

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Overview of the CEQA Process

This Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report is part of the ongoing environmental review process for the proposed City of Elk Grove Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) project and was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the project (LAFC # 09-10, State Clearinghouse No. 2010092076). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). This document is considered a recirculated EIR because significant new information has been added or changed in portions of the Draft EIR after it was initially circulated for public comment in September 2011. For purposes of clarity, this document is referred to as the Recirculated Draft EIR (Recirculated Draft EIR), and the previously circulated Draft EIR is referred to as the Draft EIR.

1.1.1 - Overview

The proposed project consists of an application to Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) to amend the City of Elk Grove's SOI. The current SOI is coterminous with the City boundary. The amended SOI would include an additional 7,869 acres generally described as the areas south of Bilby Road/Kammerer Road and Grant Line Road. Section 2, Project Description, provides a complete description of the project.

1.1.2 - Purpose and Authority

This Recirculated Draft EIR provides an analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed SOIA project. The environmental impacts of the proposed project are analyzed in the Recirculated Draft EIR to the degree of specificity appropriate, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15146. This document addresses the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that may be directly or indirectly associated with the expansion of the existing City of Elk Grove SOI boundary. There are no specific land use entitlements proposed at this time in conjunction with the proposed SOIA. No physical development is proposed in conjunction with the proposed application. However, this Recirculated Draft EIR acknowledges that future urbanization of the project area may occur as an indirect result of this SOIA; therefore, this Recirculated Draft EIR contains an analysis of indirect environmental impacts attributable to or which could result from the proposed project. This Recirculated Draft EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for the public agency decision makers and the public regarding the proposed project.

Recirculation of an EIR requires notice pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 and consultation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15086.

The Draft EIR for the City of Elk Grove Sphere of Influence Amendment project was circulated for public comment for a public review period, beginning on September 29, 2011 and ending November 14, 2012. LAFCo received 10 verbal comments and 35 written comment letters. After the close of the public comment period, LAFCo staff determined it was necessary to add new information to the Draft EIR in order to address comments received on the Draft EIR, address changes in the environmental setting related to the Sacramento County General Plan Update EIR and Sacramento Area Council of Governments' Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035, and refine the analysis to ensure that the EIR adequately addresses the requirements of CEQA. The Recirculated Draft EIR will be used, in conjunction with other environmental documentation, to enable LAFCo to evaluate the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The Recirculated Draft EIR replaces the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA Statute Section 15088.5(f)(1), Sacramento LAFCo requests new comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR, and will not be responding to comments submitted during the Draft EIR comment period. As required by CEQA Statute Section 15088.5(g), a summary of revisions made to the previously circulated Draft EIR is provided as an attachment to this Revised Draft EIR.

CEQA requires that an EIR contain, at a minimum, certain specific elements. These elements are contained in this Recirculated Draft EIR and include:

- Table of Contents
- Introduction
- Executive Summary
- Project Description
- Environmental Setting, Significant Environmental Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
- Cumulative Impacts
- Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts
- Alternatives to the Proposed Project
- Growth-Inducing Impacts
- Effects Found Not To Be Significant
- Areas of Known Controversy
- Organizations and Persons Consulted

1.1.3 - Lead Agency Determination

The Sacramento LAFCo is designated as the lead agency for the project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15367 defines the lead agency as “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.” In general, LAFCo will function as a lead agency in situations where:

- a. LAFCo is the first agency in time to act;

- b. The primary decision relates to a change of organization or reorganization or sphere of influence;
- c. The applicant agency is unable to act as the lead agency; or
- d. There are no underlying land use approvals involved.

This Recirculated Draft EIR was prepared by Michael Brandman Associates, an environmental consultant. Prior to public review, it was extensively reviewed and evaluated by Sacramento LAFCo staff. This Recirculated Draft EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Sacramento LAFCo staff as required by CEQA. Lists of organizations and persons consulted and the report preparation personnel are provided in Section 8, Persons and Organizations Consulted/List of Preparers, of the original and Recirculated Draft EIR.

1.1.4 - LAFCo Authority

LAFCo's powers are set forth in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Act). The legislative intent of Section 56300 of the Government Code requires that each LAFCo establish policies and exercise its powers in a manner that provides planned, well-ordered, efficient urban development patterns with appropriate consideration of preserving open space lands within those patterns. LAFCo's purposes include the discouragement of urban sprawl and the encouragement of the orderly formation of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances. The project must be approved by LAFCo and meet all LAFCo requirements. Specific "Policy Elements" established by the Act are as follows:

- Encourage orderly growth and development patterns (Section 56001).
- Discourage urban sprawl, preserve open-space and prime agricultural lands, efficiently provide government services, and encourage the orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances (Section 56301).
- Guide development away from open space and prime agricultural land uses unless such action would not promote planned, orderly, and efficient development (Section 56377).

In order to implement the legislative mandate, LAFCos have the specific authority to review the following actions: annexations to, or detachment from, cities or districts; formation or dissolution of districts; incorporation or disincorporation of cities; consolidation or reorganization of cities or districts; establishment of subsidiary districts; and development of, and amendments to, spheres of influence.

In order to implement the legislative policies, LAFCo has the power to approve, modify and approve, or deny applications and impose terms and conditions (Section 56885.5). However, LAFCo may not exercise direct land use authority through use of zoning or subdivision processes. Sacramento LAFCo has adopted specific standards for its actions to ensure that it renders fair and consistent decisions in

accordance with state law. LAFCo uses these specific standards, as well as applicable LAFCo-adopted policies and general standards, during its decision-making process. LAFCo may make exceptions to the general or specific standards, if it determines that such exceptions: (1) are necessary due to unique circumstances; (2) are necessary due to conflicts between general and specific standards; (3) result in improved quality or lower cost of services available; or (4) there exists no feasible or logical alternative.

Factors to be considered by Sacramento LAFCo when reviewing the proposed SOIA are the following:

- Population, population density; land area and land use; per capita assessed valuation; topography, natural boundaries, and drainage basins; proximity to other populated areas, the likelihood of significant growth in the area and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas during the next 10 years.
- Need for organized community services; the present cost and adequacy of governmental services and controls in the area; probable future needs for such services and controls; probable effect of the proposed incorporation, formation, annexation, or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the area and adjacent areas.
- The effect of the proposed action and of alternative actions on adjacent areas, on mutual social and economic communities of interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county.
- Conformity of the proposal and its effects with commission policies on providing planned, orderly, efficient patterns of urban development and with state policies and priorities on conversion of open-space lands to other uses.
- Effect of the proposal on maintaining the physical and economic integrity of lands in an agricultural preserve in open-space uses.
- The definiteness and certainty of the boundaries of the territory, the nonconformance of proposed boundaries with lines of assessment or ownership, the creation of islands or corridors of unincorporated territory, and other similar matters affecting the proposed boundaries.
- Conformity with appropriate city or county general and specific plans.
- The “sphere of influence” or any local agency that may be applicable to the proposal being reviewed.

LAFCo Compliance with CEQA

The Policies, Standards, and Procedures adopted by the Sacramento LAFCo include policies and procedures for implementing CEQA requirements for environmental review of LAFCo projects. These policies and procedures include a list of standards for determining the significance of

environmental impacts, as well as requirements that EIRs for LAFCo actions include an evaluation of countywide or cumulative impacts and an alternatives analysis evaluating a reasonable range of alternatives. After reviewing the information in an environmental document, LAFCo may:

- At its discretion, approve a project without change if the anticipated environmental impacts are insignificant.
- Require an applicant to modify a project.
- Establish mitigation measures as conditions of project approval.
- Deny the proposal because of its unacceptable adverse environmental impacts.
- Approve a project despite its significant adverse environmental impacts by making findings of fact and a statement that project benefits outweigh the costs (statement of overriding considerations).

1.2 - Scope of the EIR

This Recirculated Draft EIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The Sacramento LAFCo issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project on September 27, 2010, for a 30-day public review period. The Draft EIR was circulated for public comment for a 45-day public review period, beginning on September 29, 2011. At LAFCo’s discretion, the public comment period was extended to 52 days. The scope of this Recirculated Draft EIR includes the potential environmental impacts identified in the NOP and issues raised by agencies and the public in response to the NOP and Draft EIR. The NOP is contained in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

Twenty comment letters were received in response to the NOP. They are listed in Table 1-1 and provided in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

Table 1-1: NOP Comment Letters

Status	Affiliation	Signatory	Date
	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District	Sarena Deeble	October 1, 2010
	Elk Grove Unified School District	Robert Pierce, Associate Superintendent	October 8, 2010
	Sacramento County Planning and Community Development Department	Michael Winter, Planner III	October 13,2010
	Cosumnes Community Services District	Jeff Ramos, General Manager	October 13,2010
	Sacramento Regional Transit District	Rosemary Covington	October 13, 2010

Table 1-1 (cont.): NOP Comment Letters

Status	Affiliation	Signatory	Date
	Sacramento County Department of Waste Management and Recycling	Dave Ghirardelli	October 18,2010
	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District	Larry Robinson, Program Coordinator	October 26, 2010
	Sacramento County Municipal Services Agency	Antonia Barry, Principal Environmental Analyst	October 26, 2010
	California Department of Transportation	Alyssa Begley, Chief	October 27, 2010
	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Jerry Clark, Land Agent	November 2, 2010
Private Organizations and Individuals	Private Citizen	Marilyn Armbruster	October 24, 2010
	The Nature Conservancy	Michael Conner, Project Director	October 26, 2010
	Private Citizen	Lynn Wheat	October 26, 2010
	Private Citizen	Mark Dempsey	October 26, 2010
	Friends of the Swainson's Hawk	James P. Pachl, Attorney at Law	October 27, 2010
	Cosumnes Basin Habitat Defense Project	Mike Eaton	October 27, 2010
	Habitat 2020	Rob Burness	October 27, 2010
	Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge Association	Robert Burness, Chair, Watershed Committee	October 27, 2010
	Private Citizen	Tina Suarez-Murias	October 27, 2010
	Habitat 2020 and Sierra Club	Sean Wirth	October 28, 2010
Source: Sacramento County LAFCo, 2010.			

A total of 45 verbal and written comments were received in response to the Draft EIR. They are listed in Table 1-2 and provided in Appendix B of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

Table 1-2: Draft EIR Comment Letters

No.	Commentor	Comment Date (mm.dd.yyyy)	Commentor Code
LEAD AGENCY			
1	Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Members Meeting		LAFCo-1
2	Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Members Meeting		LAFCo-2
STATE AGENCIES			
3	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, Scott Morgan	11.15.2011	OPR-1
4	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, Scott Morgan	12.12.2011	OPR-2
5	California Department of Transportation, Eric Fredericks	11.21.2011	CALTRANS
LOCAL AGENCIES			
6	Cosumnes Community Services District, Jeff Ramos	11.02.2011	CCSD
7	Central Valley Flood Protection Board, James Herota	12.27.2011	CVFPB
8	Elk Grove Water District, Mark J. Madison	11.21.2011	EGWD
9	Sacramento County Department of Transportation	12.13.2011	SACDOT
10	Sacramento County Water Agency, Darrell K. Eck	11.14.2011	SCWA
11	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Charlene McGhee	11.23.2011	SMAQMD-1
12	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Larry Robinson	12.21.2011	SMAQMD-2
13	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, Michael Meyer	11.01.2011	SRCSD
PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS			
14	Sacramento Audubon Society, Don Schmoltdt	11.17.2011	AUD
15	Environmental Council of Sacramento, Sean Wirth (Verbal)	11.02.2011	ECOS-1
16	Environmental Council of Sacramento, Robert Burness (Verbal)	11.02.2011	ECOS-2
17	Environmental Council of Sacramento, Jonathan Ellison	11.18.2011	ECOS-3
18	Sacramento County Farm Bureau, Kevin Steward	11.21.2011	FARM
19	Friends of the Swainson's Hawk, James Pacht (Verbal)	11.02.2011	FOSH-1
20	Friends of the Swainson's Hawk, Judith Lamare, Ph.D. (Verbal)	11.02.2011	FOSH-2
21	Friends of the Swainson's Hawk, Donald B. Mooney	11.21.2011	FOSH-3
22	Friends of the Swainson's Hawk, K. Shawn Smallwood, Ph.D.	11.21.2011	FOSH-4

Table 1-2 (cont.): Draft EIR Comment Letters

No.	Commentor	Comment Date (mm.dd.yyyy)	Commentor Code
23	Friends of the Swainson's Hawk, Judith Lamare, Ph.D.	11.21.2101	FOSH-5
24	Pacific Gas and Electric, Don Kennedy	10.10.2011	PGE
25	Sierra Club, Sean Wirth (Verbal)	11.02.2011	SIERRA
26	Stonelake National Wildlife Refuge Association, Robert Burness (Verbal)	11.02.2011	SLNWR-1
27	Stonelake National Wildlife Refuge Association, Ellen Carlson	11.21.2011	SLNWR-2
28	The Nature Conservancy, Dawit Zeleke	11.21.2011	TNC
INDIVIDUALS			
29	John Berry (Letter)	11.01.2011	BER
30	Sherry D. Burch (Email)	11.13.2011	BUR
31	Mike Eaton (Email)	10.27.2011	EAT-1
32	Mike Eaton (Email)	11.01.2011	EAT-2
33	Nikki Carpenter (Email)	11.01-2011	CAR
34	Gilliam Consulting, Jim Gillum	11.21.2011	GIL
35	Bill Mosher (Verbal)	11.02.2011	MOS
36	Suzanne Pecci (Verbal)	11.02.2011	PEC-1
37	Suzanne Pecci (Email)	11.14.2011	PEC-2
38	Suzanne Pecci (Letter)	11.18.2011	PEC-3
39	Dylan Perry (Email)	11.04.2011	PER
40	Howard R. Sihner	11.16.2011	SIH
41	Scott Taylor (Verbal)	11.02.2011	TAY-1
42	Scott Taylor (Letter)	11.04.2011	TAY-2
43	Lynn Wheat (Verbal)	11.02.2011	WHE-1
44	Lynn Wheat (Email)	11.14.2011	WHE-2
45	Lynn Wheat (Letter)	11.15.2011	WHE-3

1.2.1 - Environmental Issues Determined Not to Be Significant

Certain subjects with various topical areas were determined not to be significant. Other potentially significant issues are analyzed in these topical areas; however, the following issues are not analyzed:

- Forest Land Zoning (Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources)
- Forest Lands (Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources)

- Septic and Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems (Section 3.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity)
- Airport and Private Airstrip Hazards (Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow Hazards (Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Aviation Noise (Section 3.12, Noise)
- Displacement of Persons or Housing (Section 3.13, Population and Housing)
- Air Traffic Patterns (Section 3.15, Transportation/Traffic)

An explanation of why each issue is determined not to be significant is provided in Section 7, Effects Found Not to Be Significant.

1.2.2 - Potentially Significant Environmental Issues

The NOP found that the following topical areas may contain potentially significant environmental issues that will require further analysis in the EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

1.3 - Organization of the EIR

This Recirculated Draft EIR is organized into the following main sections:

- **Section ES: Executive Summary.** This section includes a summary of the proposed project and alternatives to be addressed in the Recirculated Draft EIR. A brief description of the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved, and an overview of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, in addition to a table that summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation, are also included in this section.
- **Section 1: Introduction.** This section provides an introduction and overview describing the purpose of this Recirculated Draft EIR, its scope and components, and its review and certification process.
- **Section 2: Project Description.** This section includes a detailed description of the proposed project, including its location, site, and project characteristics. A discussion of the project

objectives, intended uses of the Recirculated Draft EIR, responsible agencies, and approvals that are needed for the proposed project are also provided.

- **Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis.** This section analyzes the environmental impacts of the proposed project. Impacts are organized into major topic areas. Each topic area includes a description of the environmental setting, methodology, significance criteria, impacts, mitigation measures, and significance after mitigation. The specific environmental topics that are addressed within Section 3 are as follows:
 - **Section 3.1 – Aesthetics:** Addresses the potential visual impacts of the proposed project and the overall increase in illumination produced by the project.
 - **Section 3.2 – Agricultural Resources:** Addresses the potential conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use, as well as conflicts with Williamson Act contracts and agricultural zoning.
 - **Section 3.3 – Air Quality:** Addresses the potential air quality impacts associated with project implementation, as well as consistency with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District’s air quality plans.
 - **Section 3.4 – Biological Resources:** Addresses the project’s potential impacts on habitat, vegetation, and wildlife; the potential degradation or elimination of important habitat; and impacts on listed, proposed, and candidate threatened and endangered species.
 - **Section 3.5 – Cultural Resources:** Addresses potential impacts of project development on known historical resources and potential archaeological and paleontological resources.
 - **Section 3.6 – Geology, Soils, and Seismicity:** Addresses the potential impacts the project may have on soils and assesses the effects of project development in relation to geologic and seismic conditions.
 - **Section 3.7 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Addresses the potential greenhouse gas emissions impacts as a result of project implementation.
 - **Section 3.8 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** Addresses the potential for the presence of hazardous materials or conditions on the project site and in the project area that may have the potential to impact human health.
 - **Section 3.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality:** Addresses the potential impacts of the project on local hydrological conditions, including drainage areas, and changes in the flow rates.
 - **Section 3.10 – Land Use and Planning:** Addresses the potential land use impacts associated with division of an established community and consistency with the Sacramento County General Plan, Sacramento LAFCo policies, and the City of Elk Grove General Plan.
 - **Section 3.11 – Mineral Resources:** Addresses potential environmental impacts to mineral resources resulting from project implementation.

- **Section 3.12 – Noise:** Addresses potential noise impacts on ambient noise levels as a result of project implementation.
 - **Section 3.13 – Population and Housing:** Addresses the growth-inducing effects of the proposed SOIA.
 - **Section 3.14 – Public Services:** Addresses potential impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, schools, parks, libraries, and trails as a result of project implementation.
 - **Section 3.15 – Transportation/Traffic:** Addresses the impacts on the local and regional roadway system, public transportation, and bicycle and pedestrian access.
 - **Section 3.16 – Utilities and Service Systems:** Addresses potential impacts on utility and service systems, including water, wastewater, storm drainage, solid waste, and energy providers as a result of project implementation.
- **Section 4: Cumulative Effects.** This section discusses the cumulative effects associated with the proposed SOIA, in conjunction with past, present, and future projects.
 - **Section 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project.** This section compares the impacts of the proposed project with three land-use project alternatives: the No Project Alternative, the Alternate SOI Boundary Alternative, and the Enhanced Regional Alternative. An environmentally superior alternative is identified.
 - **Section 6: Other CEQA Considerations.** This section provides a summary of significant environmental impacts, including unavoidable and growth-inducing impacts. This section discusses the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project, including the impacts of past, present, and probable future projects. In addition, the proposed project’s energy demand is discussed.
 - **Section 7: Effects Found Not to Be Significant.** This section contains analysis of the topical sections not further evaluated in Section 3.
 - **Section 8: Organizations and Persons Consulted/List of Preparers.** This section contains a full list of persons and organizations that were consulted during the preparation of this Draft EIR, as well as the authors who assisted in the preparation of the Draft EIR, by name and affiliation.
 - **Section 9: References.** This section contains a full list of references that were used in the preparation of this Draft EIR.
 - **Appendices:** This section includes all notices and other procedural documents pertinent to the Draft EIR, as well as all technical material prepared to support the analysis.

1.4 - Documents Incorporated by Reference

As permitted by CEQA Guidelines Sections 15148 and 15150, this Recirculated Draft EIR has cited and referenced several technical studies, analyses, and previously certified environmental documentation. Information from the documents, incorporated by reference herein, has been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s). The relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and the Recirculated Draft EIR has also been described. The documents and other sources that have been used in the preparation of this Recirculated Draft EIR include, but are not limited to:

- Sacramento LAFCo Policies, Standards, and Procedures
- County of Sacramento General Plan
- County of Sacramento Municipal Code
- City of Elk Grove General Plan
- City of Elk Grove Municipal Code
- City of Elk Grove Municipal Services Review

These documents are specifically identified in Section 9, References, of this Recirculated Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(b), these referenced documents and other sources used in the preparation of the Recirculated Draft EIR are available for review at the Sacramento LAFCo.

1.5 - Review of the Recirculated Draft EIR

Upon completion of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the Sacramento LAFCo filed a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the California Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code, Section 21161). Concurrent with the NOC, this RDEIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, as well as to all parties requesting a copy of the Recirculated Draft EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code 21092(b)(3). During the public review period, the Recirculated Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the Sacramento LAFCo offices, located at the address provided below. Agencies, organizations, and interested parties not previously contacted or who provided comments on the NOP or Draft EIR currently have the opportunity to comment on the Recirculated Draft EIR during the public review period on the Recirculated Draft EIR. Written comments on this Recirculated Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Don Lockhart AICP, Assistant Executive Officer
Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission
1112 I Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-6458
Email: Donald.Lockhart@SacLAFCo.org

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format is encouraged. Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to comments will be prepared and made available for review by the commenting agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing before the Commission on the project, at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration by decision makers for the project.

