduction in the minimum number of parking spaces required, pursuant to Elk Grove Municipal Code Sections 23.58.060 and 23.16.037. | |
| | | f. During the design review process, future development applicants shall demonstrate compliance with CAP Measure TACM-5 by showing an analysis of office and mixed-use building connections and orientation to pedestrian paths, bicycle paths, and existing transit stops within a half mile of the Project site. As feasible, all such Project components shall orient development toward an existing transit, bicycle, or pedestrian corridor with minimum setbacks, or support equivalent pedestrian, bicycle, or alternative transportation through other methods. | |
| | | g. Future development under the proposed Project shall minimize setbacks from the street, provide pedestrian pathways, and use design features for entrances and parking lots to encourage pedestrian access and safety between transit facilities, consistent with CAP Measure TACM-5. | |
| | | h. Indoor water conservation measures shall be incorporated, such as use of low-flow toilets, urinals, and faucets. | |
| | | Future development under the Project shall ensure that low- water-use landscaping (i.e., drought-tolerant plants and drip irrigation) is installed. At least 75 percent of all landscaping plants shall be drought-tolerant as determined by a licensed landscape architect or contractor and in conformance with Chapters 14.10 and 23.54 of the Elk Grove Municipal Code. | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to final design, building permit issuance | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | | | |
| Impact 5.8.1 | LS | None required. | | | LS |
| Construction and/or operation of the proposed Project would involve the routine transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, which could create a potential health hazard to the public or environment. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.8.2 | LS | None required. | | | LS |
| Development of the proposed Project may expose residents and users of the site to hazardous conditions resulting from an incident at the Suburban Propane facility. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.8.3 | PS | MM 5.8.3a | | ent plans and/or a grading permit t area that have not already been | LS |
| Construction and demolition activities conducted as part of Project development could potentially result in the release of hazardous materials, which could expose construction workers to hazards. | | | evaluated for the potential materials and hazardous con prepared by a qualified profes ESA shall assess the potential measures for cleaning up has applicants shall implement all in Phase I ESA to the satisfaction of Department and the Sacra Management Department. | for the presence of hazardous ditions, Phase I ESAs shall be sional. Each subsequent Phase I al for hazards and recommend zards, if present. Future project measures as recommended in the of the City Development Services amento County Environmental | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of improvement plans and/or | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | |
|--------|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | grading plans | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; Sacramento County Environmental Management Department | |
| | | MM 5.8.3b | With each improvement plan and the Project applicant shall include contamination associated with pre on the site. Soil sampling shall be optential herbicide/pesticide contadtected at concentrations that cand/or violate local, State, or remediation of the affected are accordance with the requirements the Sacramento County Er Department. Development of the sthe site is deemed remediated and City in consultation with the Sacra Management Department. | a detailed assessment of soil vious herbicide/pesticide use conducted within the areas of amination. If substances are could pose a health hazard federal health standards, as shall be undertaken in of the City of Elk Grove and avironmental Management ite shall not commence until clear for development by the | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of improvement plans and/or grading plans | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; Sacramento County Environmental Management Department | |
| | | MM 5.8.3c | Prior to the issuance of demolition structures constructed prior to 197 shall be conducted to determine if materials are present. Any idea building materials present in ear dismantled shall be removed un | 9, asbestos material sampling asbestos containing building ntified asbestos containing ch of the structures to be | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|-----------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | methods and work practices by a contractor prior to removal. These limited to: containment of the a filtration, wet removal technique protection and decontamination. T and monitored by a California C The abatement and monitoring p submitted for review and app Metropolitan Air Quality Managem | practices include, but are not urea by plastic, negative air es, and personal respiratory he process shall be designed ertified Asbestos Consultant. Ian shall be developed and proval by the Sacramento | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to the issuance of demolition permits | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District | |
| | | MM 5.8.3d | Prior to the issuance of demolitic structures that were constructed peeling paint shall be removed an and certified lead paint removal colocal, State, and federal regulation shall be informed that all paint considered as containing lead. precautions in accordance with regulations to protect his/her community, and to dispose of colead paint. | prior to 1970, all loose and and disposed of by a licensed contractor, in accordance with as. The demolition contractor on the buildings shall be The contractor shall take a local, state, and federal workers, the surrounding | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to the issuance of demolition permits and included in construction contracts | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | MM 5.8.3e | Prior to approval of improvement properties to currently contain, dairy operations applicant shall retain a qualified prepare a Phase 2 environmental Phase 2 ESA shall incorporate soil dairy operations or the presence of and/or groundwater contamination determines that the property dogroundwater contamination, cleanut debris piles may proceed in according to the Sacramento County EDepartment. Hazardous materials and appropriate hazardous waste as | hat formerly contained, or or debris piles, the Project environmental consultant to site assessment (ESA). The testing to determine if past f debris piles resulted in soil on. If the Phase 2 ESA es not contain soil and/or p of the dairy operations and dance with the requirements nvironmental Management and wastes shall be disposed | |
| | | | In the event that the Phase 2 ESA operations and/or debris piles had groundwater contamination, the preparing the Phase 2 ESA shall proclean up and remediation. All rem to the cleanup standards for the proposed on the subject proper completed to the satisfaction of Environmental Management Depart | environmental consultant vide a detailed work plan for ediation work shall be done particular land use being orty. Remediation shall be of the Sacramento County | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of improvement plans and/or grading plans | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; Sacramento County Environmental Management Department | |
| | | MM 5.8.3f | Prior to approval of improvement properties that of | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|---|-----|
| | | | Planning Department shall consult with SMUD, which owns and operates the transformers, to determine whether onsite transformers are to be abandoned, moved, upgraded, etc. Together, the City Planning Department and SMUD shall develop a plan for dealing with all of the transformers located within the Project area. Future actions associated with the transformers may be implemented as individual development Projects are proposed. | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of improvement plans and/or grading plans | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Planning Department; SMUD | |
| Impact 5.8.4 | LCC | None required. | | | LCC |
| Cumulative development within the City would increase handling, storage, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials within the Project area. However, cumulative development, including the proposed Project, would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations that would govern the handling, storage, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials. | | | | | |
| 5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality | | | | | |
| Impact 5.9.1 | LS | None required. | | | LS |
| Development within the proposed Project area would include construction-related activities that could expose soil to erosion during storm events, causing degradation of water quality. Urban runoff from the | | | | | |

S – Significant CC – C

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Project area post-construction could also contribute to the degradation of downstream water quality. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.9.2 Urbanization of the Project area would increase stormwater runoff and alter existing drainage patterns, potentially resulting in flooding. The Project includes a drainage plan to accommodate increased flows. | PS | MM 5.9.2a | accompanied by site-specific drain the Southeast Policy Area Drainage reports shall be reviewed and approper policy and provided the Public Works such temporary or interim imp development of the drainage mass Southeast Policy Area Drainage Studies and provided the Public Works such temporary or interim imp development of the drainage studies. | plications within the Project area shall be specific drainage reports consistent with the Project drainage Study. The project drainage wed and approved by the Public Works improvement plan approval for new roject drainage report shall include, at a taddressing existing conditions, the effects ments, all appropriate calculations, a notial increases in downstream flows and on-site improvements, and drainage ry, to accommodate flows from the site. In the peak flows eas do not exceed pre-development ry or interim improvements may be Public Works Department has determined interim improvements do not impede drainage master plan contained in the | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: Enforcement/Monitoring: | Prior to improvement plan approval City of Elk Grove Public Works Department | |
| | | MM 5.9.2b | Grading plans for individual develor area shall be designed in such a wainto proposed on-site detention be separate stormwater quality tree constructed and a detailed drainage which demonstrates that the objective hydromodification goals for the vertical areas of the state of t | ay to direct all overland flow asins. If this is not feasible, tatment facilities shall be ge study shall be completed overall flood control and | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | City's SDMP, are still met. | |
| | | Timing/Implementation: As a condition of Project approval and implemented during review of individual development projects | |
| | | Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Public Works Department | |
| Impact 5.9.3 | LS | None required. | LS |
| The proposed Project would result in increased use of groundwater from the Central Basin to meet domestic demand. The total water demand would not exceed the basin's sustainable yield. | | | |
| Impact 5.9.4 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Development of the Project area, in combination with other development in Drainage Shed C, would alter existing drainage patterns and result in water quality degradation. | | | |
| Impact 5.9.5 | LCC | | LCC |
| Development of the Project area, in combination with other development in Drainage Shed C, would increase stormwater runoff and alter existing drainage patterns. | | None required. | |
| Impact 5.9.6 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Development of the Project area, in combination with other development | | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| within the SCWA's Zone 40, would increase demand for groundwater and could potentially interfere with recharge of the aquifer. | | | | |
| 5.10 Noise | | | | |
| Impact 5.10.1 | PS | MM 5.10.1 | The following mitigation measures shall be implemented and specified on all project implementation plans: | SU |
| Construction activities could result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses, which may result in increased levels of annoyance, activity interference, and sleep disruption. | | a. Construction activities (excluding emergency work and activities that would result in a safety concern to the public or construction workers) shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Construction activities shall be prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays. | | |
| | | | Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. | |
| | | | Construction equipment staging areas shall be centrally located on the Project site or located at the farthest distance possible from nearby residential land uses. | |
| | | | d. All motorized construction equipment and vehicles shall be turned off when not in use. | |
| | | | e. To the extent practical, alternative construction processes that generate lower noise levels should be selected. Examples include the use of drilled piles as opposed to impact piles, and the use of electrified equipment as opposed to combustion engines. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: Prior to and during construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Planning | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | Department | |
| Impact 5.10.2 | LS | None required. | | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels along some area roadways. However, predicted traffic noise levels at existing land uses would not be projected to exceed applicable City noise standards. | | | | |
| Impact 5.10.3 Implementation of the proposed Project may result in non-transportation noise levels that could exceed applicable noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. | PS | MM 5.10.3 | The City shall require acoustical assessments to be prepared as part of the environmental review process for future land use development projects. The acoustical assessments shall evaluate potential environmental noise impacts attributable to the proposed Project, as well as the compatibility of proposed land uses in comparison to applicable City noise standards. Where the acoustical analysis determines that noise levels would exceed applicable City noise standards, noise reduction measures shall be identified and included in the Project. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the incorporation of setbacks, sound barriers, berms, hourly limitations, or equipment enclosures. The emphasis of such measures shall be placed on site planning and Project design. The acoustical analysis shall be prepared in accordance with City requirements, as noted in the City's General Plan, Table NO-B, Requirements for Acoustical Analysis. | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: Prior to construction | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |
| Impact 5.10.4 Groundborne vibration levels associated with construction activities and planned | PS | MM 5.10.4 | A vibration impact assessment shall be prepared for construction projects that would involve the use of major vibration-generating equipment (e.g., pile drivers, vibratory rollers) that | SU |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| transit facilities may exceed applicable groundborne vibration criterion at nearby land uses. | | could generate groundborne vibration levels in excess of 0.2 in/sec ppv at nearby structures (refer to Table 5.10-12 for distances to the projected 0.2 in/sec ppv contours). Measures to reduce ground vibration levels shall be identified for potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, changes in site design and/or use of alternative construction techniques (e.g., sonic or drilled piles). | |
| | | A vibration impact assessment shall be prepared for the development of on-site transit facilities, as well as planned land uses that could be exposed to high levels of transit-generated ground vibration levels (refer to Table 5.10-13 for distances to potentially significant transit-related vibration contours). Vibration-reduction measures shall be identified for groundborne vibration levels in excess of 0.2 in/sec ppv at nearby structures. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, incorporation of building setbacks, and improvements to LRT track, including the use of track ballast mats, high-resilience fasteners, welded track, and/or a floating slab trackbed. | |
| | | Timing/Implementation: Prior to/during environmental review process | |
| | | Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Planning Department | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS - Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Impact 5.10.5 | PS | Implement mitigation measures MM 5.10.3 and MM 5.10.4 | SU |
| Projected on-site noise levels at proposed on-site land uses associated with vehicular traffic on nearby roadways and on-site light-rail transit operations could potentially exceed the City's noise standards for land use compatibility. | | | |
| Impact 5.10.6 | CC | Implement mitigation measure MM 5.10.3. | CC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would result in a substantial contribution to cumulative noise levels along some area roadways. | | | |
| Impact 5.10.7 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in a substantial contribution to cumulative construction noise levels in the Project area. | | | |
| 5.11 Public Services | | | |
| Impact 5.11.1.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would increase demand for fire protection services, which could trigger the need for additional fire stations, the construction of which could result in impacts on the physical environment. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.1.2 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development within the CCSD's service area, would | | | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.2.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would increase demand for law enforcement services, which could trigger the need for additional law enforcement personnel, equipment, and facilities, the construction of which could result in impacts on the physical environment. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.2.2 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development within the City of Elk Grove, would increase demand for law enforcement services. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.3.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the generation of schoolaged children requiring the construction of new public school facilities, the construction of which could have impacts on the physical environment. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.3.2 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development in the EGUSD service area, would result in the generation of additional students. Each project would be required to pay development fees on a project-by-project | | | |

S – Significant CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| basis, which would fund school facility construction. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.4.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would increase demand for park and recreation facilities, the construction of which could result in impacts on the physical environment. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.4.2 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Individual development projects within the Project area would be reviewed to ensure compliance with the Elk Grove Trails Master Plan. | | | |
| Impact 5.11.4.3 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development within the CCSD service area, would result in a cumulative increase in demand for parkland and recreational facilities, the construction of which could impact the physical environment. | | | |
| 5.12 Public Utilities | | | |
| Impact 5.12.1.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would increase demand for domestic water supply. However, the Sacramento County Water Agency has determined that sufficient water supplies are available to serve the proposed Project. | | | |

S – Significant CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Impact 5.12.1.2 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would not require the construction of new and expanded water supply infrastructure that could result in impacts to the physical environment. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.1.3 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development within the SCWA's Zone 40, would increase demand for domestic water supply. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.2.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the generation of wastewater, which would require treatment at the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. There is adequate capacity within the SRCSD's existing treatment plant. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.2.2 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would require the construction of new and expanded wastewater infrastructure, which could result in impacts to the physical environment. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.2.3 | CC | None available. | CC/SU |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development in | | | |

S – Significant CC – Cumulat

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| the SRCSD service area, would generate significant new wastewater flows requiring conveyance and treatment. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.3.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate solid waste, thereby increasing demand for waste collection and disposal services. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.3.2 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development in the City, would generate solid waste, thereby increasing demand for hauling and disposal services. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.4.1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would increase demand for electric, natural gas, and telephone services. | | | |
| Impact 5.12.4.2 | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other development within the service areas of the applicable providers, would increase demand for electric, natural gas, and telephone services. | | | |
| 5.13 Transportation | | | |
| Impact 5.13.1 Implementation of the proposed Project | PS | The City shall require the completion of roadway improvements necessary to mitigate for the potential traffic impact from the Project as those improvements are triggered by subsequent development projects. If improvements are triggered by the subsequent | SU |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable

NI - No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| would result in a decline in service at seven intersections within the study area. | | improvement. Subsec | project, the project proponent shall be responsible for implementation of the improvement. Subsequent projects that do not trigger improvements shall pay its fair share toward improvements. The following shall be implemented: | | |
| | | MM 5.13.1a The City shall establish an analysis and tracking mechanism to determine when the roadway improvements identified in this EIR are triggered. | | | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of subsequent development projects | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Public Works Department | |
| | MM 5.13.1b The City shall require that the following roadway improvement are completed either (1) as the need for the improvement triggered by subsequent development projects or (2) as City CI projects funded on a fair share basis by subsequent development projects. | | need for the improvement is ent projects or (2) as City CIP | | |
| | | | A) Optimize and coordinate traf Grove Boulevard and at the follow in the improvement section below: | ing intersections as described | |
| | | | • Elk Grove Boulevard/I (Improvement 1) | Laguna Springs Drive | |
| | | | • Elk Grove Boulevard/SR (Improvement 1) | 99 Southbound Ramps | |
| | | | • Whitelock Parkway/West (Improvement 2) | Stockton Boulevard | |
| | | | Bruceville Road/Bilby Road (In | nprovement 3) | |
| | | | Bilby Road/Franklin Boulevard | (Improvement 4) | |
| | | | Willard Parkway/Bilby Road (National Control of Co | North) (Improvement 5) | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | Kammerer Road/Bruceville Road (Improvement 6) | |
| | | B) Construct improvements to the Bruceville Road/Bilby Road intersection to accommodate the typical City of Elk Grove expanded intersection for a four-lane arterial. | |
| | | C) Install a traffic signal at the intersection of Bilby Road and Franklin Boulevard. Widen the northbound and southbound approaches to the intersection to provide the following lane configuration: | |
| | | A shared left-turn/through lane and a separate right-turn lane on the northbound approach | |
| | | A separate left-turn lane and shared through/right-turn lane on the southbound approach | |
| | | A shared left/through/right-turn lane on the eastbound and westbound approach. | |
| | | OR | |
| | | Implement the planned Kammerer Road widening and extension project. | |
| | | D) Install a traffic signal and provide the following lane configurations at the Kammerer Road/Bruceville Road intersection: | |
| | | A shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound approach | |
| | | A shared left/through lane on the southbound approach | |
| | | A shared left/right-turn lane on westbound approach. | |
| | | Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of subsequent development projects | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | Resulting Level of Significance | |
|--|---|--|--|---|-------|
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Public Works Department | |
| Impact 5.13.2 | PS | None available. | | | SU |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would worsen existing unacceptable conditions along SR 99. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.13.3 | LS | None required. | | | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access within the Project area. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.13.4 | LS | None required. | | | LS |
| Implementation of the proposed Project would not disrupt or interfere with existing or planned bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities. | | | | | |
| Impact 5.13.5 Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other planned, | CC | MM 5.13.5a The City shall require that the following roadway improvem are completed either (1) as the need for the improvement triggered by subsequent development projects or (2) as City | | ne need for the improvement is opment projects or (2) as City CIP | CC/SU |
| approved, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in a decline of service at eight intersections within the study area. | | | development projects. | share basis by subsequent | |
| | | | A) SR 99/Elk Grove Boulevard On-Ramp, as previously describ | d interchange Northbound Loop ped. | |
| | | | B) SR 99/Whitelock Parkwa described. | ay interchange, as previously | |
| | | | Boulevard intersection and | ne Hood Franklin Road/Franklin widen the southbound and e intersection to provide the | |

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

| Impact | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | | | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | Separate left- and right-turn approach | lanes on the northbound | |
| | | | Separate through and right-tu approach | rn lanes on the southbound | |
| | | | Separate left- and right-turn approach | lanes on the eastbound | |
| | | | D) Widen the Grant Line Roa intersection to provide the followin | | |
| | | | Widen westbound Grant Line lanes through the intersection SR 99 northbound slip on-ramp | that would transition to the | |
| | | | Widen northbound Survey Relates and a shared through/right | | |
| | | | Restripe the southbound East 5 to provide a separate left-turn turn lane, and a separate right- | lane, a shared through/right- | |
| | | | Timing/Implementation: | Prior to approval of subsequent development projects | |
| | | | Enforcement/Monitoring: | City of Elk Grove Public Works Department | |
| Impact 5.13.6 | CC | None available. | | | CC/SU |
| Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other planned, approved and reasonably foreseeable projects, would worsen existing unacceptable operations along SR 99. | | | | | |

S – Significant CC – Cu

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

This page intentionally left blank.

S – Significant

CC – Cumulatively Considerable

LS – Less Than Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

NI – No Impact

PS – Potentially Significant

LCC – Less than Cumulatively Considerable

CS - Cumulative Significant

City of Elk Grove March 2014