5 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter provides a summary of significant environmental impacts; significant and unavoidable impacts; significant irreversible environmental changes; growth-inducing effects; and cumulative impacts.

5.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Section 15226.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a discussion of any significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented.

Chapter 3 of this EIR provides a detailed analysis of significant and potentially significant environmental impacts related to approval of the SOIA and future development; identifies feasible mitigation measures, where available, that could avoid or reduce these significant and potentially significant impacts; and presents a determination whether these mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Following is a listing of significant and unavoidable impacts associated with implementation of the SOIA. Cumulative impacts associated with the SOIA, including significant impacts, are summarized in Section 5.3.

Section 3.1, Aesthetics

- **Impact 3.1-1:** Degrade the existing visual character of the project site or impact scenic vistas
- **Impact 3.1-2:** Create light or glare

Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources

- **Impact 3.2-1:** Direct loss of agricultural land, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland under Williamson Act Contract
- **Impact 3.2-2:** Indirect loss of adjacent agricultural land, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance or Lands Under Williamson Act Contract

Section 3.3, Air Quality

- **Impact 3.3-1:** Short-term construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors
- **Impact 3.3-2:** Long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors
- **Impact 3.3-3:** Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations
- **Impact 3.3-4:** Exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of odors

Section 3.4, Biological Resources

- **Impact 3.4-2:** Special-status raptors and other nesting raptors

Section 3.5, Cultural Resources

- **Impact 3.5-2:** Substantial adverse change to undiscovered historical resources or unique archeological resources
- **Impact 3.5-4:** Disturbance of human remains

Section 3.6, Energy

- **Impact 3.6-1:** Energy efficiency
- **Impact 3.6-2:** New or expanded electrical and natural gas utilities

Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact 3.8-1:** Contribution to significant climate change cumulative impact

Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality

- **Impact 3.10-2:** Depletion of groundwater supplies

Section 3.11, Land Use, Population, Housing, Employment, Environmental Justice, and Unincorporated Disadvantaged Communities

- **Impact 3.11-4:** Consistency with the SACOG 2036 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- **Impact 3.11-5:** Conversion of open space
- **Impact 3.11-6:** Induce population growth

Section 3.12, Noise and Vibration

- **Impact 3.12-1:** Temporary, short-term exposure of sensitive receptors to construction noise
- **Impact 3.12-3:** Temporary, short-term exposure of sensitive receptors to potential groundborne noise and vibration from project construction
- **Impact 3.12-4:** Long-term traffic noise levels at existing noise-sensitive receivers
- **Impact 3.12-5:** Land use compatibility of on-site sensitive receptors with future traffic noise levels
- **Impact 3.12-6:** Land use compatibility of on-site sensitive receptors to or generation of non-transportation noise levels in excess of local standards

Section 3.13, Public Services and Recreation

- **Impact 3.13-1:** Increased demand on fire protection and emergency medical services
- **Impact 3.13-2:** Increased demand for law enforcement services

Section 3.14, Transportation

- **Impact 3.14-1:** Conflict with an applicable transportation plan, ordinance, policy, or congestion management program

Section 3.15, Utilities and Service Systems

- **Impact 3.15-1:** Increased demand for water supplies and water system facilities
- **Impact 3.15-2:** Increased demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities

5.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

CEQA requires that significant irreversible environmental changes caused by a plan be addressed in an EIR. Specifically, the EIR must consider whether "uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued

phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2[c]). Nonrenewable resources, as used in this discussion, refer to the physical features of the natural environment: land, air, and waterways.

If the SOIA Area is developed consistent with the assumptions embodied in the conceptual land use scenario, this would result in commitment of land to this mix of urban uses instead of the agricultural uses that exist today.

Future development of the SOIA Area would use both renewable and nonrenewable natural resources during both construction and operational phases – both within the SOIA Area and also to construct any required off-site improvements. Future development would likely use nonrenewable fossil fuels during construction and operation. Other nonrenewable and slowly-renewable resources consumed as a result of development of the SOIA Area would include, but not necessarily be limited to, lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemical construction materials, steel, copper, and water. Future development would consume energy for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, building heating and cooling, lighting, appliances, electronics, office equipment, and commercial machinery. Energy could also be consumed during each vehicle trip associated with these proposed uses. It is important to note that actual energy usage could vary substantially, depending upon factors such as the type of uses that would occupy the buildings, actual miles driven by future residents and employees, and the degree to which energy conservation measures are incorporated into the design of the various facilities.

Irreversible changes would likely occur as a result of future excavation, grading, and construction activities associated with implementation of the conceptual land use scenario of the proposed project. If there is future development, this would also generate additional transportation demand, construction, energy demand, and other activities that would increase emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants, as well as generation of noise. Different air pollutants and different greenhouse gas emissions remain in the atmosphere for different amounts of time, ranging from a few years to thousands of years.

If there is development in the future within the SOIA Area, this could result in irreversible damage from environmental accidents, such as an accidental spill or explosion of a hazardous material. During construction of projects, equipment on the site would use various types of fuel. Operation of projects could include the use of hazardous materials, which could increase the risk of an accidental spill or release.

During construction, equipment would be using various types of fuel and material classified as hazardous. In the State of California, the storage and use of hazardous substances are strictly regulated and enforced by various local, regional, and state agencies. The enforcement of these existing regulations would preclude credible significant impacts related to environmental accidents.

Detailed assessments for each of the above mentioned topics are provided throughout Chapter 3 of this EIR. Cumulative impacts associated with each of these topics are additionally addressed in detail in this chapter.

5.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This section provides an analysis of cumulative impacts of the SOIA, taken together with other past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related impacts, as required by Section 15130 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines). Other past, present, and future projects that would contribute to environmental impacts of the proposed SOIA are referred to as "related projects."

The goal of such an exercise is twofold:

1. first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such related projects, when considered together, would be cumulatively significant; and

2. second, to determine whether the SOIA itself would cause a "cumulatively considerable" (and thus significant) incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts. (See CEQA Guidelines Sections 15130[a]-[b], Section 15355[b], Section 15064[h], and Section 15065[c]).

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines: "(t)he discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impacts to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact." The proposed project is considered to have a significant cumulative effect if:

3. The cumulative effects of development without the project are not significant and the project's additional impact is substantial enough, when added to the cumulative effects, to result in a significant impact; or

4. The cumulative effects of development without the project are already significant and the project contributes measurably to the effect. The term "measurably" is subject to interpretation. The standards used herein to determine measurability are that either the impact must be noticeable to a reasonable person, or must exceed an established threshold of significance.

5.3.1 CUMULATIVE CONTEXT

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1) identifies two approaches to preparing the cumulative context for analysis of cumulative impacts. The first is the summary approach (also known as the "plan" approach), which summarizes the relevant projections from an adopted general plan or related planning document evaluating regional or areawide conditions. The second is the list approach, which requires a listing of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related or cumulative impacts.

For this EIR, both the plan and the list approach have been combined and the cumulative context is specific to each environmental impact. For some environmental issues, the cumulative scope should be broad. This is appropriate given the regional context of transportation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions issues. Issues considered in the more localized context (i.e., construction noise, public services) are not addressed in the regional context because cumulative impacts in these topic areas are generally limited to the service area of the service providers.

The broadest cumulative context used in this EIR is the state of California for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts. Although the effects of climate change are experienced globally, as detailed in Section 3.8 of this EIR, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions," the assessment of GHG emissions impacts is established by State legislation. Please see Section 3.8 for the cumulative analysis of GHG emissions impacts.

The next broadest cumulative context used in this EIR is the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, which is comprised of Sacramento, Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, the northeast portion of Solano, and

western portion of Placer counties. California's air basins have been created to group together regions that have similar natural factors that affect air quality.

The next broadest cumulative context is past, present, and probable future plans and projects that are described by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). This is a land use change scenario for the Sacramento region that includes anticipated past development and future development through 2036 (SACOG 2016). Currently, the population is more than 2.4 million, and there are 952,214 housing units (DOF 2016). Developed acreage in the region is forecast to increase by 7 percent between 2012, the baseline year for the MTP/SCS, and 2036, the MTP/SCS planning horizon. This 7-percent increase in developed acreage contrasts with an anticipated increase in housing units of 32 percent and an increase in jobs of 49 percent, indicating that new development could accommodate jobs and population on relatively less acreage. SACOG estimates that Elk Grove will grow by a total of 13,910 housing units between the baseline year for the MTP/SCS and 2036. This is a 27-percent increase. The MTP/SCS identifies a 64-percent increase in employment in Elk Grove by 2036 (19,864 new jobs).

The next broadest cumulative context used in this Chapter is Sacramento County's General Plan, which was updated and adopted on June 7th, 2011, and provides a complete and current representation of cumulative conditions for the County. The land use assumptions embodied in the General Plan include not only new development, but also existing development and development currently in entitlement review by the County.

Finally, some cumulative impacts are experienced more locally, and this EIR considers buildout of the City of Elk Grove's General Plan, along with a potential SOIA and possible development of approximately 579 acres, including a 100-acre multi-sport park complex southeast of Grant Line Road, southeast of the existing City limits.

5.3.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

AESTHETICS

Growth in the Sacramento region will change the visual character of agricultural lands, other open spaces, and existing developed areas that are intensified with redevelopment in the future. As development occurs throughout the region, substantial changes in visual conditions would continue as open viewsheds are replaced by urban development. Existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development projects within Sacramento County and the cities of Elk Grove, Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Citrus Heights, would collectively change the existing visual character, potentially disrupt scenic views, and add sources of light and glare. This includes the SEPA, which is located north of the SOIA Area, the Lent Ranch Marketplace, and other large regional projects, including the potential casino north of the SOIA Area and the proposed Multi-Sport Park Complex Project. Continued urbanization of the region would convert agricultural and open space land to urban uses with residential and commercial buildings and associated roadways and other infrastructure. Agricultural lands, viewsheds, and scenic resources have, and will be affected by projects and plans implemented throughout the region. As development occurs throughout the region, substantial changes in visual conditions would continue as open viewsheds are replaced by urban development, including buildings that are visible from longer distances, as well as lower-profile buildings that are only visible from adjacent public viewing areas or transportation corridors. This is a **significant cumulative** impact.

Development in the SOIA Area in the future would change the perceived visual character and quality of the environment by adding urban elements to a largely agricultural area. Views of open areas would be replaced by

views of residential and commercial uses. The visual character of the SOIA Area, as experienced from both public rights-of-way and private properties with existing views of the SOIA Area would be significantly changed. Future development within the SOIA Area would be a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to a cumulatively considerable impact. No feasible mitigation exists; cumulative impacts would be **significant and unavoidable.**

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Past, present, and future projects throughout the region have, and will continue to convert existing agricultural land to other uses – predominantly urban use. This includes plans and projects in Sacramento County, including the cities of Elk Grove, Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Citrus Heights, and all existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development projects within these jurisdictions. This includes the SEPA north of the SOIA Area, the Lent Ranch Marketplace, and other large regional projects, including the potential casino north of the SOIA Area and the proposed multi-sport park complex project. In addition to these local development projects, there are several urban development projects in Sacramento County and throughout the Central Valley that are contributing to the cumulative loss of agricultural resources, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance and lands under Williamson Act Contract. Continued urbanization of the region in accordance with applicable land use plans, as well as those approved and proposed development projects described previously, would continue to convert agricultural and open space land to urban uses with residential and commercial buildings and associated roadways and other infrastructure. The continued conversion of farmland in the region is a **significant cumulative** impact.

Based on analysis of the Sacramento County Important Farmland map (DOC 2014), an estimated 510 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance could be directly and permanently converted to nonagricultural, urban use. In 2014, an estimated 149,798 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance existed in Sacramento County. A conversion of an estimated 510 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would account for approximately one-third of one percent of this total. The total conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be relatively small in the context of the county's entire agricultural land base and would not likely cause a substantial reduction in the county's total agricultural production. However, the conversion of agricultural land would contribute to the incremental decline of Important Farmland in the county and would result in the irreversible conversion of this agricultural land. In addition, future development in the SOIA Area could impact nearby agricultural uses and result in the conversion of adjacent agricultural lands. The impact is **cumulatively considerable**.

According to the Elk Grove General Plan and EIR, the loss of agricultural productivity on lands designated for urban uses is a significant and unavoidable consequence of future development. Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to the incremental decline of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland in the county, region, and state and contribute to the irreversible conversion of this agricultural land. Individual development projects would be responsible for incorporating any feasible mitigation to avoid or minimize impacts to agricultural resources. However, this would not create new farmland. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The cumulative impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

AIR QUALITY

By its nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The cumulative setting for air quality is the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). As shown in Table 3.3-2 in Section 3.3 of this EIR, "Air Quality," ambient

concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2) at the Elk Grove – Bruceville Road monitoring station has not exceeded the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) in the past 3 years. The eight-hour ozone concentration exceeded the CAAQS two times in 2014 and 2015. The eight-hour ozone concentration exceeded the NAAQS only once in 2015. The one-hour ozone concentration has not exceeded the CAAQS in the past three years. Although the 24-hour fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) concentration has exceeded the NAAQS, the annual averages have remained well below the standard. All projects included in the conceptual land use scenario along with any other future development in the SVAB, including the potential casino north of the SOIA Area and the proposed multi-sport park complex project, would result in new air pollutant emissions, during construction and/or operation which could exceed thresholds. This is considered a **significant cumulative** impact. Future development activities within the SOIA Area could accommodate more population and jobs than anticipated by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Pollution Control District (SMAQMD) air quality attainment plans and the SACOGS 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) growth assumptions, and, therefore, would be inconsistent with both applicable SMAQMD air quality attainment plans.

Development of the SOIA Area may result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the SVAB is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard. Mitigation Measures 3.3-1 thorough 3.3-4 were designed to reduce impacts to air quality should the SOIA Area be considered for development. These mitigation measures seek to address emissions generated during construction and operational activities with associated land uses. Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 requires an assessment and strategy to reduce TAC-related emissions in association with potential future development. This will reduce potential impacts associated with air quality, but LAFCo has no authority to enforce mitigation strategies. No other feasible mitigation measures exist. The impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

Daily volumes for cumulative conditions with development of a previous and larger SOIA request for 7,869 acres of land that included the current proposed SOIA Area were estimated to be a maximum of 99,100 for SR 99, 25,800 for Kammerer Road, 31,800 for Eschinger Road, and 19,300 for Bruceville Road (Fehr & Peers 2011). None of the daily volumes for cumulative conditions with development of a much larger previous SOIA request for 7,869 acres of land that included this SOIA Area exceed the screening level included in the first step of SMAQMD's screening process. Thus, the proposed SOIA does not have any roadways in the vicinity that would exceed the project screening levels established by SMAQMD. There is **no significant cumulative** effect related to exposure of on-site sensitive uses to substantial pollutant concentrations.[1]

It is possible that, if the SOIA is approved, and if there is future annexation, if that annexation is approved, and if there is future development within the SOIA Area, that such development could generate or attract trips that could use I-5. According to the EIR for the previous and larger SOIA request, cumulative volumes along I-5 north of Laguna Boulevard could approach 111,700. As noted above, the K factor for 99 in Sacramento County ranges

1 LAFCo notes that the purpose of this EIR is to identify the significant effects of the proposed SOIA on the environment, not the significant effects of the environment on the proposed project. This is consistent with a recent California Supreme Court's decision (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District [2015] 62 Cal.4th 369, Case No. S213478). Although identifying the environmental effects of attracting development and people to an area is consistent with CEQA's legislative purpose and statutory requirements, identifying the effects on the proposed project and its users of locating the project in a particular environmental setting is neither consistent with CEQA's legislative purpose nor required by the CEQA statutes. Nonetheless, for disclosure purposes, LAFCo has elected to provide analysis of relevant impacts of existing environmental conditions relative to the proposed SOIA, including exposure to existing TAC emissions.

from 7 percent to 10.5 percent and the K factor for I-5 in Sacramento County ranges from 7.54 to 9.82 percent and I-5 would have peak-hour volumes of approximately 12,100 (Caltrans 2015). Using SMAQMD's Major Roadway Protocol lookup table, incremental cancer risk for this peak hourly volume would exceed 296 between 100 and 200 feet from the edge of the outside travel lanes to the east and between 25 and 50 feet to the west (SMAQMD 2009, Table 2, page 11). This is a **potentially significant cumulative** impact.

If there is future development within the SOIA, it is possible that such development would contribute trips to I-5. The proposed project analyzed in this EIR is a SOIA request that does not involve development or land use change. For the purposes of analysis in this EIR, the applicant has developed a land use scenario that includes up to 5,000 housing units and 20,000 jobs. Whether or not there would be annexation, whether that annexation would be approved, and whether there would be proposed projects following annexation, and whether any of these projects would be approved is speculative, not to mention the land use mix of such future uses. If the land use mix encourages internalization of trips or if the land use mix is such that very few heavy-duty trips would be generated that would use I-5, any potential contribution to TAC effects along the I-5 corridor would be reduced. The level of development and land use mix is unknown currently, so it is possible that there could be a **cumulatively considerable contribution** to the potentially significant cumulative impact. There is no feasible mitigation available. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Past and present actions by humans have substantially altered biological resources in the Central Valley region of California including Sacramento County, specifically, compared to historical conditions. Among the most important of these past actions have been conversion of natural vegetation and habitats to agricultural and developed land uses; fill and alteration of aquatic habitats; flood control and water supply projects; and the introduction of nonnative species, which in many cases have competed with, preyed upon, and degraded habitat for native species. More recently, the large-scale conversion of agricultural habitats to urban land uses has resulted in substantial loss of habitat for species such as State-listed Swainson's hawk and federally-listed giant garter snake that have adapted to use agricultural habitats in response to loss of their natural habitats. Past, present, and foreseeable future urbanization in the city of Elk Grove has contributed substantially to the loss of grassland, wetland, and agricultural habitats that are important to many species in the region, including listed species like Swainson's hawk and giant garter snake.

These past and present actions have resulted in significant adverse effects on the extent, species composition, and functioning of natural habitats that occur in the region; and on the distribution and abundance of plant and wildlife species associated with these habitats. Large areas of freshwater marsh, riparian, valley oak woodland, grassland, and vernal pool vegetation have been lost or degraded in the region over the past 100 years. The increase in the distribution and abundance of invasive plant species and nonnative plant communities, the large number of plant and wildlife species listed as threatened or endangered or considered sensitive by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the dramatic reductions in the extent of aquatic habitats and natural vegetation in the Central Valley region are evidence of these overall significant adverse effects. These actions have altered habitats, biotic interactions, and physical processes that continue to affect species in the region today. This is a **cumulatively significant** impact.

While the project could result in direct loss of individuals of western pond turtle and song sparrow, approval of the SOIA would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact on these species because habitat for these species in the SOIA Area is marginal.

The SOIA Area is comprised entirely of agricultural land that provides limited habitat values to most species; however, agricultural lands provide important foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, northern harrier, sandhill crane, and loggerhead shrike, and the agricultural ditches and canal provide aquatic dispersal habitat for giant garter snake. The SOIA Area also contains burrow habitat for burrowing owl. Although mitigation measures are proposed to compensate for the loss of habitat from the SOIA Area, fully compensating for the impact by preserving existing habitat in the vicinity is infeasible because there is a limited amount of suitable habitat land available and there would be a net loss of habitat regardless of the acreage preserved as compensatory mitigation. Because there has been a substantial loss of natural and agricultural habitats for these species that has resulted in a notable decline in their regional population numbers, loss of habitat from the region is considered a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, the loss of 1,156 acres of agricultural habitat from the SOIA Area could have a **cumulatively considerable contribution** to this significant cumulative impact. Impacts on the sensitive biological resources resulting from future development of the SOIA Area requires implementation of mitigation measures 3.4-1, 3.4-2a, 3.4-2b, 3.4-2c, 3.4-3, 3.4-4, 3.4-5, 3.4-6, 3.4-7, and 3.4-8a, 3.4-8b, 3.4-9, 3.4-0a, and 3.4-10b. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources resulting from future development of the SOIA Area. But, there is no additional feasible mitigation available that would avoid this impact. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The cumulative setting for cultural resources is Sacramento County, including the cities of Elk Grove, Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Citrus Heights, and all existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development projects within these jurisdictions. This includes the Southeast Policy Area (SEPA) north of the SOIA Area, the Lent Ranch Marketplace, and other large regional projects, including the potential casino north of the SOIA Area and the proposed Multi-Sport Park Complex Project. Continued urbanization of the region in accordance with applicable land use plans as well as those approved and proposed development projects described previously, could result in the disturbance of cultural resources, which includes archaeological and historic-period built environment resources. Regulations protecting cultural resources have substantially reduced the rate and intensity of these impacts. However, even with these regulations, cultural resources are still degraded or destroyed as cumulative development in proceeds. This is a **significant cumulative** impact.

As stated previously, there would be no significant adverse change on any known historical resources including prehistoric or historic cultural resources, as defined by CEQA guidelines, associated with the SOIA. Future development in the SOIA Area as well as any off-site infrastructure improvements could entail earth-moving activities and grading during on- and off-site construction. The potential for an impact on-site is relatively low; however, the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect previously unknown significant cultural resources. Because all significant cultural resources are unique and non-renewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one archaeological site or historic-period built environment property has the potential to affect all others in a region since these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The proposed project, in combination with other development in the region, could contribute to the loss of significant cultural resources. Compliance with California law and City of Elk Grove policies and actions as described in Section 3.5,

"Cultural Resources," will ensure that any cultural resources encountered during construction, including archaeological features or potential human remains, would be treated in an appropriate manner under CEQA and other applicable laws and regulations. This would reduce the potential for a significant impact resulting from inadvertent damage or destruction of presently undocumented cultural resources. If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (including human remains) is made during project-related construction activities, disturbances in the area of the find must be halted and appropriate treatment and protection measures must be implemented, all in consultation with a professional archaeologist and in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 if the resource is an historical resource of an archaeological nature and/or with CEQA Section 21083.2 if the resource is a unique archaeological resource. If the discovery could potentially be human remains, compliance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050 et seq. and Public Resources Code Section 5097.9 et seq. would be required. Although the potential for an impact is low, and compliance with California law and City of Elk Grove policies and actions would further reduce the potential for an impact, the impact is considered **cumulatively considerable**. No additional feasible mitigation is available. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

ENERGY

Energy Use

Increased demand for electrical and natural gas supplies and infrastructure is a byproduct of all future land uses and development throughout the Sacramento region. Energy is consumed for heating, cooling, and electricity in homes and businesses; for public infrastructure and service operations; and for agriculture, industry, and commercial uses. Each service provider is responsible for ensuring adequate provision of these utilities within their jurisdictional boundaries and would be responsible for upgrading their existing electrical and natural gas distribution systems or constructing new distribution systems to meet the demands of individual projects.

As noted in Section 3.6 of this EIR, "Energy," transportation is, by far, the largest energy consuming sector in California, accounting for approximately 39 percent of all energy use in the state (U.S. Energy Information Administration 2015). Since transportation accounts for more energy consumption than heating, cooling, and powering of buildings, powering industry, or any other use, the overall efficiency of energy use in the region will depend importantly on the ability of local lead agencies to plan in a way that reduces travel demand. SACOG's 2016 MTP/SCS demonstrates an increase in energy efficiency through 2035 in relation to transportation energy use – household generated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita is forecast to decrease by more than 8 percent; SACOG also estimates that total VMT will decrease by almost 7 percent during the 2016 MTP/SCS planning period (SACOG 2016, Chapter 5B, page 91).

Energy efficiency will also increase in relation to heating and cooling of buildings. The State of California adopted the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), which establishes mandatory standards for all buildings in California, including for energy efficiency. This Code is updated over time and in each instance, the energy efficiency standards are increased. The next update takes effect on January 1, 2017.

The City of Elk Grove 2030 General Plan and Climate Action Plan includes energy conservation strategies for land use, transportation, community design, public facilities and infrastructure, which also support the reductions in GHG emissions and increased emissions in criteria pollutants. However, the demand for energy and consumption of energy resources would still increase should the area become developed. Future land use patterns, new construction and building renovations, and commuting patterns would increase demand for energy in the City. This would result in a significant cumulative increase in the demand for energy and the need for

construction and/or extension of additional facilities to generate and/or distribute electricity and natural gas to serve the SOIA Area. This is considered a **significant cumulative** impact.

As previously stated, the project does not include direct changes to land use or the City of Elk Grove General Plan goals and policies. In addition, no specific land use entitlements, development proposals, and land development activities are proposed at this time in conjunction with the proposed SOIA. There are no direct impacts to energy as a result of the proposed project. However, the indirect effects of energy consumption and demand should the SOIA Area be annexed to the City and developed could contribute to cumulative impacts. Individual development projects would be required to assess project impacts during the environmental review process to ensure that PG&E has sufficient electrical and natural gas supplies to meet demand. Future development could eventually generate a need for new infrastructure, the construction of which could cause impacts on the environment. Construction and operation of off-site electrical and natural gas facilities are the responsibility of SMUD and PG&E, respectively. SMUD and PG&E would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the cumulative environmental impacts and would be required to implement feasible mitigation to reduce impacts found to be significant. However, cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. The SOIA could have an indirect **cumulatively considerable contribution** to this significant cumulative impact. No additional feasible mitigation is available. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

Electricity and Natural Gas

Future development within the SOIA Area would increase demand for electricity and natural gas services and require the development of new utility infrastructure to deliver services to future development. Electrical and natural gas service in the City of Elk Grove is provided by SMUD and PG&E, respectively.

Projects in the SMUD and PG&E service areas would vary in size and have different amounts of development. However, they would be expected to increase the demand for electricity and natural gas supplies and related infrastructure. Individual development projects would be required to assess project impacts during the environmental review process to ensure that PG&E has sufficient electrical and natural gas supplies to meet demand. Future development could eventually generate a need for new infrastructure, the construction of which could cause impacts on the environment. Construction and operation of off-site electrical and natural gas facilities are the responsibility of SMUD and PG&E, respectively. SMUD and PG&E would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the cumulative environmental impacts and would be required to implement feasible mitigation to reduce impacts found to be significant. However, cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. Thus, impacts would be **cumulatively significant**.

Future development in the SOIA Area could contribute to the cumulatively significant or potentially significant cumulative impacts associated with the increased demand for electrical and natural gas supplies. Therefore, future development within the SOIA Area could result in a **cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative impact** related to the increased demand for electrical and natural gas supplies and facilities. No additional feasible mitigation is available. This is considered a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

GEOLOGY, SOILS, MINERALS, AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Cumulative impacts on geology and soils would be less than significant due to the implementation of existing regulations and policies intended to manage geological hazards; and due to the site-specific nature of geological, mineral, and paleontological resource impacts. Increases in population, jobs, buildings, and infrastructure cumulatively considered would create a corresponding increase in exposure to humans and structures to risks associated with seismic activity, expansive soils, and unstable ground. However, each individual project which would contribute to these increases in people and development must meet the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC), local ordinances, and land use plan policies, such as following BMPs and developing grading erosion control plans.

Compliance with City of Elk Grove and Sacramento County General Plan policies and local ordinances require site-specific investigations and implementation of best management practices (BMPs) to protect potentially unique and scientifically significant paleontological resources. All developments within the vicinity of the SOIA Area in Sacramento County would be required to follow the same site-specific investigative procedures, which would prevent the effects of cumulative impacts from related projects and other development in the area. This would eliminate the possibility of additive impact effects, and there would be **no cumulatively considerable impacts** related to geologic or seismic hazards.

Development in the Sacramento region could occur in areas with geologic and soils constraints, in areas that could have paleontological resources sensitivity. Sensitive geologic units considered for paleontological resources are widespread in the Sacramento region, particularly in valley areas and adjacent lower foothills (SACOG 2015). Land use change and infrastructure improvements throughout the region have the potential to adversely affect buried paleontological resources. Since many resources are buried under the ground surface, it is difficult to predict the location of resources in the context of site planning, and therefore difficult to avoid in project designs. This is a **significant cumulative** impact.

Development as a result of the proposed SOIA would have the potential to damage previously unknown and potentially significant paleontological resources. In addition, off-site improvements such as roads, sewer lines, drainage facilities, and water lines could also be required if future development were to occur in the SOIA Area, which could damage paleontological resources. However, the potential for damage to paleontological resources is reduced by policies from both the City of Elk Grove and Sacramento County General Plans related to investigating construction project sites for potential archaeological or paleontological resources and applying recommended BMPs as applicable to reduce impacts to these resources. Regulations and policies of applicable local jurisdictions would minimize impacts to previously unknown paleontological resources in the proposed SOIA Area, and the impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Because there are no known mineral resources that could be of regional or state value, and no known locally important mineral resource discovery sites within the SOIA Area, there would be n**o significant cumulative impact** related to mineral resources.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Please see Section 3.8, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” of this EIR for the analysis of cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The health and safety impacts associated with a proposed project usually occur on a project-by-project basis, rather than cumulatively. Development associated with the project and future development within the area could result in increased hazard related impacts. As previously described, development would involve the storage, use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials (such as asphalt, fuel, lubricants, and solvents) to varying degrees during demolition, construction, and operation. Facilities that would use hazardous materials on site after the project and any off-site improvements are constructed would be required to obtain permits and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards designed to avoid hazardous waste releases. The storage, use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials are extensively regulated by various federal, State, and local agencies, and therefore construction companies and businesses (during the operational phase) that would handle any hazardous substances would be required by law to implement and comply with these existing hazardous-materials regulations.

Past, present, and future related project sites likely contain existing hazards materials (e.g., piles of debris, underground or aboveground storage tanks, septic systems, stained soils [indicating potential contamination], lead-based paints, asbestos-containing materials, or PCBs. However, if hazardous materials are encountered on site during construction of the related projects, the associated impacts would be localized to those projects and would not be additive to other hazardous materials-related impacts in the SOIA Area.

Federal, State, and local regulations would determine appropriate land uses and would assist in reducing the impacts. Because future development would be required to undergo environmental review and include mitigation measures to abate the site-specific hazards, any potential cumulative impacts associated with the project would be expected to be decreased. There is **no significant cumulative** impact.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Groundwater

The SOIA Area is located within Groundwater Basin 5-21.65 Sacramento Valley, South American subbasin. This subbasin encompasses the area bounded on the north by the American River, on the south by the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, on the west by the Sacramento River, and on the east by the Sierra Nevada mountain range. Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority monitoring data shows that groundwater elevations generally declined by approximately 20 to 30 feet consistently until about 1980. Water levels recovered by about 10 feet from 1980 through 1983, and remained stable until the beginning of the 1987–1992 drought, where until 1995, water levels declined by about 15 feet. Most water levels recovered between 1995 and 2003 generally to levels higher than prior to the 1987–1992 drought. Under current drought conditions, the water level is likely low. New development within the subbasin will increase the need for groundwater. This is considered a **significant cumulative** impact.

As described in Section 3.10, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” future development included in the conceptual land use scenario would increase demands for water supply and thus groundwater uses. Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) would need to conduct future water supply assessments to determine if existing water supplies would meet the demand of future development such that it would not negatively affect groundwater supplies. SCWA would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the environmental impacts. Cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and

unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. Future development in the SOIA Area and related projects could contribute to the cumulatively significant or potentially significant cumulative impacts associated with the future groundwater uses that would be needed to serve future development and other development within the SCWA service area. The SOIA could have an indirect **cumulatively considerable contribution** to this significant cumulative impact. No additional feasible mitigation is available. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

Erosion, Siltation, Polluted Runoff, Flooding and Flood Hazards

Development in Elk Grove and Sacramento County would result in increased impervious surfaces, excavation and grading activities, and construction of buildings, homes, and other structures which could affect hydrology and water quality in the cumulative study area. However, compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permitting requirements, Clean Water Act permitting requirements, and applicable local regulations such as flood control ordinances and grading permits would ensure that there would be **no significant cumulative impact.**

LAND USE AND PLANNING / POPULATION / HOUSING

Land Use

The cumulative setting for land use impacts is Sacramento County, including the cities of Elk Grove, Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Citrus Heights, and all existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development projects within these jurisdictions. This includes the SEPA north of the SOIA Area, the Lent Ranch Marketplace, and other large regional projects, including the potential casino north of the SOIA Area and the proposed multi-sport park complex project. Land use inconsistencies are not physical effects in and of themselves and combinations of policy inconsistencies would not rise to the level of a physical effect. There would be **no cumulative impact** related to land use. Cumulative effects of the physical changes related to the project are discussed in the other topics in this section.

Population, Housing, and Employment

Like land use policy inconsistency, population growth is not considered a significant cumulative effect because it is not a physical environmental impact. However, the direct and indirect effects, such as housing and infrastructure needs that are related to population growth, can lead to physical environmental effects.

At a regional level, the population of the six-county SACOG region is expected to increase to 3,078,772 by 2036. The number of housing units is expected increase to 1,188,347 and the number of jobs ix expected increase to 1,327,265 during the same time period (SACOG 2015). Those counties and their incorporated cities implement general plans, along with specific plans that are outside the development assumptions from local general plans, that could potentially accommodate substantially greater population and employment growth compared to regional forecasts and planning efforts. Increased population and employment in the region could generate the need for additional housing and infrastructure, which could lead to conversion of undeveloped land and associated adverse physical environmental impacts of the sort that are considered in this topic-specific sections of this EIR. Considering the indirect effects from past, present, and future development under the cumulative plans, this is a **significant cumulative** impact.

As discussed in Section 3.11, "Land Use, Population, Housing, Employment, Environmental Justice, and Unincorporated Disadvantaged Communities," there are no land uses changes proposed as part of this SOIA application. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce population growth through development of new housing and employment opportunities or extension of infrastructure. **No direct cumulative** impact would occur.

Future development could indirectly facilitate population growth through development of 4,000 to 5,000 dwelling units and creation of 18,000 to 20,000 jobs. The SOIA Area is located outside of the City of Elk Grove's Planning Area; therefore, the population that could be accommodated within the SOIA Area was not considered as part of the adopted Elk Grove General Plan. In addition, the 2016 MTP/SCS designates the SOIA Area as "Blueprint Vacant Urban Designated Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period (SACOG 2016)." The increase in population and housing attributed to future development is not accounted for in these planning documents.

The SOIA Area is not included in SACOG's future employment projection; therefore, the number of jobs potentially generated by future development would represent a substantial number of jobs not accounted for in SACOG's employment projections for the City. The proposed SOIA would indirectly result in a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to a significant cumulative impact. The purpose of the proposed project itself is to provide for future annexation of the SOIA Area and subsequent development of housing and employment opportunities. There is no feasible mitigation to reduce this impact to a less-than-cumulatively considerable level. The impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

NOISE

When determining whether the overall noise (and vibration) impacts from related projects would be cumulatively significant and whether the project's incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts would be cumulatively considerable, it is important to note that noise and vibration are localized occurrences; as such, they decrease rapidly in magnitude as the distance from the source to the receptor increases. Therefore, only those related projects that are in the direct vicinity of the SOIA Area and those that are considered influential in regards to noise and vibration (e.g., not located where ambient conditions are dominated by traffic noise from SR 99 and relatively large in size) would have the potential to be considered in a cumulative context with the project's incremental contribution (e.g., Capital Southeast Connector, 1,200-acre mixed-use Southeast Policy Area).

Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Equipment Noise

The City's noise regulations limit construction activities to daytime hours. However, it is anticipated that compliance with these regulations alone would not avoid significant construction-noise impacts associated with the related projects because of the anticipated substantial increase in ambient noise levels for existing and future adjacent sensitive receptors to construction areas during daytime hours. Therefore, significant cumulative noise impacts associated with construction activities could occur from continued construction of the proposed project and projects that are a part of the cumulative context.

The Capital Southeast Connector and 1,200 acre mixed-use Southeast Policy Area are close enough to the SOIA Area to have an additive effect from construction noise sources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-1 would reduce project-related construction-noise impacts, but depending on the phasing of possible future SOIA Area development relative to other developments in the area, the project could still result in a **cumulatively**

considerable incremental contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts from construction noise. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**

Temporary, Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Potential Groundborne Noise and Vibration

Groundborne noise and vibration levels from construction of projects included as a part of the cumulative context would be similar in nature and magnitude to those identified for the proposed SOIA Area. Specifically, construction activities would result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne noise and vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and activities involved. Although detailed information is not currently available, construction of the related projects would be anticipated to result in maximum groundborne noise and vibration levels associated with bulldozing activities. According to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), levels associated with the use of a large bulldozer is 0.089 in/sec PPV (87 VdB) at 25 feet. With respect to the prevention of structural damage, bulldozing would not exceed the Caltrans-recommended level of 0.2 in/sec PPV even at a distance of 25 feet. In addition, with respect to prevention of human disturbance, bulldozing could exceed the FTA-recommended level of 78 VdB within 50 feet. The exact locations of bulldozing activities have not been determined at this time; however, nearby sensitive receptors could be located within the distances modeled above that are correlated with the Caltrans- and FTA-recommended exceedance levels. Therefore, the related projects could result in a significant impact from short-term exposure of sensitive receptors to potential groundborne noise and vibration. Construction of future projects in the SOIA Area would result in a significant impact from temporary, short-term groundborne noise and vibration levels in the immediate vicinity and possibly during the same time frame as the related projects. The impact is **cumulatively considerable**. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**

Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Non-Transportation Source Noise

Non-transportation source noise associated with the proposed SOIA and projects included in the cumulative context could potentially result in exceedance of the City's noise regulations at sensitive receptors. The noise from any non-transportation noise sources associated with the related projects could be controlled at the source by means of noise walls, enclosures, and site planning, but there is no guarantee that all the related projects would include such noise controls as part of their proposals. Therefore, **significant cumulative noise impacts** associated with non-transportation noise sources could occur. Projects within the Capital Southeast Connector and 1,200 acre mixed-use Southeast Policy Area are close enough to the proposed SOIA Area to have an additive effect from non-transportation noise sources.

Mitigation Measure 3.12-6 would reduce project-generated non-transportation source noise impacts. However, project implementation could still result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to significant cumulative stationary-source noise impacts. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**

Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Increased Traffic Noise Levels

Construction noise and stationary-source noise can be controlled on-site at the point of origin; however, traffic noise may extend beyond a project site along existing and proposed off-site and on-site roadways, resulting in significant traffic noise impacts on sensitive uses along these roadways. Development forecast under the MTP/SCS would generate and attract vehicular travel along roadways located throughout the region, including

within and near the City's Planning Area, which would combine with traffic associated with development in the Planning Area to increase vehicular traffic noise in areas directly adjacent to travelways.

Because full buildout of the proposed project would result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise on several roadways, the project would result in an incrementally considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. Furthermore, the combined cumulative increase in traffic on area roadways would extend the 60-dBA noise contour distances for these roadway segments, causing the sensitive receptors from the related projects to fall within this contour. Thus, the traffic noise impacts from the proposed project and the related projects (Capital Southeast Connector and 1,200 acre mixed-use Southeast Policy Area), taken together, are considered **cumulatively significant**, and the proposed project would result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to a significant cumulative impact. Construction of sound walls and other noise-attenuating features (e.g., berms) throughout the area would require a citywide program and may not be feasible to implement. Because it is considered infeasible to sufficiently reduce noise at every existing and proposed sensitive receptor that could be affected, this cumulative traffic noise impact is considered **significant and unavoidable.**

PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

Future development in service provider's boundaries, including within the SOIA Area, would increase the demand for public services. In terms of cumulative impacts, the appropriate service providers are responsible for ensuring adequate provision of public services within their jurisdictional boundaries.

Although a cumulative shortage of public services and facilities would not in and of itself represent a significant environmental impact under CEQA because these are not physical impacts on the environment, such a shortage could lead to the need to develop additional public-services facilities, which could in turn lead to significant construction- and operation-related environmental impacts. It is assumed that future development and/or development of the additional public-services facilities required to serve them would be preceded by the required environmental review. However, conducting the required CEQA review of the related projects would not necessarily guarantee that significant environmental effects associated with construction of new fire, police, school facilities, and other public services would not occur. Hence, the development of new fire, police, and other public services could result in **potentially significant cumulative** impacts.

Fire Protection Services

The CCSD Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services to a 157-square-mile area encompassing the city of Elk Grove, the city of Galt, and areas of unincorporated southern Sacramento County. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.13-1 would ensure that the City demonstrate fire protection facilities would meet the service demand of any future development.

Individual development projects within the CCSD Fire Department service area would incorporate California Fire Code and City or County standards into project designs and provide funding for additional fire protection services and facilities. Any construction or expansion of CCSD Fire Department facilities would require additional analysis in subsequent CEQA documents, prepared at the time such improvements are proposed. CCSD Fire Department would conduct a CEQA analysis to analyze specific impacts and identify any required mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant or significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of mitigation measures would be the responsibility of the CCSD Fire Department, and such measures would be implemented in accordance with the certified CEQA documents. However, impacts could remain significant after

implementation of mitigation (i.e., significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, a **significant cumulative** impact would occur, and the proposed SOIA could result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to impacts related to increased fire protection services and facilities. No additional feasible mitigation measures exist for these cumulative impacts. Thus, impacts would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Law Enforcement Services

The SOIA Area is currently served by the SCSD, which provides specialized law enforcement services to the County and local police protection to both the incorporated and unincorporated areas. The EGPD also provides certain law enforcement services to the SOIA Area through a mutual aid agreement and would be the main provider if future annexation requests were approved. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 would ensure that the City demonstrate police protection facilities would meet the service demand of any future development.

Development within the unincorporated areas of the county, or within Elk Grove, would increase the demand for SCSD and EGPD law enforcement services and facilities. Individual development projects would be required to assess impacts related to law enforcement services during the environmental review process to ensure that the SCSD and EGPD have sufficient facilities and equipment to meet demand and provide funding for additional police protection facilities through payment of development impact fees. As appropriate, future facility construction would be subject to project-level environmental analysis and mitigation. However, impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, a **significant cumulative** impact would occur, and the proposed SOIA would result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to impacts related to increased law enforcement services and facilities. No additional feasible mitigation measures exist for these cumulative impacts. Thus, impacts would be cumulatively **significant and unavoidable**.

Schools

The EGUSD provides K–12 education to the City of Elk Grove and the SOIA Area. Development within the EGUSD service area could increase the demand for school facilities. However, new development within the EGUSD would be required to pay state-mandated school impact fees that may be used to finance new schools and equipment, and to reconstruct existing facilities to maintain adequate housing for EGUSD's students as described in Mitigation Measure 3.13-3. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. However, depending on how school facilities are located and designed relative to possible future residential development within the SOIA Area and other areas within the School District service area, there could be indirect impacts related to transportation, such as air pollutant emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation noise. This is a **potentially significant cumulative impact**.

It is possible that future residential development within the SOIA Area would generate demand for school facilities that are not met within the SOIA Area or are not for some period of time within the SOIA Area as it builds out. Off-site impacts associated with possible school facility development are not knowable at this time and are conservatively assumed for the purposes of this EIR to be cumulatively considerable. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

Parks and Recreation

The CCSD provides parks and recreation facilities for residents of the city of Elk Grove, as well as portions of Sacramento County. CCSD serves an area of roughly 157 square miles, including the city limits of the City of Elk Grove, plus unincorporated areas of Sacramento County.

New development, including future development within the SOIA Area, would generate demand for new and existing recreational facilities in Elk Grove and the unincorporated county. Payment of the development impact fees would provide financing for public facilities, including parks and recreational facilities, which are required to serve new development. Individual development projects would be required to assess impacts related to parks and recreational facilities during the environmental review process to ensure sufficient facilities to meet demand. As appropriate, future facility construction would be subject to project-level CEQA analysis and mitigation. However, impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation. A **significant cumulative** impact would occur, and the proposed SOIA would result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to impacts related to increased parks and recreation facilities. No feasible mitigation measures exist for these cumulative impacts. Thus, impacts would be **cumulatively significant and unavoidable.**

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The purpose of the cumulative (2035) transportation impact analysis is to determine whether implementation of the proposed project in addition to planned cumulative growth will adversely affect the planned transportation system. The MTP for 2036 identifies roadway and transit improvements that are proposed to accommodate future travel demand and includes the western segment of the proposed Capital SouthEast Connector project.

The SOIA Area is located just south of the western segment of the proposed Capital SouthEast Connector project, which is a 35-mile roadway that will link communities in El Dorado County and Sacramento County and the cities of Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and Elk Grove. It will connect between US 50 in El Dorado Hills and I-5 at Hood-Franklin Road southwest of Elk Grove. Many of the roadway improvements are located along potential alignments of the SouthEast Connector project, including improvements on Grant Line Road, Kammerer Road, and Hood-Franklin Road. There are planned roadway improvements under SouthEast Connector in the SOIA Area that include widening Kammerer Road to six lanes from SR 99 to Bruceville Road, and extension of Kammerer Road (four lanes) from Bruceville Road to I-5 with UPRR overcrossing.

Roadway and Freeway Segment Operations

Table 5-1 and Table 5-2 summarize study roadway and freeway segment operations under cumulative and cumulative plus conditions, respectively, and include the following information for each study roadway segment:

- Daily roadway capacity
- Daily traffic volume (two-way total)
- Volume-to-capacity ratio
- LOS

As shown in Table 5-1, the cumulative no project conditions may not meet the minimal acceptable operation level for the City or County. The County defines the minimum acceptable operation level for its roadways and intersections to be LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for urban areas. The urban areas are those areas within the Urban Service Boundary as shown in Figure 1 of the Land Use Element of the Sacramento County General Plan

(Sacramento County 2016). The areas outside the Urban Service Boundary are considered rural. Also, Policy CI-13 indicates that the City shall require that all roadways and intersections in Elk Grove operate at a minimum Level of Service "D" at all times. This would be a **significant cumulative** impact.

Table 5-2 shows whether the studied roadways are within the urban/City boundary or in rural areas (as identified in the County's Land Use Element). Table 5-2 also shows existing no project and cumulative no project LOS for the studied roadway segments and provides comparison between cumulative no project conditions and existing no project conditions. As shown, four roadway segments and five freeway segments already operate with LOS E or F under existing conditions. These roadway and free segments are labeled "Yes" under Impact column for existing conditions in Table 5-2. The cumulative no project condition would have indirect impacts related to traffic congestion on additional four roadway segments and four freeway segments. These roadway and free segments are labeled "Yes" under Impact column for cumulative no project conditions in Table 5-2.

However, as shown in Table 5-2, the cumulative no project condition would only cause deterioration in daily level of service from LOS E to LOS F or an increase of more than 0.05 in volume over capacity ratios on the following roadway and freeway segments:

- Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive
- Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to SR 99
- Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Parkway
- SR 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard
- SR 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road
- SR 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to north of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road

Table 5-1. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Cumulative No Project Conditions

Roadway Segment	Daily Capacity[1]	Daily Volume[2]	V/C Ratio	LOS
Elk Grove Boulevard from I-5 to Harbour Point Drive	54,000	25,500	0.47	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	54,000	26,300	0.49	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	54,000	35,331	0.65	B
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	54,000	59,720	1.11	**F**
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to SR 99	54,000	75,609	1.40	**F**
Elk Grove Boulevard from SR 99 to East Stockton Boulevard	36,000	33,016	0.92	**E**
Elk Grove Boulevard from East Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	36,000	31,793	0.88	D
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	18,000	32,093	1.78	**F**
Grant Line Road from Promenade Parkway to East Stockton Boulevard	18,000	28,589	1.59	**F**
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	18,000	35,381	1.97	**F**
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	18,000	25,430	1.41	**F**
Bilby Road from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	18,000	8,400	0.47	A
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Parkway	20,000	29,179	1.46	**F**
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to SR 99	18,000	1,100	0.06	A
Dillard Road from SR 99 to Wilton Road	17,000	4,700	0.28	A
Lambert Road from I-5 to Bruceville Road	17,000	900	0.05	A
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Parkway	36,000	14,916	0.41	A
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Parkway	36,000	22,400	0.62	B
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	18,000	3,700	0.21	A
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	17,000	2,100	0.12	A
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	17,000	1,500	0.09	A
I-5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	80,000	65,890	0.82	D
I-5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	72,067	0.90	**E**
I-5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	80,000	88,912	1.11	**F**
I-5 from Laguna Boulevard to north of Laguna Boulevard	120,000	103,341	0.86	D
SR 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	80,000	94,355	1.18	**F**
SR 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	80,000	85,778	1.07	**F**
SR 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	80,000	87,003	1.09	**F**
SR 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	80,000	88,580	1.11	**F**
SR 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	89,361	1.12	**F**
SR 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	80,000	145,671	1.82	**F**
SR 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to north of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	80,000	186,067	2.33	**F**

Notes:

1 The capacity of each roadway is based on the number of lanes and the facility type.

2 The baseline condition represents conditions in fall 2014, which for most of the studied roadways segments were obtained from the City of Elk Grove Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes. The segment volumes not available in the City's 2014 ADT were obtained from the 2011 study for the proposed project.

Bold text indicates unacceptable LOS.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014.

Table 5-2. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Comparison between Cumulative No Project and Existing No Project Conditions

Roadway Segment	Urban/City or Rural	LOS			Impact?	
		Existing No Project	Cum. No Project	VOC Ratio Increase	Existing	Cum. No Project
Elk Grove Boulevard from Interstate 5 to Harbour Point Drive	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	B	B	0.04		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	Urban/City	D	**F**	0.20		**Yes**
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to State Route 99	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.20	Yes	**Yes**
Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	C	**E**	0.14		Yes
Elk Grove Boulevard from E Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	Urban/City	C	D	0.14		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	Urban/City	**E**	**F**	0.23	Yes	**Yes**
Grant Line Road from Promenade Pkwy to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.50	Yes	Yes
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.50	Yes	Yes
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	D	**F**	0.50		Yes
Bilby Road from franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	A	A	0.25		
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Pkwy	Urban/City	A	**F**	0.65		**Yes**
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99	Rural	A	A	1.35		
Dillard Road from State Route 99 to Wilton Road	Rural	A	A	0.09		
Lambert Road from Interstate 5 to Bruceville Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Urban/City	A	A	0.27		
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Rural	B	B	0.07		
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	Rural	A	A	0.90		
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	A	A	1.38		
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Interstate 5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	Rural	B	D	0.00		
Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Rural	C	**E**	0.12		Yes
Interstate 5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	**E**	**F**	0.10	Yes	**Yes**
Interstate 5 from Laguna Boulevard to North of Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	C	D	0.04		
State Route 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	Rural	**E**	**F**	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	Rural	D	**F**	0.02		Yes
State Route 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	D	**F**	0.02		Yes
State Route 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	Rural	D	**F**	0.05		Yes
State Route 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	**E**	**F**	0.27	Yes	**Yes**
State Route 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.27	Yes	**Yes**
State Route 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to North of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.27	Yes	**Yes**

Notes: VOC Ration = volume-to-capacity ration
Bold text indicates significant increase in VOC ratio. For roadways already operating at an unacceptable LOS, a project is considered to have a significant effect if it increases the volume-to-capacity ratio by more than 0.05. (Sacramento County 2004)
Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014, Sacramento County 2016

Table 5-3 summarizes study roadway and freeway segment operations under cumulative plus project conditions.

Table 5-3. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Roadway Segment	Daily Capacity[1]	Daily Volume[2]	V/C Ratio	LOS
Elk Grove Boulevard from Interstate 5 to Harbour Point Drive	54,000	26,923	0.50	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	54,000	27,723	0.51	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	54,000	37,643	0.70	B
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	54,000	70,192	1.30	**F**
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to State Route 99	54,000	86,481	1.60	**F**
Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard	36,000	38,385	1.07	**F**
Elk Grove Boulevard from E Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	36,000	37,062	1.03	**F**
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	18,000	36,528	2.03	**F**
Grant Line Road from Promenade Pkwy to E Stockton Boulevard	18,000	39,651	2.20	**F**
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	18,000	46,542	2.59	**F**
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	18,000	36,892	2.05	**F**
Bilby Road from franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	18,000	12,818	0.71	C
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Pkwy	20,000	43,273	2.16	**F**
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99	18,000	25,479	1.42	**F**
Dillard Road from State Route 99 to Wilton Road	17,000	6,185	0.36	A
Lambert Road from Interstate 5 to Bruceville Road	17,000	4,261	0.25	A
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	36,000	24,750	0.69	B
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	36,000	24,712	0.69	B
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	18,000	19,981	1.11	**F**
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	17,000	25,531	1.50	**F**
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	17,000	4,860	0.29	A
Interstate 5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	80,000	65,940	0.82	D
Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	80,802	1.01	**F**
Interstate 5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	80,000	96,731	1.21	**F**
Interstate 5 from Laguna Boulevard to North of Laguna Boulevard	120,000	107,682	0.90	D
State Route 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	80,000	96,018	1.20	**F**
State Route 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	80,000	87,440	1.09	**F**
State Route 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	80,000	88,666	1.11	**F**
State Route 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	80,000	92,956	1.16	**F**
State Route 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	111,246	1.39	**F**
State Route 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	80,000	166,556	2.08	**F**
State Route 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to North of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	80,000	207,952	2.60	**F**

Notes:

1 The capacity of each roadway is based on the number of lanes and the facility type.

2 The baseline condition represents conditions in fall 2014, which for most of the studied roadways segments were obtained from the City of Elk Grove Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes. The segment volumes not available in the City's 2014 ADT were obtained from the 2011 study for the proposed project.

Bold text indicates unacceptable LOS.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014.

As shown in Table 5-3, if there is development of the SOIA Area in the future, this may have indirect impacts on County of Sacramento and City of Elk Grove facilities under cumulative plus project conditions.

Table 5-4 shows whether the studied roadways are within the urban/City boundary or in rural areas (as identified in the County's Land Use Element). Table 5-4 also shows cumulative no project LOS and with project LOS for the studied roadway segments and provides comparison between cumulative no project conditions and existing no project conditions. As shown, eight roadway segments and nine freeway segments already operate with LOS E or F under cumulative no project conditions. These roadway and free segments are labeled "Yes" under Impact column for cumulative no project conditions in Table 5-3. The cumulative plus project condition would have indirect impacts related to traffic congestion on additional three roadway segments. These roadway and free segments are labeled "Yes" under Impact column for cumulative plus project conditions in Table 5-3.

However, as shown in Table 5-4, the cumulative no project condition would only cause increase in traffic volume would cause deterioration in daily level of service from LOS E to LOS F or an increase of more than 0.05 in volume over capacity ratios on the following roadway and freeway segments:

- Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard
- Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99
- Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road
- Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road
- Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard

Congestion Management Plan (CMP) also requires establishment of LOS standards to measure congestion at specific monitoring locations on the freeway and arterial systems. Policy CI-5-Action 4 indicates that the City shall participate in the preparation and implementation of a CMP consistent with legal requirements which gives priority to air quality goals, alternatives to automobile travel, and the development of demand reduction measures over additional road capacity. Policy CI-17 requires the City to regulate truck travel as appropriate for the transport of goods, consistent with circulation, air quality, congestion management, and land use goals.

Also, the MTP/SCS road investments emphasize access to infill development areas, congestion relief, support for bus and rail transit, and improved bicycle and pedestrian access. Local road investments increase capacity for local passenger travel, creating a benefit to goods movement on highways. The Capitol SouthEast Connector in the MTP/SCS is an expansion of existing segments of Kammerer Road, Bruceville Road, Grant Line Road and White Rock Road in the SOI Area.

However, the above impacts on the studied roadway and freeway segments would occur because adequate roadways and adequate capacity is not planned on I-5 or SR 99 to accommodate cumulative traffic volumes with buildout of the proposed SOIA Area have not yet been identified to support the conceptual land use changes that would occur under implementation of the proposed project. Under these circumstances, many of the study roadways would operate at levels worse than the stated significance criteria. This is a **cumulatively considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact.

Section 3.14, "Transportation," includes mitigation measures to reduce impacts on transportation. Impacts on local roadways outside of the City's jurisdiction would require consultation with other agencies (e.g., Sacramento County, the Capital SouthEast Connector JPA, and Caltrans), and the City cannot assure that mitigation for improvements outside its jurisdiction would be implemented. Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

Table 5-4. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Comparison between Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Roadway Segment	Urban/City or Rural	LOS		VOC Ratio Increase	Impact	
		Cum. No Project	Cum. Plus Project		Cum. No Project	Cum. Plus Project
Elk Grove Boulevard from Interstate 5 to Harbour Point Drive	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	B	B	0.04		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.19	Yes	**Yes**
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to State Route 99	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.20	Yes	**Yes**
Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	**E**	**F**	0.15	Yes	**Yes**
Elk Grove Boulevard from E Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	Urban/City	D	**F**	0.15		**Yes**
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.25	Yes	**Yes**
Grant Line Road from Promenade Pkwy to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.61	Yes	**Yes**
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.62	Yes	**Yes**
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.64	Yes	**Yes**
Bilby Road from franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	A	C	0.25		
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Pkwy	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.70	Yes	**Yes**
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99	Rural	A	**F**	1.35		**Yes**
Dillard Road from State Route 99 to Wilton Road	Rural	A	A	0.09		
Lambert Road from Interstate 5 to Bruceville Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Urban/City	A	B	0.27		
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Rural	B	B	0.06		
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	Rural	A	**F**	0.90		**Yes**
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	A	**F**	1.38		**Yes**
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Interstate 5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	Rural	D	D	0.00		
Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Rural	**E**	**F**	0.11	Yes	**Yes**
Interstate 5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.10	Yes	**Yes**
Interstate 5 from Laguna Boulevard to North of Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	D	D	0.04		
State Route 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	Rural	**F**	**F**	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	Rural	**F**	**F**	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	**F**	**F**	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	Rural	**F**	**F**	0.05	Yes	**Yes**
State Route 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.27	Yes	**Yes**
State Route 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.26	Yes	**Yes**
State Route 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to North of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	Urban/City	**F**	**F**	0.27	Yes	**Yes**

Notes: VOC Ration = volume-to-capacity ration

Bold text indicates significant increase in VOC ratio. For roadways already operating at an unacceptable LOS, a project is considered to have a significant effect if it increases the volume-to-capacity ratio by more than 0.05. (Sacramento County 2004)

Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014, Sacramento County 2016

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

In terms of cumulative impacts, the appropriate service providers are responsible for ensuring adequate provision of public utilities within their service boundaries. Utilities and service systems would be provided to future development by the Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA), the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) (formerly known as County Sanitation District-1), Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD), Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). The related projects discussed in this section include future development that would occur within each provider's service area

Water Supply and Water Systems

The SOIA Area is adjacent to the southwestern boundary of SCWA's Zone 40; therefore, it is most likely that water service would be provided by SCWA. SWCA's nearest water transmission mains are along Bilby Road at West Stockton Boulevard and at the Grant Line Road/State Route 99 interchange. The Poppy Ridge WTP is located near the intersection of Bruceville Road and Poppy Ridge Road (see Exhibit 3.17-1 in Section 3.17, "Utilities and Service Systems"). Zone 40 provides water supply through a conjunctive-use water supply system consisting of surface water, groundwater, and recycled water. The Zone 41 UWMP addresses water supply and demand issues, water supply reliability, water conservation, water shortage contingencies, and recycled-water usage for the areas within Sacramento County where Zone 41 provides retail water services, including Zone 40. As shown in Table 3.15-2 in Section 3.15, SCWA would have water supplies that exceed demands in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years. The SOIA Area is not with SCWA's Zone 40 service area and water supply demands to the SOIA Area were not accounted for in the Zone 41 UWMP or Zone 40 WSMP.

Planned SCWA water system improvements could serve future development in the service area. The Zone 40 WSIP shows the future Whitelock WTP, planned as a Phase 2 facility in The Zone 40 WSMP, and additional water conveyance pipelines are proposed along Whitelock Parkway (SCWA 2006). These water system improvements were identified in the 2005 Zone 40 WSMP EIR, and the environmental impacts of the construction and operation were analyzed at a programmatic level. SCWA would conduct project-level CEQA or NEPA analysis, if necessary, to analyze specific cumulative impacts and identify any required mitigation measures for construction and operation of new off-site facilities.

As shown in Section 3.15, "Utilities," SCWA would have water supplies that exceed demands in all water years. Future development within the SCWA service area could require SCWA water. If capacity is not available, SCWA may need to expand or construct water systems facilities. SCWA would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the environmental impacts of constructing or expanding facilities and would be required to implement mitigation for any impacts found to be significant. However, impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Thus, future development within the service area could lead to a **significant cumulative** impact.

As shown on Table 3.15-3, the estimated water supply demand based on build-out of the conceptual land use scenario has been conservatively estimated as 3,233 afy. SCWA would have water supplies that exceed demands in all water years. Surplus water supplies could potentially meet water supply demands of future development. Off-site water supply facilities necessary to serve future development have not been identified at this time. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.15-1 would reduce significant impacts associated with increased for water supplies and demand for off-site water facilities because the City of Elk Grove would demonstrate adequate

water supplies and water system facilities would be available for the amount of development identified in the annexation territory.

However, future development in the SOIA Area could contribute to the cumulatively significant or impacts associated with the future construction of water facilities that would be needed to serve development within the SCWA service area. Therefore, is the effects of future development within the SOIA Area is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

Wastewater Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment Facilities

Future development within the SASD or SRSCD service areas would receive municipal wastewater service through existing infrastructure or the construction of on-site wastewater transmission facilities and new and/or expansion of existing infrastructure. Planned construction of the SASD infrastructure in the LA Laguna Trunk shed and the SRCSD South Area Interceptor and expansion of the SRWTP would be required to serve future development within their service areas regardless of whether development within the SOIA Area occurs. However, it cannot be determined if the SRWTP and other facilities would have capacity to treat wastewater generated by future development. If SASD or SRCSD are not able to provide wastewater service to new development with existing infrastructure, construction or expansion of existing infrastructure may be required, the construction of which could have environmental impacts. Both SASD and SRCSD would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with increased demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities and would be required to implement feasible mitigation measures to reduce any impacts found to be significant. However, cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. Thus, future development within the service area would be a **potentially cumulative considerable** impact.

Future development in the SOIA Area could contribute to the cumulatively significant impacts associated with the future construction of wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities that would be needed to serve development within the SASD and SCRSD service areas. Mitigation Measure 3.15-3 would reduce impacts because the City of Elk Grove would demonstrate adequate on-site and off-site wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities would be available for the amount of development identified in the annexation territory. However, LAFCo would not have control over the City's approval, timing, or implementation of on-site wastewater collection and conveyance facilities. Therefore, future development could result in a **cumulatively considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to the increased demand for SASD and SCRSD wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

Solid Waste

Residential solid waste in the City of Elk Grove is disposed of at the Kiefer Landfill and commercial solid waste is primarily disposed of at the Kiefer Landfill, the L and D Landfill, and the Yolo County Landfill. These landfills currently provide solid waste disposal services to both municipal and commercial customers in Sacramento and Yolo Counties. Development of new land uses within those counties would increase the amount of solid waste disposal at the Kiefer Landfill, the L and D Landfill, and the Yolo County Landfill. The Kiefer Landfill, the L and D Landfill, and the Yolo County Landfill have a large volume of landfill capacity (254 million cubic yards)

available to serve future development within their service areas through 2064. Therefore, **no significant cumulative** impact would occur.

5.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

According to Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR should:

> [d]iscuss ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects that would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss characteristics of some projects that may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

A project has the potential to induce growth both directly and indirectly. Direct growth inducement would result if a project involved construction of new housing. Indirect growth inducement would result, for instance, if implementing a project resulted in substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial, or governmental enterprises); or a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that indirectly stimulates the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand; and/or removal of an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as improving the capacity of a public utility or service (e.g., construction of a major sewer line with excess capacity through an undeveloped area).

Growth inducement itself is not an environmental effect but may lead to environmental effects. These environmental effects may include increased demand on other services and infrastructure, increased traffic and noise, degradation of air or water quality, degradation or loss of plant or animal habitats, conversion of agricultural and open space land to urban uses, or other adverse impacts.

5.4.1 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

There are no land uses changes proposed as part of this SOIA application. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce population growth through development of new housing and employment opportunities or extension of infrastructure.

However, future development could indirectly facilitate population growth by generating a population of approximately 13,000 to 16,250 people in the City of Elk Grove. The SOIA Area is located outside of the City of Elk Grove's Planning Area; therefore, the population that could be accommodated within the SOIA Area was not considered as part of the adopted Elk Grove General Plan. However, the City is currently updating its General Plan and although no draft has been released, preliminary maps show the SOIA Area within the future planning area. It is anticipated that the population, housing, and employment that could be accommodated under the future land use scenario would be addressed in the City's General Plan update.

The proposed project could develop approximately 4,000 to 5,000 dwelling units. In addition to residential development, future development could generate a substantial amount of employment-generating land uses. The conceptual land plan assumes a broad range of commercial, office, and industrial uses that generate 18,000 to 20,000 jobs.

In addition, the future development under the SOIA could require off-site improvements for services, facilities, and utilities. Some of these improvements could benefit development elsewhere within Elk Grove and in other portions of the County. Potential growth-inducing impacts resulting from the extension of circulation facilities and expansion of utility infrastructure are addressed in Sections 3.14, "Transportation" and 3.15, "Utilities and Service Systems," respectively.

Future development in the SOIA Area would require construction workers. Because construction workers typically do not change where they live each time they are assigned to a new construction site, it is not anticipated that there would be any substantial relocation of construction workers to Elk Grove or Sacramento County associated with the SOIA. LAFCo does not anticipate substantial impacts associated with growth inducement associated with the temporary relocation of construction workers.

The additional population associated with the future development within the SOIA Area could spur an increase in demand for goods and services in the surrounding area, which could potentially result in additional development to satisfy this demand. In this respect, the SOIA Area would be growth inducing. It would be speculative to attempt to predict where and when any such new services would be developed, and whether or not existing and future planned industrial and commercial development would satisfy additional demand for goods and services created by the project. Existing vacant light industrial and commercial space may be sufficient to meet additional demand created by implementation of the SOIA that is not accommodated within the SOIA Area.

In summary, the SOIA would maintain existing land use designations and zoning and would not result on the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or utilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth and impacts; however, the project may indirectly induce substantial population growth because the increased population and employment opportunities associated with the future development could increase demand for goods and services, thereby fostering population and economic growth in unincorporated Sacramento County and other nearby communities. It is possible that a successful SOIA could place pressure on adjacent areas to seek development entitlements or annexation applications.

However, the SOIA Area would provide sufficient acreage to accommodate population and employment growth. Therefore, the SOIA would likely not induce substantial growth outside of the SOIA Area. Furthermore, any growth outside of the SOIA Area would require its own LAFCo SOI amendment and environmental review outside of the SOIA process.

This page intentionally left blank.