EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This summary is provided in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines) Section 15123. As stated in Section 15123(a), "an EIR [environmental impact report] shall contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical." As required by the guidelines, this chapter includes (1) a summary description of the City of Elk Grove General Plan Amendments and Update of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Standards (Project), (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (Table ES-1, presented at the end of this chapter), (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative, and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the Project.

ES.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The proposed Project would amend the City of Elk Grove General Plan (General Plan) to establish the Livable Employment Area Community Plan (LEA Community Plan); update of City VMT thresholds and guidelines (VMT Update); and various other General Plan land use adjustments including amendments to the South Study Area and West Study Area; and amendments to adopted General Plan Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a and MM 5.5.1b that requires preparation of a cultural resource study and protection of cultural resources for subsequent development projects.

ES.2.1 Project Background and History

State law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan. The City certified the City of Elk Grove General Plan Update Final EIR (General Plan EIR) and adopted the current General Plan in February 2019.

In 2019, the Elk Grove City Council directed City staff to study how to leverage the value of a planned new thoroughfare, Kammerer Road, beyond its ability to carry vehicle traffic, to lay the foundation for economic development in the form of a 21st century employment center. The charge was to connect transportation with land-use planning and design in recognition that the most economically, socially, and environmentally successful communities, which are walkable and contain a mix of uses. In January 2021, the City completed the Kammerer Road Urban Design Strategies that resulted in recommended increases in General Plan land use intensities and transportation improvements along a conceptual road corridor plan for the Promenade Parkway and Kammerer Road corridors. As a separate project, the City has also been exploring establishment of the future zoo site within this area.

The City has upgraded its current Travel Demand Model from SACSIM15 to SACSIM19. This modeling update has triggered the need to reevaluate the City's VMT thresholds as set forth in General Plan Mobility Chapter (Policy MOB-1-1) and the 2019 City of Elk Grove Transportation Analysis Guidelines.

The City is a member of the Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority (JPA), which was established to implement the 34-mile corridor known as the Capital SouthEast Connector (Connector). The Connector would connect Interstate 5 (I-5), State Route (SR) 99, SR 16, and US Highway 50. The Connector is intended to relieve traffic congestion, preserve open space, and improve roadway safety. Segment C of the Connector is a 2.7-mile section on Grant Line Road between Bond Road and Calvine Road in the City identified as the "Special Sheldon Segment." Segment A2 is a section on Kammerer Road between Bruceville Road and SR 99. The City is considering General Plan policy changes for these two segments.

ES.2.2 Project Objectives

The primary objectives of the General Plan Amendments and Update of VMT Standards Project are to:

- create a physical environment that supports the growth of 21st century employment opportunities;
- develop walkable communities with amenities that attract and retain businesses and residents;
- update the City's VMT thresholds consistent with the most recent model while maintaining consistency with the policy provisions of the Mobility Chapter of the General Plan for efficient transportation systems in the City;
- refine the requirements for General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a and Mitigation Measure 5.5.1b to improve its implementation; and
- establish design and implementation provisions for Segments A2 and C of the Capital SouthEast Connector.

ES.2.3 Project Location

The City is located in Sacramento County and consists of approximately 42 square miles within its boundary. Land uses are regulated under the City General Plan, which was comprehensively updated in 2019. The City General Plan established a Planning Area (approximately 31,238 acres) which includes all land within the current City limits as well as lands outside the City limits. Existing land uses in the City consist of residential at varying densities, commercial, office, industrial, park, and open space. Beyond the City limits, the Planning Area primarily consists of agricultural lands and rural residential uses. Nearby natural open space and habitat areas include the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and the Sacramento River to the west, the Cosumnes River Preserve to the south, and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San) bufferlands to the northwest. Major roadway access to the City is provided by I-5 and SR 99.

ES.2.4 Project Characteristics

The proposed General Plan Amendments and Update of VMT Standards consists of the following components:

- General Plan amendments for creation of the LEA Community Plan Area,
- General Plan amendments to Update VMT thresholds and associated changes to the City Transportation Analysis Guidelines,
- Other land use plan revisions, principally in the Old Town Special Planning Area,
- Incorporation of the Grant Line Road Precise Plan into the Rural Area Community Plan,
- Amendments to adopted General Plan Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a and MM 5.5.1b, and
- Revisions to the South and West Study Areas in the General Plan.

ES.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

This EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.) to evaluate the physical environmental effects of the proposed Project. The City is the lead agency for the Project. The City Council has the principal responsibility for approving the Project and for ensuring that the requirements of CEQA have been met.

Table ES-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the Project. The table identifies the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after implementation of the mitigation measures.

For detailed discussions of all Project impacts and mitigation measures, the reader is referred to the topical environmental analysis in Chapter 3, "Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures." Cumulative impacts are discussed in Chapter 4, "Cumulative Impacts."

ES.4 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Implementing the Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts beyond what was identified in the General Plan EIR:

- Impact 3.2-2: Operational Air Quality
- Impact 3.5-1: Project Generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Impact 3.6-2: Increased Traffic Noise
- Impact 3.8-3: Increased Demand for New Public School Facilities
- Impact 3.9-1: Result in an Exceedance of City of Elk Grove General Plan VMT Thresholds
- Impact 4-3: Cumulative Air Quality Impacts
- Impact 4-6: Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Impacts
- Impact 4-8: Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts
- Impact 4-12: Cumulative Public School Impacts
- Impact 4-14: Cumulative Impacts on Vehicle Miles Traveled

ES.5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following alternatives are evaluated in this Draft SEIR. The reader is referred to Chapter 5, "Alternatives," for a further discussion of alternatives.

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative assumes continued implementation of the City's 2019 General Plan. The LEA Planning Area, Old Town Policy Area, South Study Area, and West Study Area would retain their current General Plan and zoning designations. In addition, roadway improvements would not occur along Grant Line Road as detailed in the Precise Plan. And General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a would remain as currently written in the General Plan EIR.
- Alternative 2: Lent Ranch Alternative includes retaining the existing zoning and land use designations in the Lent Ranch Policy Area.
- Alternative 3: Reduced Project Alternative includes removing the area south of Kammerer Road from the LEA Community Plan and retaining the existing zoning and land use designations.

ES.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify the areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. The areas of controversy associated with the Project are:

- potential increases in traffic noise; and
- transportation impacts related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

These issues are each addressed in this Draft SEIR. Any impacts related to these issues are identified either as less than significant or as less than significant after mitigation with the exception of the impacts identified under the

heading "Significant and Unavoidable Impacts," above. Issues related to impacts identified as significant and unavoidable remain areas of controversy.

ES.7 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify issues to be resolved related to the proposed project. Issues to be resolved by the City are identified below, including issues that will not necessarily be resolved through the SEIR:

- Should the General Plan amendments be approved as proposed?
- Should the existing land use designations in the LEA Planning Area and Old Town Policy Area modified?
- Should the City's Transportation Guidelines be updated with the most recent model information?
- Should General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures MM 5.5.1a and MM 5.5.1b be revised?
- Should the design and implementation provisions for Segments A2 and C of the Capital SouthEast Connector be approved as proposed?

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
Aesthetics			
Impact 3.1-1: Potential to Substantially Degrade the Existing Visual Character or Quality of Public Views of the Project Area and Its Surroundings The General Plan EIR determined that buildout of the City's Planning Area would cause conversion from a rural/natural character to a more urbanized character and this impact would be significant and unavoidable. Future development associated with the Project would result in the development of higher density residential and commercial uses that would be similar in development character that was evaluated in the General Plan EIR, which determined this impact significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts than were addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with City Municipal Code Chapter 19.12 and Section 23.16.080.	SU
Impact 3.1-2: Potential to Create a New Source of Substantial Light or Glare Which Would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area The General Plan EIR determined that buildout of the City's Planning Area would create substantial new sources of light and glare and the impact would be significant and unavoidable. Future development associated with the Project would create nighttime lighting within the City similar to conditions anticipated for the planned urban land uses for the City under the General Plan. The Project would be subject to the City's General Plan policies, Design Guidelines, and Municipal Code requirements that address lighting and glare. In addition, lighting, including adverse effects of glare and light trespass or spillover light are considerations addressed by the City through the site plan and design review process. All future development in the Project area would be subject to this review process, ensuring that the effects of glare and spillover light would be addressed. Therefore, the Project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts than were addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 23.56 and Section 23.16.080.	SU

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
Air Quality			
Impact 3.2-1: Construction Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors The General Plan EIR Impact 5.3.1 determined that development and growth under the General Plan could result in short-term construction emissions that could violate or substantially contribute to a violation of the NAAQS and CAAQS for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. This impact was identified as significant and unavoidable. Implementation of the Project could generate construction emissions of ROG, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 from demolition, material and equipment delivery trips, worker commute trips, and other miscellaneous activities. However, construction activities and emissions from implementation of the Project would be similar to what was anticipated under the General Plan EIR and the current General Plan land use designations. Subsequent projects would be required to comply with General Plan Policy NR-4-8, which would require that emissions in exceedance of SMAQMD's thresholds of significance be mitigated. Therefore, construction-generated emissions would not result in a new or substantially more severe construction air quality impacts than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. However, pursuant to the previous findings it remains significant and unavoidable.	SU	**Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: Implement the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's Advanced On-site Exhaust Control Measures for the LEA Community Plan Area** Subsequent development in the LEA Community Plan Area shall implement SMAQMD's Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices for NO_X and exhaust PM emissions. Before the issuance of grading and/or building permits, subsequent project applicants shall submit to the City and SMAQMD an initial report of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used 8 hours or more during any portion of the construction project before any grading activities. The initial report shall include the horsepower rating, engine model year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The subsequent project applicants shall provide the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. The information shall be submitted at least 4 business days before the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment. The report shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. Before any grading activities, the subsequent project applicants shall provide a plan for approval by the City and SMAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty off-road vehicles (50 horsepower or more) to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a subsequent project-wide fleet-average of 10 percent NO_X reduction (depending on available technology and engine Tier) compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. This plan shall be submitted in conjunction with the equipment inventory. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. If achievement of the aforementioned reductions over the statewide average are deemed infeasible by the City, SMAQMD, or construction contractor, the subsequent project applicants shall ensure the construction fleet meets the lowest fleetwide emissions average possible, through the use of all available on-site emissions reduction measures (e.g., highest tier engines, emission control devices, cleaner burning fuel).	SU

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		The subsequent project applicants shall submit a final report at the end of the job, phase, or calendar year, as pre-arranged with SMAQMD staff and documented in the approval letter, to demonstrate continued project compliance. If modeled construction-generated emissions of NO_X are not reduced to a level below SMAQMD's thresholds of significance by the application of the aforementioned mitigation measures, then the project developer must pay a mitigation fee into SMAQMD's off-site mitigation program. By paying the appropriate off-site mitigation fee, construction-generated emissions of NO_X would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The fee calculation to offset daily NO_X emissions shall be based on the SMAQMD-determined cost to reduce one ton of NO_X applicable at the time (currently $30,000 per ton in May 2023 but subject to change in future years). Once initial construction activities are finalized by the subsequent project applicants, and before the issuance of grading and/or building permits, quantification of construction-related emissions shall be verified at the project level. As each subsequent project-level construction phase is finalized throughout the duration of the project buildout, the mitigation fee shall be calculated based on current information, available construction equipment, and proposed construction activities. As construction activities occur over the buildout period, the developer shall work with SMAQMD to continually update mitigation fees based on actual on-the-ground emissions. The final mitigation fees shall be based on the contractor equipment report provided by the developer to SMAQMD and shall reconcile any fee discrepancies due to schedule adjustments and increased or decreased equipment inventories. Equipment inventories and NOX emission estimates for subsequent construction phases shall be coordinated with SMAQMD, and the off-site mitigation fee measure shall be assessed to any construction phase that would result in an exceedance of SMAQMD's mass emission threshold for NO_X.	
Impact 3.2-2: Long-Term Operational Emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ General Plan EIR Impact 5.3.2 and 5.3.6 determined that long-term operational emissions of ROG, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 would be substantial and could substantially contribute to a violation of the NAAQS and CAAQS for ozone and PM and conflict with air quality attainment efforts. This impact was identified as significant and unavoidable. Implementation of the Project could generate long-term operational emissions of ROG, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5. The Project proposes greater development than what was presented in the General Plan EIR. This level of	SU	**Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: Prepare an Air Quality Mitigation Plan for the LEA Community Plan Area** The City shall prepare an Air Quality Management Plan that demonstrates a 15 percent reduction in operational air pollutant for the LEA Community Plan Area, compared to unmitigated baseline project consistent with General Plan Policy NR-4-1. The Air Quality Management Plan shall be submitted to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District for review and endorsement. Air Quality Management Plan emission reduction measures will be identified and	SU

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
development would subsequently result in greater operational emissions as compared to the General Plan EIR for the Planning Area. Therefore, operational emissions would result in a substantially more severe air quality impacts that was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would be significant and unavoidable.		quantified and may include commitments to reducing VMT, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and energy efficiency building measures. The Air Quality Management Plan shall be submitted to SMAQMD prior to the certification of the Final EIR to confirm that the project meets reduction requirements.	
Impact 3.2-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Carbon Monoxide Pollutant Concentrations The General Plan EIR concluded that the Project would not contribute to localized concentrations of mobile-source CO impacts. Implementation of the Project would include land use amendments that would result in distribution of vehicle trips throughout the City; however, this redistribution would not result in a new CO impact. Based on modeling performed for this analysis, the maximum development proposed for the Project could generate a maximum of 24,200 daily trips; however, the trips would be distributed throughout the City and into the region and would not be focused within one intersection exclusively. Therefore, there is no new effect and the impact is not substantially more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan. This impact would remain less than significant as identified in the General Plan EIR.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.2-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to TACs The General Plan EIR concluded that operational-related emissions of mobile source TACs would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to public health. Implementation of Project could generate mobile source TACs. However, these TAC emissions would be similar to what was anticipated under buildout conditions as described in the General Plan EIR and its current land use designations. Therefore, potential TAC mobile emissions would not result in a new or substantially more severe TAC impacts that was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policies NR-2-4, NR-4-9, NR-4-10, MOB-3-1, MOB-3-2, MOB-3-5, MOB-3-6, MOB-3-7, MOB-3-13, and MOB-7-5.	SU
Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources			
Impact 3.3-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource	PS	**Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1b** As part of the development review process for projects involving modification to existing buildings and structures, require all affected buildings and structures over 50	LTS

<table>
<tr><th>Impacts</th><th>Significance before Mitigation</th><th>Mitigation Measures</th><th>Significance after Mitigation</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable</td></tr>
<tr><td>General Plan EIR Impact 5.5.1 determined that implementation of the General Plan could result in impacts to historical resources and identified that implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a and MM 5.5.1b would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Future development associated with the Project could be located on properties that contain previously unevaluated historic-age buildings or structures which could result in damage to or destruction to these features. If they are found to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, or the Elk Grove Register of Historic Resources, the impact to historical resources would be potentially significant. All projects within the City would be subject to adopted General Plan Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a and MM 5.5.1b. As part of the Project adopted Mitigation Measures MM 5.5.1a and MM 5.5.1b would be modified to provide additional clarity and separate the requirements and procedures for historical resources from archaeological resources. Therefore, there is no new significant effect and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. The Project would remain a less-than-significant impact to historical resources.</td><td></td><td>years of age to be evaluated for historical significance, using the significance criteria set forth for historic resources under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, which are also the criteria for listing in the Elk Grove Register of Historic Resources, contained in Section 7.00.050 of the Municipal Code. For buildings or structures that do not meet the CEQA criteria for historical resource, no further mitigation is required.

If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings" (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).

If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for demolition, the City shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping, if applicable and setting. Documentation shall be to the applicable level (short form, Level I, Level II, or Level III) of Historic American Building Survey or Historic American Engineering Record documentation. This is consistent with Section 7.00.080(B)(5) of the Elk Grove Municipal Code. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the City, Elk Grove Historical Society, and the North Central Information Center, at minimum. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Impact 3.3-2: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Unique Archaeological Resources

General Plan EIR Impact 5.5.1 determined that implementation of the General Plan could result in significant impacts to archaeological resources and identified that implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.5.1a and 5.51b would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Future development associated with the Project could be located on properties that contain known or unknown archaeological resources and ground-disturbing activities could result in discovery or damage of yet undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. This would be a potentially significant impact. However, all projects within the City would be subject to adopted General Plan Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a. As part of the Project adopted Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a would be modified to provide additional clarity and separate the requirements and procedures for archaeological resources from historical resources. Therefore, there is no new</td><td>PS</td><td>Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1a

Prior to the approval of subsequent development projects in the Planning Area, the City shall determine the level of archaeological sensitivity based on the previously prepared confidential archaeological sensitivity map, in combination with the level of previous disturbance of the project area and anticipated level of ground disturbance, as shown below.

<table><tr><td></td><td>Developed, proposed ground disturbance less than 24"</td><td>Not previously developed, proposed ground disturbance less than 24"</td><td>Developed, proposed ground disturbance more than 24"</td><td>Not previously developed, proposed ground disturbance below 24"</td></tr></table></td><td>LTS</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Impacts</th><th>Significance before Mitigation</th><th>Mitigation Measures</th><th>Significance after Mitigation</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable</td></tr>
<tr><td>significant effect and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. The Project would remain a less-than-significant impact to archaeological resources.</td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>low area of archaeological sensitivity</td><td>minimum investigation</td><td>minimum investigation</td><td>minimum investigation</td><td>moderate investigation</td></tr>
<tr><td>medium area of archaeological sensitivity</td><td>minimum investigation</td><td>moderate investigation</td><td>moderate investigation</td><td>intensive investigation</td></tr>
<tr><td>high area of archaeological sensitivity</td><td>moderate investigation</td><td>intensive investigation</td><td>intensive investigation</td><td>intensive investigation</td></tr>
</table>

Minimum Investigation: Implement Mitigation Measure 5.5-1a(1).
Moderate Investigation: Implement Mitigation Measure 5.5-1a(1) and (2).
Intensive Investigation: Implement Mitigation Measure 5.5-1a(1), (2), and (3).

1) Unless the project qualifies for part (2) below, no cultural resources study shall be required as part of the project consideration. If archaeological materials or tribal cultural resources are discovered during grading or construction activities within the project site, work shall halt immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the Planning Division shall be notified, and a qualified professional shall be retained. As related to archaeological materials, a professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in archaeology shall determine the significance of the discovery. As related to tribal cultural resources, a "qualified professional" consists of the geographically and culturally affiliated tribe.

If resources are determined to be potentially significant, the City shall require the preparation of a treatment plan and report of findings for archaeological and tribal cultural resources by a qualified professional. The City and the applicant shall consult and agree to implement all measures the City deems feasible. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The applicant shall be required to implement measures necessary for the protection and documentation of archaeological and tribal cultural resources.
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		2) A detailed cultural resources study of the subject property shall be conducted by either the City or the applicant and then peer reviewed by the City. The report shall include a records search of the North Central Information Center, the Native American Heritage Commission, tribal outreach, and a pedestrian field survey. The cultural resources study shall identify, evaluate, and mitigate impacts to archaeological and tribal cultural resources as defined by CEQA and/or the NHPA. Mitigation methods to be employed include, but are not limited to, the following: ▶ Redesign of the project to avoid the resource. The resource site shall be deeded to a nonprofit agency to be approved by the City for maintenance of the site. ▶ If avoidance is determined to be infeasible by the City, the resource shall be mapped, stabilized, and capped pursuant to appropriate standards. ▶ If capping is determined infeasible by the City, the resource shall be recovered to appropriate standards. 3) Prior to the start of any ground disturbing activities, a qualified archaeologist meeting the United States Secretary of Interior guidelines for professional archaeologists shall be retained to develop a construction worker awareness brochure. This brochure shall be distributed to all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter cultural resources. The topics to be addressed in the Worker Environmental Awareness Program will include, at a minimum: ▶ types of cultural resources expected in the project area; ▶ what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource; ▶ what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and ▶ penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archeological Resources Protection Act.	
Impact 3.3-3: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource	LTS	No mitigation is required beyond compliance with California PRC 21081.3.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
No California Native American tribes responded to AB 52 notification letters, however, one tribal cultural resource is known to exist in the Planning Area. It is possible that additional tribal cultural resources could be identified during analysis of subsequent projects associated with the Project. General Plan EIR Impact 5.5.1 determined that implementation of the General Plan could result in impacts to tribal cultural resources and identified that implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.5.1a and 5.51b would be required. However, compliance with PRC Section 21080.3.2 and Section 21084.3 (a) would reduce this impact to less than significant. Therefore, there is no new significant effect and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. The Project would continue to result in a less-than-significant impact to tribal cultural resources.			
Impact 3.3-4: Disturb Human Remains It is possible that ground-disturbing construction activities associated with the Project could uncover previously unknown human remains. General Plan EIR Impact 5.5.1 determined that implementation of the General Plan could result in impacts to the disturbance of human remains and identified that implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.1b would be required. However, compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 would reduce this impact less than significant. Therefore, there is no new significant effect and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. The Project would continue to result in a less-than-significant impact to human remains.	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California PRC Section 5097.	LTS
Energy			
Impact 3.4-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy during Project Construction or Operation The General Plan EIR evaluated the energy consumption associated with the land uses proposed under the General Plan and concluded that energy consumption would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary because development would be required to comply with the most recent versions of the California Energy Code and actions under the Elk Grove CAP that include zero net energy requirements in 2020 and 2030 for residential and commercial development. Implementation of the Project could result in the consumption of additional energy supplies during construction in the form of gasoline and diesel fuel consumption; however, this	LTS	No new mitigation is required beyond compliance with City's CAP and the 2022 California Energy Code and any subsequent code updates.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
energy expenditure would not be considered wasteful when compared to other construction projects. Operation of development facilitated by the Project would also result in additional energy consumption but would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Energy Code and the CAP. Implementation of the Project would be required to comply with these standards and would not result in a new or substantially more severe energy impacts that was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would, therefore, remain less than significant.			
Impact 3.4-2: Conflict with or Obstruction of a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency The General Plan EIR evaluated consistency with applicable state or local plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency and concluded that the land use under the General Plan would not conflict with an applicable plan. Implementation of the Project could increase energy demands compared to existing conditions; however, development would be required to comply with applicable California Energy Code. Additionally, the City's CAP contains several measures that would apply to subsequent development that would reduce overall energy demand. As a result, implementation of the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, the Project would not have a more severe impact than what was identified in the General Plan EIR. This impact would remain less than significant.	LTS	No new mitigation is required beyond compliance with the City's CAP, including measures BE-1, BE-5, BE-6, BE-7, BE-8, and ACM-5, and Municipal Code Chapter 16.07 and Section 23.58.120.	LTS
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change			
Impact 3.5-1: Project-Generated GHG Emissions and Consistency with Plans and Regulations The General Plan EIR determined that GHG-related impacts would be less than significant through the incorporation of GHG reduction actions included in the General Plan and 2019 CAP (Impact 5.7.1) but would not likely meet long term reduction goals under Executive Order S-3-05 and result in a significant and unavoidable impact (Impact 5.7.2). Construction and operation of development under the Project would generate an estimated 29,701 MTCO2e/year in 2040, the assumed first full year of Project operation. Consistent with the findings of the General Plan EIR, new development	SU	No additional mitigation is available beyond compliance with Measures BE-1, BE-4, BE-5, BE-6, BE-7, BE-8, TACM-6, TACM-8, TACM-9, and ACM-5 from the 2019 CAP and EGMC Chapter 16.07 and Section 23.58.120.	SU

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
under the Project would be subject to the policies contained in the 2019 CAP and 2019 General Plan, which would demonstrate consistency with statewide GHG reduction goals set forth by SB 32. However, development under the Project would extend beyond 2030 into 2040 and beyond. While the current CAP has a long-term reduction target for 2050 of 1.4 MTCO2e per capita, the measures of the CAP are designed to reduce the gap in emission between a business-as-usual scenario for 2020 and 2030 but do not currently fully address reduction targets for 2050. Also, since the time the current CAP was prepared GHG reduction goals have become more stringent (i.e., 80 percent reduction in 1990 GHG emissions by 2050 versus an 85 percent reduction in 1990 GHG emissions by 2045). Because the measures of the current CAP are limited to target years of 2020 and 2030, it does not account for the newest GHG reduction targets, and compliance with CAP measures would not be sufficient to meet the State's long-term targets. Due to the more stringent GHG reduction targets and increase in emissions, this impact would result in a substantially more severe impact than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would be significant and unavoidable.			
Noise and Vibration			
Impact 3.6-1: Construction Activities Could Result in a Substantial Temporary Increase in Noise Levels at Nearby Noise-Sensitive Land Uses The General Plan EIR determined that the potential noise generation from construction activities could result in a substantial temporary increase in noise levels, but impacts would be less than significant with adherence to the EGMC and General Plan policies. Potential construction noise impacts would be reduced by adherence to the EGMC and General Plan Policy N-1-7, which addresses potential impacts on current and future sensitive land uses associated with construction noise by setting allowable construction hours to limit impacts on sensitive land uses. Additionally, the City may require site-specific assessment and mitigation for future development under the Project to reduce construction noise. Finally, development facilitated by the Project would be subject to Policy N-1-8 that may require applicants to assess and minimize potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receivers. Construction activities associated with implementation of the Project would be similar to construction activities anticipated under the	LTS	**Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 Construction Noise Reduction Measures for the LEA Community Plan Area** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented and specified on subsequent project building and improvement plans: ▶ 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 site or located at the farthest distance possible from nearby residential land uses. ▶ All motorized construction equipment and vehicles shall be turned off when not in use. ▶ To the extent feasible, alternative construction processes that generate lower noise levels shall be selected. Examples include the use of drilled piles as opposed to impact piles, use of electrified equipment as opposed to	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
current General Plan and would be required to comply with these standards as well as General Plan Policy N-1-7 and N-1-8. and would not result in new or substantially more several impacts related to construction noise. This impact would remain less than significant.		combustion engines, and temporary noise barriers or noise curtains installation such that they block the line of sight between the noise source and the receiver. ▶ Post visible signs along the perimeter of the construction site that disclose construction times and duration, as well as a contact number for a noise complaint and enforcement manager. The on-site noise complaint and enforcement manager's duties shall include documenting noise complaints, responding to and investigating noise-related complaints, implementing any feasible and appropriate measures to reduce noise at the receiving land uses, and reporting the complaints to City staff on a weekly basis.	
Impact 3.6-2: Traffic Noise General Plan EIR Impact 5.10.2 identified that implementation of the General Plan would result in a significant and unavoidable increase in transportation noise, including traffic noise levels along many existing roadways in the City. Further, Impact 5.10.2 notes that the General Plan includes a set of policies that are intended to ensure that new specific proposed development would comply with noise standards and would not adversely impact sensitive land uses from traffic noise. The policies include Policy N-1-1, Policy N-1-2, Policy N-1-4, Policy N-1-5, Policy N-1-6, and Policy N-2-2. Implementation of the Project would result in an exceedance of the City's traffic noise standard as identified in General Plan Policy N-2-2 and an increase in traffic noise as compared to roadways segments analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Project would result in substantially more severe traffic noise impacts than the General Plan EIR. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	SU	**Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 Operational Noise Reduction Measures for the LEA Community Plan Area** The City shall require acoustical assessments to be prepared as part of subsequent land use development projects in the LEA Community Plan Area. The acoustical assessments shall evaluate potential environmental noise impacts attributable to the subsequent project, anticipated traffic noise condition, stationary noise sources, and 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 subsequent 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 (Elk Grove Municipal Code and General Plan).	SU
Impact 3.6-3: Future Development Could Expose Existing Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to New Non-Transportation Noise Sources that Could Exceed the City's Applicable Noise Standards General Plan EIR Impact 5.10.3 determined that potential noise generation from future development could expose existing noise-sensitive land uses to new non-transportation noise sources that could exceed the City's applicable noise standards. Specific to residential land uses, the General Plan EIR identified lawn and garden equipment, voices, and amplified music as potential noise sources associated with residential land uses. Operational noise associated with	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy N-2-1 and Municipal Code Section 6.32.110 and Mitigation Measure 3.6-2.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
commercial and industrial land uses typically consists of site-specific mechanical building equipment (e.g., heating equipment, HVAC systems) and other types of machinery. The General Plan EIR identified Section 6.32.110 of the EGMC as containing hourly noise standards that apply to non-transportation noise sources. Additionally, General Plan Policy N-2-1 indicates that noise created by new proposed non-transportation noise sources shall be mitigated so as not to exceed noise level standards. Development facilitated by the Project would be required to comply with these standards and would not result in new or substantially more severe noise impacts than addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain less than significant.			
Impact 3.6-4: Result in Development Projects Involving that Could Expose Receptors to Excessive Groundborne Vibration General Plan EIR Impact 5.10.4 determined that potential vibration generation from construction and operation could occur as a result of the Project. Long-term vibration was mainly associated with transit system routes and maintenance activities, and vibration from increased traffic would not be perceptible. Short-term vibration associated with construction could be substantial for activities such as pile driving and vibratory rolling. Adherence to Policy N-1.9 was identified as having a mitigating effect on construction vibration and the impact was determined to be less than significant. Implementation of the Project would be required to comply with these standards and would not result in new or substantially more severe vibration impacts. Project impacts would remain less than significant.	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy N-1-9 and Municipal Code Section 6.32.100.	LTS
Population, Employment, and Housing			
Impact 3.7-1: Induce Substantial Population Growth General Plan EIR Section 3.3 determined that implementation of the General Plan would exceed SACOG's population and housing projections for Elk Grove. The Project would accommodate up to 1,851 net new dwelling units, 123,923 jobs, and approximately 5,979 net new persons beyond the General Plan. This growth would exceed projections assumed under the City's General Plan and regional planning efforts completed by SACOG. The Project would not indirectly induce unplanned population growth or residential development. Therefore, there is no new significant	LTS	No new mitigation is required.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
effect and the impact is not more severe than the impact identified in the General Plan EIR. Growth inducement impacts would remain less than significant.			
Public Services and Recreation			
Impact 3.8-1: Require Construction of New Fire Protection Facilities, Resulting in Adverse Environmental Impacts The General Plan EIR determined that where new growth areas within the City have been identified, new fire stations are planned to accommodate the anticipated growth and no significant impacts would occur. Compliance with applicable regulations and existing General Plan policies would ensure new fire station siting and resources are available. If new fire protection facilities are proposed, environmental review for the new facility would be conducted as appropriate. Project impacts associated with the construction of needed fire protection facilities would not result in a new or substantially more severe construction impacts than disclosed in the technical sections of the General Plan EIR. Buildout projected under the Project would be required to comply with applicable regulations and policies. Therefore, impacts related to the provision of fire services would remain less than significant.	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 16.85 and 17.04 and General Plan policies ER-4-1, ER-4-2, SAF-1-3, and SAF-1-4.	LTS
Impact 3.8-2: Require Construction of New Law Enforcement Facilities, Resulting in Adverse Environmental Impacts General Plan EIR Impact 5.11.1.2 indicated that police services operates out of a centralized facility at the City Hall complex and additional police services to accommodate development can be accomplished through additional personnel and equipment and no significant impacts would occur. Relative to the General Plan EIR, the Project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts related to law enforcement. In addition, Elk Grove General Plan Policy SAF-1-1 directs regular monitoring and review of the level of police staffing provided in Elk Grove and ensures that sufficient staffing and resources are available to serve local needs. The addition of new officers and/or administrative staff would not require a new or expanded police facility because EGPD operations would continue within the centralized facility at the City Hall complex and additional police services to accommodate development can be accomplished through additional personnel	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy SAF-1-1.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
and equipment. Therefore, impacts related to the provision of law enforcement would remain less than significant.			
Impact 3.8-3: Increased Demand for New Public School Facilities Impact 5.11.3.1 of the General Plan EIR identifies that future development in the City would result in an increase of school-aged children and would require the construction of new public school facilities. As determined by the General Plan EIR, because school facilities would be constructed by the EGUSD the environmental impacts of school construction would be significant and unavoidable. Implementation of the Project would result in an increase in student generation that could require additional school facility needs beyond current General Plan analysis. This would be an increase in impact severity than what was previously identified in General Plan EIR Impact 5.11.3.1. No mitigation measures are available to reduce potentially significant impacts; thus this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU	As stated in the General Plan EIR, no additional feasible mitigation is available beyond compliance with existing laws and General Plan policies, and payment of EGUSD fees. While the EGUSD could and should implement measures to reduce physical environmental effects of school development, the EGUSD is not subject to mitigation adopted by the City. No new enforceable measures are available to the City to mitigate this impact. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable for the Project as determined in the General Plan EIR.	SU
Impact 3.8-4: Require Construction of New Park or Recreation Facilities, resulting in Adverse Environmental Impacts Impact 5.11.4.1 of the General Plan EIR identifies that increased development would increase the demand on existing recreational facilities and require the development of new recreational facilities and no significant impacts would occur. Construction of park facilities would be subject to policies, standards, and mitigation measures from the General Plan and the General Plan EIR, or the mitigation identified in project-specific mitigation monitoring and reporting programs. No new or substantially more severe impacts would be associated with implementation of the Project. The impacts of park construction would remain less than significant.	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan policies PT-1-3, PT-1-5, PT-1-6, and PT-1-9, City and CCSD MOU, and City Municipal Code Chapter 22.40.	LTS
Transportation			
Impact 3.9-1: Result in an Exceedance of City of Elk Grove General Plan VMT Threshold General Plan Impact 5.13.3 identified that implementation of the General Plan would result in increased VMT that would be significant and unavoidable. Project-generated VMT per service population associated with buildout of the Project	SU	No additional feasible mitigation is available beyond compliance with the General Plan Policies MOB-1-1, MOB-3-1 through MOB-3.9, MOB-3-10 through MOB-3-13, MOB-3-14 through MOB-3-17, MOB-4-1 through MOB-4-5, MOB-5-1 through MOB-5-10, and Mitigation Measure 3.13-1 from the Housing Element SEIR.	SU

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
would result in an exceedance of the City's VMT per service population threshold for several land use designations. The addition of Project-generated total daily VMT within the City could also result in an exceedance of the established Citywide limit of 6,367,833 VMT. The Project VMT modeling, limits, and results were calculated using a different base year (i.e., 2020), a revised calculation methodology, and new modeling tool (i.e., EGSIM20) than that of the General Plan EIR. Because of this, the changes in VMT associated with implementation of the Project, and more specifically the revisions to the model and VMT limits, are not comparable to the VMT estimates in the General Plan. Therefore, it cannot be assured that development under the Project would be able to achieve the VMT per service population limits for individual land use types or the required reduction in total daily VMT within the City with implementation of all feasible mitigation, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.			
Impact 3.9-2: Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities General Plan EIR Impact 5.13.7 identified that implementation of the General Plan would not result in conflicts with plans, policies, or programs for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Implementation of the Project would be subject to and implement General Plan policies applicable to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and service. Additionally, subsequent development projects under the Project would be subject to all applicable City guidelines, standards, and specifications related to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, there is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain less than significant.	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan and General Plan Policies MOB-1-2, MOB-3-1, MOB-3-7, MOB-3-8, MOB-5-4, MOB-5-6, MOB-5-7, and H-1-3.	LTS
Impact 3.9-3: Substantially Increase Hazards Because of a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses No significant design hazard impacts were identified in the General Plan EIR. Implementation of the Project would be subject to, and constructed in accordance with, applicable roadway design and safety guidelines and General Plan policies. Therefore, the Project would not increase hazards because of a roadway design feature or incompatible uses. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. The Project	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond General Plan Policy MOB-3-10 and compliance with City standards and specifications.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
would continue to result in a less-than-significant impact to transportation hazards.			
Impact 3.9-4: Result in Inadequate Emergency Access The internal circulation network and any changes to the external circulation network associated with the development facilitated by the Project would be subject to review by the City of Elk Grove and responsible emergency service agencies; thus, ensuring that the Project would be designed to meet all applicable emergency access and design standards and adequate emergency access would be provided. There is no new significant effect, and the impact is not more severe than what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. The Project would continue to result in a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with City and Cosumnes Community Services District Fire Department standards.	LTS
Utilities and Service Systems			
Impact 3.10-1: Adverse Impacts on Sufficient Water Supply, Infrastructure, and Treatment General Plan Impact 5.12.1.1 identified significant and unavoidable water supply impacts because of the anticipated new water demand as a result of proposed development located outside of City limits but within the Study Areas. Implementation of the Project could generate additional demand for water supplies from increased development. Development facilitated by the Project would result in 3.12 mgd of water demand. However, the additional demand is minor compared with existing and projected water demand and water supplies. Therefore, the additional water demand resulting from the Project would not result in a new or substantially more severe water supply impacts than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	SU	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance General Plan Policy INF-1-1 and Mitigation Measure 5.12.1.1.	SU
Impact 3.10-2: Adverse Impacts on Wastewater Treatment Capacity General Plan EIR Impact 5.12.2.1 evaluated whether implementation of the General Plan would increase demand for wastewater treatment. General Plan EIR Impact 5.12.2.2 evaluated whether implementation of the General Plan would require the construction of new or expanded wastewater infrastructure, which could result in impacts to the physical environmental effects. The analyses both concluded that while the General Plan would increase demand for wastewater treatment, facility	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
plans would have sufficient capacity to serve the additional wastewater; the impacts were found to be less than significant. Development facilitated by the Project could generate approximately 3.12 mgd of wastewater that would increase wastewater generation anticipated under the adopted General Plan. The SRWTP has adequate capacity to accommodate additional growth. Therefore, the additional wastewater services resulting from the provision of new development and an increase in residents as part of the Project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain less than significant.			
Impact 3.10-3: Adverse Impacts on Landfill Capacity and Compliance with Applicable Solid Waste Regulations General Plan EIR Impact 5.12.3.1 concluded that increased demand for solid waste services associated with implementation of the General Plan would not result in significant environmental impacts. Implementation of the Project could result in increased solid waste generation associated with proposed residential, commercial, and industrial development that would require redesignation of General Plan land uses. There is substantial remaining capacity in the landfills serving local waste haulers, with an average remaining capacity of more than 70 percent. All future development projects associated with the Project would be required to comply with all applicable solid waste regulations, including the City's Space Allocation and Enclosure Design Guidelines for Trash and Recycling. Therefore, the additional solid waste services resulting from the Project would not result in a new or substantially more severe impacts than was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Project impacts would remain less than significant.	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with the City's existing recycling programs and associated regulations, we well as EGMC Section 30.70.030(C).	LTS
Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Addressed in Previous EIRs			
Impact 3.11.1 Agricultural Resources	SU	**Mitigation Measure 3.11-1 Agricultural Resources Preservation for the LEA Community Plan Area** The applicant of subsequent development projects in the LEA Community Plan Area shall protect one acre of existing farmland land of equal or higher quality for each acre of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance that would be developed as a result of the Project. The Project mitigation acreage must be located within Sacramento County. This protection may consist of the establishment of farmland conservation easement, farmland deed	SU

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		restriction or other appropriate farmland conservation mechanism that ensures the preservation of that land from conversion in perpetuity, but may also be utilized for compatible wildlife habitat conservation efforts (e.g., Swainson's 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 farmland/wildlife habitat must have adequate water supply to support agricultural use. The preservation of off-site farmland shall be done prior to the City's approval of the project's first 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. b) 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 which 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 which 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 by an entity acceptable to the City and/or the City in perpetuity. The entity shall not sell, lease, or convey any interest in agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation land which it shall acquire without the prior written approval of the City. f) The applicant shall pay to the City an agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation monitoring fee to cover the costs of administering, monitoring and enforcing the document in an amount determined by the receiving entity, not to exceed 10 percent of the easement price paid by the applicant, or a different amount approved by the City Council, not to exceed 15 percent of the easement price paid by the applicant.	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		g) The City shall be named a beneficiary under any document conveying the interest in the agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation land to an entity acceptable to the City. h) If any qualifying entity owning an interest in agricultural/wildlife habitat mitigation land ceases to exist, the duty to hold, administer, monitor and enforce the interest shall be transferred to another entity acceptable to the City.	
Impact 3.11.2 Biological Resources	SU	**Mitigation Measure 3.11-2 Special Status Plant Preconstruction Surveys for the LEA Community Plan Area** Applicants for any projects shall retain a qualified biologist(s) to conduct a preliminary evaluation of the specific project site to determine whether freshwater emergent wetland, or irrigation/drainage ditch habitats 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 special-status plant species, including Sanford's arrowhead. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with CDFW Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities (2009). These guidelines require that rare plant surveys be conducted at the proper time of year when rare or endangered species are both evident and identifiable. Field surveys shall be scheduled to coincide with known flowering periods and/or during appropriate developmental periods that are necessary to identify the plant species of concern. Survey results shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. If no special status plant species are found in or adjacent to (within 100 feet) proposed impact areas, no further mitigation is required. If any special status plant species 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.	SU

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		If project-related impacts will result in the loss of occupied habitat for a special-status plant species, mitigation to ensure that the special-status plant species population is not reduced below to self-sustaining levels, avoid elimination of the plant community, or reduce the range of the plant species based on the technical analysis of the qualified biologist and applicable agency (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife and California Department of Fish and Wildlife) input/guidance. Mitigation may include redesign of the subsequent project to avoid the plant species and permanent preservation of onsite plant species population, transplantation of the plant species to habitat suitable for the plant species, or offsite mitigation banks. Plans for avoidance, minimization, and mitigation (if appropriate) shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Elk Grove at the time of application for the City's review and approval. Surveys shall occur no more than two years prior to groundbreaking of the subsequent project. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-3 Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Avoidance and Minimization in the LEA Community Plan Area** 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. If an elderberry shrub(s) with one or more stems measuring 1 inch or greater in diameter at ground level is documented, and a 100-foot avoidance buffer can be maintained around the shrub, the following protective measures shall be implemented: 1) Fence and flag all areas to be avoided during construction activities. In areas where encroachment into the 100-foot buffer has been approved by the USFWS, provide a minimum setback of at least 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry plant. 2) 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	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		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. 4) 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 and the City. 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 2017 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 3:1 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	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		sites prior to initiation of revegetation work. Planting or seeding the conservation area with native herbaceous species is encouraged. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-4 Giant Garter Snake Avoidance and Minimization in the LEA Community Plan Area** For projects with potential to impact giant garter snake (GGS) habitat, applicants shall have a qualified biologist perform a preconstruction survey within 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities within 200 feet of all aquatic habitats potentially suitable for GGS. In order to protect snakes, de-watering of areas shall not occur prior to completion of the pre-construction surveys. If aquatic habitat potentially suitable for giant garter snake would be filled, the aquatic habitat shall be dewatered at least 15 days before fill. Dewatering of aquatic habitat for construction purposes shall not occur between October 1 and April 15, except for areas within a cofferdam, unless authorized by USFWS. Any dewatered habitat must remain dry for at least 15 consecutive days after April 15 and before excavation or filling of the dewatered habitat. All construction activities within 200 feet of aquatic habitat suitable for giant garter snakes shall be conducted during the snake's active season of May 1 to October 1 so that snakes can move and avoid danger, and a monitoring biologist shall be retained by the City and funded by the project applicant to routinely monitor construction activities within 200 feet of aquatic habitat. For any construction outside of the snake's active period, USFWS will be consulted to determine whether additional measures are necessary to avoid or minimize potential impacts during the inactive season and avoid take. The applicant shall implement the avoidance and minimization measures outlined in Appendix C Standard Avoidance and Minimization Measures During Construction Activities in Giant Garter Snake (Thamnophis gigas) Habitat (USFWS 1997) whenever working within 200 feet of aquatic habitats potentially suitable for GGS. If a snake is encountered during construction activities, the monitoring biologist shall contact the City and will have the authority to stop construction activities until appropriate corrective measures have been completed or it is determined that the snake will not be harmed. GGS encountered during construction activities should be allowed to move away from construction activities on their own. Capture and relocation of trapped or injured individuals can only be attempted by personnel or individuals with current USFWS recovery permits pursuant to Section 10(a) 1(A) of the ESA. The biologist	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		shall be required to report any incidental take to the USFWS immediately. The project area shall be re-inspected whenever a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or greater has occurred. This mitigation measure does not apply to land areas where surveys within the active period of the snake have been conducted and no snakes were found. In areas where aquatic habitats potentially suitable for giant garter snake are being retained on the site: ▶ A qualified biologist shall install temporary exclusion fencing around suitable upland habitat within 200 feet of aquatic habitat to prevent giant garter snakes from entering the work area during construction. The fencing shall be maintained for the duration of the construction activities; ▶ Ground disturbance, spoils, and equipment storage and other project activities shall not be allowed within the fenced area; and ▶ Water quality shall be maintained and construction runoff into wetland areas shall be limited using hay bales, filter fences, vegetative buffer strips, or other accepted equivalents. However, no plastic, monofilament, jute, or similar matting to control erosion that could entangle snakes shall be placed in the project area. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-5 Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Minimization in the LEA Community Plan Area** ▶ For projects with potential burrowing owl habitat, applicants shall retain a qualified biologist to determine whether suitable nesting habitat occurs within 500 feet of the specific project site within 30 days prior to any construction activities outside of the breeding season (September 1 through January 31). If suitable habitat exists, focused surveys must be performed by a qualified biologist in accordance with the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, published March 7, 2012. Surveys shall be repeated if project activities are suspended or delayed more than 15 days during nesting season. ▶ If no burrowing owls are detected, no further mitigation is required. If active burrowing owl nest sites are detected, the project applicant shall implement the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation methodologies outlined in the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation prior to initiating project-related activities that may impact burrowing owls. Burrowing owl surveys are valid for one year from the date of the survey.	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		Mitigation Measure 3.11-6 Migratory Bird Preconstruction Survey in the LEA Community Plan Area If clearing and/or construction activities would occur during the nesting bird season (February 1 through September 1), preconstruction surveys to identify active non-raptor native bird nests protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or California Fish and Game Code Section 3503 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 500-foot buffer (if accessible). Surveys shall be repeated if construction activities are delayed or postponed for more than 30 days. If active nest sites are identified within 500 feet of project activities, impacts on nesting birds shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers around active nest sites identified during focused surveys to prevent disturbance to the nest. Project activity shall not commence within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged, the nest is no longer active, or reducing the buffer would not likely result in nest abandonment. Buffer size for common, non-raptor bird species shall be determined by a qualified biologist. Factors to be considered for determining buffer size shall include presence of natural buffers provided by vegetation or topography, nest height above ground, baseline levels of noise and human activity, species sensitivity, and proposed project activities. Generally, buffer size for these species shall be at least 20 feet. The size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist, determines that such an adjustment shall not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Any buffer reduction for a special-status species shall require consultation with CDFW and/or the City. Periodic monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during project activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest, the buffer has been reduced, or if birds within active nests are showing behavioral signs of agitation (e.g., standing up from a brooding position, flying off the nest) during project activities, as determined by the qualified biologist. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-7 Raptor Nesting Preconstruction Survey in the LEA Community Plan Area** If clearing and/or construction activities would occur during the raptor nesting season (January 15–August 15), preconstruction surveys to identify active raptor nests shall be	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days of construction initiation in specific project sites. Focused surveys must be performed by a qualified biologist for the purposes of determining presence/absence of active nest sites within the proposed impact area, including construction access routes and a 1,000-foot buffer. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation is required. Surveys shall be repeated if construction activities are delayed or postponed for more than 30 days. If active white-tailed kite or other raptor (excluding Swainson's hawk) nest sites are identified within 1,000 feet of project activities, the applicant shall impose a 500-foot setback of all active nest sites prior to commencement of any project 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. Trees containing white-tailed kite or other raptor (excluding Swainson's hawk) nests that must be removed as a result of project implementation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (September 1–January 1). Swainson's hawks are State listed as a threatened species; therefore, impacts to Swainson's hawk nest trees require regulatory authorization from the CDFW prior to removal. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-8 Swainson's Hawk Avoidance and Minimization in the LEA Community Plan Area** The City shall require future project applicants to implement the measures to mitigate the potential loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. For any project 40 acres and greater the following measure shall be implemented to reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat: ▶ The project applicant shall acquire conservation easements or other instruments to preserve suitable foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk. The location of mitigation parcels as well as conservation instruments protecting them shall be approved by the City. ▶ The amount of land preserved shall be at a ratio provided in Chapter 16.130 Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Fees of the Elk Grove Municipal Code foreach acre developed at the project site. In deciding whether to approve the land proposed for preservation by the Project applicant, the City shall consider the benefits of preserving lands in proximity to other protected lands. The preservation of land	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		shall be done prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, or the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, whichever occurs first. ▶ The applicant shall implement the following minimum conservation easement content standards, or such other requirements as may be updated by the City Council from time-to-time and as provide din Chapter 16.130: ◤ The land to be preserved must be found to be suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat as determined by the City based on substantial evidence. ◤ The land shall be protected through either fee title or conservation easement ("legal agreement") acceptable to the City of Elk Grove. ◤ The legal agreement shall be recordable and contain an accurate legal description of the mitigation land. ◤ The legal agreement shall prohibit any activity, which in the sole discretion of the City, substantially impairs or diminishes the land's capacity as suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. ◤ If the land's suitability as foraging habitat is related to existing agricultural uses on the land, the legal agreement shall protect any existing water rights necessary to maintain such agricultural uses on the land covered by the document and retain such water rights for ongoing use on the mitigation land. ◤ The applicant shall pay or cause to be paid to the City a mitigation monitoring fee to cover the costs of administering, monitoring, and enforcing the document in an amount determined by the City or a third-party receiving entity approved by the City, not to exceed 10% of the easement price paid by the applicant, or a different amount approved by the City Council. ◤ Interests in mitigation land shall be held in trust by an entity acceptable to the City and/or the City in perpetuity. The entity shall not sell, lease, or convey any interest in mitigation land without the prior written approval of the City. ◤ The City shall be named a beneficiary under any legal agreement conveying the interest in the mitigation land to an entity acceptable to	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		the City and the City shall receive indemnification, defense and indemnity in any legal agreement. ◤ If any qualifying entity owning an interest in mitigation land ceases to exist, the duty to hold, administer, monitor and enforce the interest shall be transferred to another entity acceptable to the City or to the City. ▶ Before committing to the preservation of any land, the project proponent shall obtain the City's approval of the land proposed for preservation. This mitigation measure may be fulfilled in combination with a mitigation measure imposed on the project requiring the preservation of agricultural land as long as the agricultural land is suitable Swainson's hawk habitat as determined by the City in its sole discretion. For any project less than 40 acres (smaller projects shall still mitigate pursuant to Chapter 16.130) the following measure shall be implemented to reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat: ▶ Prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, or the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall preserve at the Chapter 16.130 prescribed ratio land of similar equally suitable habitat for each acre of habitat lost. This land shall be protected through a fee title or conservation easement acceptable to the City of Elk Grove, or ▶ Prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, or the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall submit payment of Swainson's hawk impact mitigation fee per acre of habitat impacted (payment shall be at a 1:1 ratio) to the City of Elk Grove in the amount set forth in the Elk Grove Municipal Code. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-9 Western Pond Turtle Avoidance and Minimization in the LEA Community Plan Area** The City shall require future project applicants to implement the following measures to avoid the potential loss of western pond turtles: ▶ Projects shall be planned and designed to avoid aquatic habitats that could support western pond turtle to the extent that is technically feasible and appropriate. Avoidance shall be deemed technically feasible and appropriate if	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		the habitat may be preserved on-site while still obtaining the project purpose and objectives and if the preserved habitat features (i.e., aquatic habitats) could reasonably be expected to continue to function as suitable habitat for western pond turtle following project implementation. ▶ A preconstruction survey for western pond turtle shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to work in suitable aquatic habitat. If no pond turtles are observed, no further mitigation is necessary. ▶ If pond turtles are observed, a qualified biologist, with approval from CDFW, shall relocate pond turtles from to the nearest area with suitable aquatic habitat that will not be disturbed by project related construction activities. ▶ Construction within 500 feet of aquatic habitat known to support western pond turtles shall be conducted outside of the nesting season (March-August) unless a nesting survey conducted by a qualified biologist determines there are no active nests or hatchlings present in the proposed construction area. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-10 Western Red Bats Avoidance and Minimization in the LEA Community Plan Area** The City shall require future project applicants to implement the following measures to avoid the potential loss of western red bats: ▶ A qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for roosting western red bats prior to any tree removal. If evidence of bat use is observed, the number of bats using the roost will be determined. Bat detectors may be used to supplement survey efforts. If no evidence of bat roosts is found, then no further study shall be required. ▶ If tree roosting bats are found, bats shall be excluded from the roosting site before the tree is removed. A mitigation program addressing compensation, exclusion methods, and roost removal procedures shall be developed by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW before implementation. Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young). Once it is confirmed that bats are not present in the original roost site, the tree may be removed.	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		Mitigation Measure 3.11-11 Wetland Avoidance and Minimization in the LEA Community Plan Area If there is potential for wetlands to occur on a project site, project applicants shall retain a qualified wetland consultant to determine if state or federally protected wetlands or other waters are present. If potential waters of the United States or state are identified, the project applicant shall submit a delineation report to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) for verification or jurisdictional determination. The verified delineation will be submitted to the City for its records. If the project site supports a lake, river, or stream, the project applicant shall complete a notification of lake and streambed alteration and submit it to CDFW. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, a stream is defined as a body of water that flows at least periodically or intermittently through a bed or channel having banks and supports fish or other aquatic life. This can include human-created waterways. Project applicants shall ensure that their specific projects would result in no net loss of state or federally protected waters through impact avoidance, impact minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation, as determined in CWA Section 404 and 401 permits and/or Waste Discharge Requirements and a California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement. Evidence of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided prior to construction and grading activities for each proposed project.	
Impact 3.11.3 Geology and Soils	LTS	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan policies and implementation of General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure MM 5.6.5 to protect paleontological resources.	LTS
Impact 3.11.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS	**Mitigation Measure MM 5.5.2 Hazardous Materials Evaluation** Prior to approval of improvement plans, grading permits, and or demolition permits for properties in the Planning Area that have not already been evaluated for the potential for the presence of hazardous materials and hazardous conditions, Phase I ESAs shall be prepared by a qualified professional. Each Phase I ESA shall assess the potential for hazards and provide recommendations whether additional investigation (Phase II ESA) should be completed. If determined necessary, a Phase II ESA shall be conducted to determine the lateral and vertical extent of soil, groundwater, and/or soil vapor contamination, as recommended by the Phase I ESA. The City shall not issue a grading	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		or building permit for a site where contamination has been identified until remediation or effective site management controls appropriate for the site use have been completed consistent with applicable regulations and to satisfy the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, the California Department of Substances Control, and/or Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, as appropriate. If the Phase I ESA determines there are no recognized environmental conditions, no further action is required. However, the City shall ensure any grading or improvement plan or building permit includes a statement that if hazardous materials contamination is discovered or suspected during construction activities, all work in the vicinity of the contamination shall stop immediately until a qualified professional has evaluated the site and determined an appropriate course of action. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-12 Soil Contaminant Evaluation for the LEA Community Plan Area** With each improvement plan and/or grading plan application, the Project applicant shall include a detailed assessment of soil contamination associated with previous herbicide/pesticide use on the site. Soil sampling shall be conducted within the areas of potential herbicide/pesticide contamination. If substances are detected at concentrations that could pose a health hazard and/or violate local, State, or federal health standards, remediation of the affected areas shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the City of Elk Grove and the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department. Development of the site shall not commence until the site is deemed remediated and clear for development by the City in consultation with the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-13 Asbestos and Lead Prevention in the LEA Community Plan Area** Prior to the issuance of demolition permits for existing onsite structures constructed prior to 1979, asbestos material sampling shall be conducted to determine if asbestos containing building materials are present. Any identified asbestos containing building materials present in each of the structures to be dismantled shall be removed under acceptable engineering methods and work practices by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor prior to removal. These practices include, but are not limited to: containment of the area by plastic, negative air filtration, wet removal techniques, and personal respiratory protection and decontamination. The process shall be designed and monitored by a California	

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		Certified Asbestos Consultant. The abatement and monitoring plan shall be developed and submitted for review and approval by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. Prior to the issuance of demolition permits for existing onsite structures that were constructed prior to 1970, all loose and peeling paint shall be removed and disposed of by a licensed and certified lead paint removal contractor, in accordance with local, State, and federal regulations. The demolition contractor shall be informed that all paint on the buildings shall be considered as containing lead. The contractor shall take precautions in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations to protect his/her workers, the surrounding community, and to dispose of construction waste containing lead paint. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-14 Utility Hazard Avoidance in the LEA Community Plan Area** Prior to approval of improvement plans and/or a grading permit for development of properties that contain transformers, the City 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.	
Impact 3.11.5 Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS	**Mitigation Measure 3.11-15 Stormwater Retention for the LEA Community Plan Area** Grading plans for individual development projects in the LEA Community Plan Area shall be designed in such a way to direct all overland flow into proposed on-site detention basins. If this is not feasible, separate stormwater quality treatment facilities shall be constructed and a detailed drainage study shall be completed which demonstrates that the overall flood control and hydromodification goals for the watershed, contained in the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan, are still met. **Mitigation Measure 3.11-16 Drainage Report for the LEA Community Plan Area** New development in the LEA Community Plan Area shall be accompanied by site-specific drainage report. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to improvement plan approval for new development.	LTS

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The sites specific drainage plans shall ensure that peak flows from developed areas do not exceed pre-development conditions. Site-specific drainage reports shall demonstrate consistency with the Southeast Policy Area Drainage Study.	
Impact 3.11.6 Land Use and Planning	Not Significant	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan policies.	Not Significant
Cumulative Impacts			
Impact 4-1: Contribute to Cumulative Visual Resources Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No feasible mitigation measures are available to mitigate impacts to visual resources beyond compliance with Elk Grove Municipal Code Chapter 19.12 and Section 23.16.080. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-2: Contribute to Cumulative Light and Glare Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No feasible mitigation measures are available to mitigate impacts to light and glare beyond compliance with Elk Grove Municipal Code Chapter 23.56. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-3: Contribute to Cumulative Air Quality Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No additional mitigation is available to address this impact beyond implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.2-1 and 3.2-2 and compliance with General Plan policies NR-4-1, MOB-1-1, and Standard MOB-3-2a, Municipal Code Sections 16.07.200 through 16.07.500 and 23.58.120, and SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-4: Contribute to Historic Resources, Archaeological Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Human Remains Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan policies HR-2-1, adopted Mitigation Measures 5.5-1a and 5.5-1b, compliance with California	Not cumulatively considerable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
		PRC Section 5097 et seq. and 21081.3, and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. This impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	
Impact 4-5: Contribute to Cumulative Energy Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with the City's CAP, including measures BE-1, BE-5, BE-6, BE-7, BE-8, and ACM-5, and Municipal Code Chapter 16.07 and Section 23.58.120. This impact would not be cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable
Impact 4-6: Contribute to Cumulative Greenhouse Gas and Emissions and Climate Change Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with the City's CAP, No additional mitigation is available beyond compliance with Measures BE-1, BE-4, BE-5, BE-6, BE-7, BE-8, and ACM-5 from the 2019 CAP and Municipal Code Chapter 16.07 and Section 23.58.120. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-7: Contribute to Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan policies N-1-1, N-1-4, N-1-5, and N-2-3, and Mitigation Measure 3.6-2. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-8: Contribute to Cumulative Construction and Development Noise and Vibration Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy N-1-8, Municipal Code Section 6.32.100, the Elk Grove Construction Specifications Manual, and Mitigation Measure 3.6-1. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-9: Contribute to Cumulative Population Growth Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	This impact would not be cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable
Impact 4-10: Contribute to Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with EGMC Chapter 16.85 and 17.04 and General Plan policies ER-4-1, ER-4-2, SAF-1-3, and SAF-1-4. This impact would not be cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
Impact 4-11: Contribute to Cumulative Law Enforcement Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan Policy SAF-1-1. This impact would not be cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable
Impact 4-12: Contribute to Cumulative Public School Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-13: Contribute to Cumulative Parks and Recreation Facilities Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with General Plan policies PT-1-3, PT-1-5, PT-1-6, and PT-1-9, City and CCSD MOU, and EGMC Chapter 22.40. This impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	Not cumulatively considerable
Impact 4-14: Contribute to Cumulative Vehicles Miles Traveled Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with Housing Element EIR Mitigation Measure 3.13-1. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-15: Contribute to Cumulative Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facility Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan and General Plan Policies MOB-1-2, MOB-3-1, MOB-3-7, MOB-3-8, MOB-5-4, MOB-5-6, MOB-5-7, and H-1-3. This impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	Not cumulatively considerable
Impact 4-16: Contribute to Cumulative Hazards Due to a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond General Plan Policy MOB-3-10. This impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	Not cumulatively considerable
Impact 4-17: Contribute to Cumulative Water Service Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance General Plan Policy INF-1-1 and General Plan Mitigation Measure 5.12.1.1, which would address potential effects from water supply from SCWA outside the City limits. This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable			
Impact 4-18: Contribute to Cumulative Wastewater Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable
Impact 4-19: Contribute to Cumulative Solid Waste Impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	No additional mitigation is required beyond compliance with the City's existing recycling programs and associated regulations, as well as Municipal Code Section 30.70.030(C). This impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	Not cumulatively considerable
Impact 4-20: Contribute to Cumulative Groundwater Use Impacts	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable	This impact would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable

This page intentionally left blank.