

This section provides an overview of the project and the environmental analysis. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate chapter of Section 5.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.

### 2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EIR

This Draft EIR provides an analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of the Franklin Boulevard Widening project located in the City of Elk Grove. This Draft EIR fully evaluates the proposed project and four alternatives (including the no project alternative) to the proposed project.

The EIR analysis focuses on potential impacts arising from development of the proposed project and project alternatives. The EIR adopts this approach in order to provide a credible worst-case scenario of the impacts resulting from project implementation. Where appropriate, some impacts are analyzed under future conditions, which assume buildout of reasonably foreseeable projects in the area. Other issues that are site-specific in nature are evaluated against baseline conditions. CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 defines baseline conditions as the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they exist at the time the NOP is published.

### 2.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project would widen a portion of Elk Grove Boulevard from five lanes to six lanes and a portion of Franklin Boulevard from three lanes to six lanes. The proposed project would include new right-of-way to accommodate new free right-turn lanes on eastbound Elk Grove Boulevard and southbound Franklin Boulevard north of Laguna South Channel, North Drainage, and for portions of the Franklin Boulevard widening, including two bus turnouts, south of Laguna South Channel, North Drainage along the west side of Franklin Boulevard. The project would require 0.79 acres of the conservation easement on along Elk Grove Boulevard and 0.43 acres along Franklin Boulevard.

Elk Grove Boulevard would be widened approximately 24 feet on the south side (eastbound) between the UPRR overcrossing and Franklin Boulevard, a distance of approximately 0.25 mile. The Elk Grove Boulevard widening would include an additional eastbound through lane and 4-5 foot wide bike lane, as well as an approximately 300 feet long dedicated right turn lane onto southbound Franklin Boulevard. The UPRR overcrossing will only require re-striping, but will not include any widening of the structure itself. The project would not require widening at the base of the current engineered slope created by the County of Sacramento Public Works Department (County) as a ramp for Elk Grove Boulevard leading up to the UPRR overcrossing.

Franklin Boulevard would be widened approximately 26 feet on the west side from its intersection with Elk Grove Boulevard south to approximately 80 feet south of Poppy Ridge Road, a distance of approximately 1.1 mile, to provide for a six lane arterial with median landscaping. Widening Franklin Boulevard to the west is designed to allow nearly all the existing pavement for the road to remain. The Franklin Boulevard widening would include an additional three through lanes, a four-foot bike lane, and a three-foot curb/gutter on the southbound direction (west side). An auxiliary lane of approximately 280 feet in length would extend from the intersection of Elk Grove Boulevard in the southbound direction to receive traffic from the free right turn lane on eastbound Elk Grove Boulevard. A sidewalk on the west side would only be constructed at two bus turnout locations, one just south of Percheron Drive and one just north of Blossom Ridge Drive. Short segments of sidewalk on the west side of Franklin Boulevard would also be constructed between the crosswalks at the Percheron Drive and Blossom Ridge Drive

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

intersections and the bus turnouts. The landscaped median will be 12 feet wide. Final asphalt overlay on both the east and west side would be required to complete the project.

The proposed project would fill an earthen intermittent drainage ditch along the western side of Current Franklin Boulevard and replace it with an underground storm water conveyance system consisting of curb and gutter with storm water catchment basins along the new portion of the widened roadway. The majority of storm water catchment basins on the west side of Franklin Boulevard would be routed across and under Franklin Boulevard to the existing underground storm water pipe system on the east side of the road, which, in turn, routes storm water either northward to outfall into Laguna South Channel, North Drainage or southward to connect with the storm water system along Poppy Ridge Road. New directional lighting would be established along the west side of Franklin Boulevard, and utility poles would be relocated approximately 5 feet west to the back of curb of the new roadway.

The principal objectives of the Franklin Boulevard Widening project are identified as follows:

- Provide adequate roadway and intersection level of service to accommodate future traffic anticipated in the area from planned and approved development under the General Plan and East Franklin Specific Plan;
- Provide for improved roadway and intersection safety;
- Accommodate the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians;
- Plan for future transit service;
- Provide a safe corridor for all modes of transportation; and
- Provide more efficient access to residential and commercial developments and schools within the East Franklin Specific Plan.

## 2.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and reduce the degree of environmental impact. This EIR fully evaluates four alternatives to the proposed project, including the "no project" alternative. Descriptions for each of the alternatives are provided below. Section 4.0, Alternatives to the Project, provides more detailed information on each of the project alternatives.

### 2.3.1 ALTERNATIVE A: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE (AA):

The No Project alternative consists of continued operation of the segments of Franklin Boulevard and Elk Grove Boulevard in the project area as three and five lane major arterials on the west side of the City of Elk Grove. None of the proposed roadway widening, or improvements to intersections, medians, bicycle or mass transit facilities would be constructed.

### 2.3.2 ALTERNATIVE B: EASTERN ALIGNMENT SOUTH OF LAGUNA SOUTH CHANNEL (AB)

This alternative shifts Franklin Boulevard to the east approximately 38 feet to minimize potential biological impacts on the west side of Franklin Boulevard. The alignment of Franklin Boulevard under this alternative would shift back to the west to conform to the south end of the existing Laguna South Channel culvert. No widening would occur on the west side of Franklin Boulevard south of Laguna South Channel culvert, except for slopes for two bus turnouts. The shift in the

road to the east just south of Laguna South Channel culvert would involve construction of a retaining wall along the channel bank above the ordinary high water line to support the shifted new roadway. The Elk Grove Boulevard widening would be the same as the proposed project and include an additional eastbound through lane and 4-5 foot wide bike lane, as well as an approximately 300 foot long dedicated right turn lane onto southbound Franklin Boulevard. Alternative AB would require 0.79 acres of the conservation easement on along Elk Grove Boulevard and 0.13 acres along Franklin Boulevard.

### 2.3.3 ALTERNATIVE C: EAST AND WEST ALIGNMENT (AC)

This alternative is designed to widen Franklin Boulevard to the west and east while staying within the City's existing right-of-way along the west side of Franklin Boulevard south of the Laguna South Channel to reduce potential biological impacts to the conservation easement property. This alternative widens Franklin Boulevard to the east approximately 18 feet, and to the west approximately 10 feet, except at the two bus turnouts, which would extend westward an additional 20 feet to the edge of the City's existing right-of-way. The Elk Grove Boulevard widening would be the same as the proposed project and include an additional eastbound through lane and 4-5 foot wide bike lane, as well as an approximately 300 feet long dedicated right turn lane onto southbound Franklin Boulevard. Alternative AC would require 0.79 acres of the conservation easement on along Elk Grove Boulevard and 0.12 acres along Franklin Boulevard.

### 2.3.4 ALTERNATIVE D: STANDARD ROADWAY DESIGN (AD)

This alternative is designed to widen Franklin Boulevard to the west by approximately 22 feet and widen Elk Grove Boulevard to the south by 6 feet. The 22 feet of widening along Franklin Boulevard includes relocation of utility poles and a maintenance road west of the road. The Franklin Boulevard roadway and slopes would taper back to conform to both the north and south ends of the existing culvert over Laguna Channel. Alternative AD would require 0.79 acres of the conservation easement on along Elk Grove Boulevard and 3.02 acres along Franklin Boulevard.

## 2.4 SCOPE AND CONTENT

The City of Elk Grove was identified as the Lead Agency for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR on July 6, 2005. This notice was circulated to the public, local, State, and Federal agencies, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the proposed project. The NOP is presented in **Appendix A**. In addition, an Initial Study was prepared for the project and released for public review at the same time as the NOP. The Initial Study is also included in **Appendix A**.

Based on the analysis in the initial study, the following topics were found to have no impacts or less than significant impacts without the need for mitigation, and they are not analyzed in this Draft EIR:

### **Mineral Resources**

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) requires the State Geologist to inventory and classify selected mineral resources within California. The project area is a rural area and has been inventoried to determine mineral resource zones. The project area is

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

classified as MRZ-3, areas containing aggregate deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.<sup>1</sup>

The proposed project would not use or extract any mineral or energy resources and would not restrict access to known mineral resource areas. The proposed project would not conflict with energy conservation plans, use non-renewable resources in a wasteful manner or result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

### **Population and Housing**

The project would not involve the removal or relocation of any housing, and would, therefore, not displace any people or necessitate the construction of any replacement housing. The project would involve the widening of existing roadways and would not in itself induce growth above that which is expected from planned residential development in the area.

### **Recreation**

No recreational facilities have been identified in the project area and there are no known plans to develop new recreational facilities within the project area. The private parcel managed by Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge adjacent to the south side of Elk Grove Boulevard and west side of Franklin Boulevard is not accessible to the public, and the property boundary is fenced to prevent disturbance to sensitive wildlife habitat. The proposed project would add bicycle lanes to the south side of Elk Grove Boulevard and west side of Franklin Boulevard, which could slightly increase bicycle traffic on these roads. The slight increase in bicycle traffic through the project area is not expected to significantly increase the use of existing small neighborhood parks, or create any new demand for any type of recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would have no impact on existing local recreational facilities.

The following environmental resources were found to have the potential of being significantly affected by the proposed project and have been addressed in greater detail in the Draft EIR:

- **Land Use.** The project has the potential to conflict with provisions of a conservation easement on an adjacent parcel that is within the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge (SLNWR), managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The purpose of the conservation easement and SLNWR is to conserve and protect the conservation values of the protected property in perpetuity. Thus, the project could conflict with the provisions of this easement and the goals of the SLNWR.
- **Visual Resources/Light and Glare.** Development of the project could create a slightly different visual character at the project site by removal of approximately seven large oak trees and replacement of smaller trees in the Franklin Boulevard median. In addition, new street lighting along the west side of Franklin Boulevard adjacent to the SLNWR could create new light and glare sources.
- **Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset.** Construction activities associated with the project would include refueling and minor maintenance of construction equipment on location, which could lead to minor fuel and oil spills.

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Elk Grove General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, Geology and Soils Section, August 2003.

- **Transportation and Circulation.** The proposed project is intended to provide adequate levels of service to traffic moving through the area from existing and planned development. Levels of service through the year 2025 are analyzed in this Draft EIR.
- **Noise.** Noise generated from construction vehicles and activities would result in periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the construction site. The proposed project has the potential to increase noise levels at residences near the project as a result of moving traffic closer to houses. The increase in roadway-related noise could exceed the standards established by the City of Elk Grove.
- **Air Quality.** Construction of the proposed project is expected to generate air pollutant emissions that may exceed applicable air quality standards.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality.** The project could result in an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff with the potential for related impacts such as increased soil erosion and siltation. Runoff from the site may contain pollutants that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, particularly to Laguna South Channel, Northern Drainage, a tributary to SLNWR/Beach Lake drainage basin.
- **Geology and Soils.** Development of the site would result in some loss of topsoil, as some areas of the site would be covered by impervious surfaces. There is the potential for minor construction-related erosion due to grading activities. The soils located on the project site are not expected to have a significant potential for liquefaction or expansion.
- **Biological and Natural Resources.** There may be potential impacts from project development on habitat of special-status species, both within and outside of lands managed by SLNWR. The project would result in the fill of grasslands, roadside ditches, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools along the west side of Franklin Boulevard. The project would result in the removal of native trees along Franklin Boulevard, which could conflict with General Plan policies.
- **Cultural Resources.** Construction activities associated with site development may result in significant impacts on undiscovered historic and cultural resources.
- **Agricultural Resources.** The City anticipates acquiring right of way from small portions of parcel APN 132-0020-003 that is currently used for agricultural purposes (cattle grazing). Thus, the proposed project could convert farmland to non-agricultural use.
- **Public Services and Utilities:** Discusses the impacts the project may have on the need for additional public services.

## 2.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Concerns raised in response to the NOP and Initial Study were considered during the preparation of the Draft EIR. The NOP comment letters are presented in **Appendix A**. Listed below is a summary of issues raised by the public in response to the NOP/IS. The issues identified below are divided by topic area.

### 2.5.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

USFWS, Stone Lakes Refuge Alliance, Stone lakes National Refuge Association, Friends of the Swainson's Hawk, and the Homeowners Association of the Stonelake Community expressed

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

opposition to the proposed project design because it would encroach into SLNWR lands that were preserved to protect habitat created for several threatened and sensitive species of plants and animals. Several commenters requested the City explore alternative project designs to avoid the SLNWR managed lands.

### 2.5.2 VISUAL RESOURCES

The USFWS commented that the project would have effects on the visual character of the SLNWR parcel, particularly from the planned lighting along the west side of Franklin Boulevard.

### 2.5.3 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The USFWS commented that the project would impact agricultural lands within the SLNWR that are used for cattle grazing, thus converting agricultural land to non-agricultural use.

### 2.5.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The USFWS commented that the project, along with other future projects, may cumulatively impact the SLNWR by increasing urban runoff leading to deterioration of water quality, continued loss of agricultural lands further impacting habitat for special status bird species, and possibly constructing multi-use trails through portions of SLNWR.

## 2.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**Table 2.0-1** presents a summary of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance of each environmental impact is indicated both before and after the application of the recommended mitigation measure(s). The following abbreviations have been used to identify the Proposed project and the project alternatives:

Proposed Project	PP
Alternative A	AA
Alternative B	AB
Alternative C	AC
Alternative D	AD

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

## 2.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The proposed project and alternatives are analyzed to an equal level of detail in this Draft EIR. A detailed discussion of the alternatives and their comparison to the proposed project is provided in Section 4.0, Project Alternatives.

Based upon the evaluation described in this section, the No Project Alternative (AA) is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative. The No Project Alternative was determined to have less adverse environmental impacts than the proposed project on most environmental issues overall. However, the No Project Alternative would have a greater adverse

impact on long-term traffic issues regarding intersection operations, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and bus service than would the proposed project. Also, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the objectives of the proposed project, and would not be consistent with the City of Elk Grove General Plan Circulation Element.

Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified. As analyzed in Section 4.0, AB would have the least amount of biological effects and would be the least environmentally damaging alternative. However, AB would have significant and unavoidable impacts to a future sewer interceptor planned by SRCSD parallel to the east side of Franklin Boulevard. Implementation of AB would add considerable construction costs associated with demolition and reconstruction of portions of Franklin Boulevard, and adversely impact future traffic and emergency services during sewer interceptor installation and maintenance. AB would also cost the City over twice as much to construct as the proposed project.

After reviewing the comparative impacts of the proposed project and all alternatives, the Draft EIR concludes that the proposed project is the preferred option for meeting the purpose and objectives of the project.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2.0-1  
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Land Use</b>			
<b>Impact 5.1.1</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>The Elk Grove General Plan designates land uses along the project Segment of Franklin Boulevard as public open space/recreation, low-density residential, mixed use commercial/office/multi-family, public parks, public schools, estate residential, and high-density residential, and along the segment of Elk Grove Boulevard as estate residential, and private open space/residential. The project is consistent with the General Plan and the East Franklin Specific Plan. However, the project is inconsistent with the provisions of the USFWS conservation easement of the SLNWR.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.1.1</b></p> <p>The City shall conduct real estate negotiations with the Laguna Stone Lake, LLC (a division of AKT Development Corporation and the USFWS) regarding a land transfer that would incorporate mitigation and compensation equal to the biological value of the SLNWR land the City would acquire for the project. At a minimum, the City shall ensure no net loss of wetlands and other sensitive habitat and abide by the provisions of the USFWS Biological Opinion, and other mitigation contained in the ACOE 404 permit required for this project.</p>	LS
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, Franklin Boulevard and Elk Grove Boulevard would not be widened or improved and would maintain their existing conditions. The No Project alternative would be inconsistent with the City General Plan that shows Franklin Boulevard is to be improved to a six lane arterial in Figure CI-2, Master Plan of Roadways.</p>	S	<p>No mitigation measures are available other than the project to mitigate for this impact. Implementing AA would result in a significant and unavoidable impact regarding consistency with the roadway improvements required in the City of Elk Grove General Plan.</p>	SU
<b>Impact 5.1.2</b>			
<p><b>PP, AA, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Land along the west side of Franklin Boulevard is zoned AG-80 (permanent agriculture-80 acres). The properties adjacent to the east side of Franklin Boulevard within the East Franklin</p>	LS	None Required.	

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Policy Area (also known as the East Franklin Specific Plan area) are zoned RD-5 (single-family residential), SC (shopping center), RD-20 (multiple-family residential); and Multiple Zones. The properties along Elk Grove Boulevard are zoned RD-1 (single-family residential, and O (recreation). Although a small amount of right-of-way would be acquired from adjacent lands for widening of the roadways, the project would not preclude the remainder of the lands from their intended uses based on the City zoning. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning of the lands along the existing roadway.</p>			
<p><b>Impact 5.1.3 Cumulative Impact</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the proposed project would widen existing roadways, which is consistent with the City of Elk Grove General Plan.</p>	LS	None Required	
<p><b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, Franklin Boulevard and Elk Grove Boulevard would not be widened or improved and would maintain their existing conditions.</p>	LS	None Required	
<p><b>Visual Resources</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 5.2.1</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AC</b> Development of the project would alter the existing visual character of the area by widening Franklin Boulevard to west and Elk Grove Boulevard into the Stone Lake Natural Wildlife Refuge (SNLWR). The PP and AC would remove up to seven oak trees, and replace natural drainage ditches and wetlands with an underground storm drainage system and two bus turnouts.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> <b>MM 5.2.1</b> Trees removed by the project shall be compensated for by planting of replacement trees per the requirements of the City of Elk Grove Tree Preservation Ordinance. To reestablish the aesthetic value of the trees removed and to encourage native tree regeneration, replacement trees shall be planted within the project area to the extent feasible. When it is not feasible</p>	LS

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

**2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p><b>AB</b></p> <p>Under AB, very small strips of the intermittent drainage ditch for two bus turnouts, and a small area of seasonal wetlands just south of Laguna South Channel, North Drainage would be filled on the west side of Franklin Boulevard, and one oak tree would be removed. No vernal pools, or elderberry bushes would be removed or filled on the west side of Franklin Boulevard. Under this alternative a concrete retaining wall would be constructed along the channel bank on the east side of Franklin Boulevard just south of Laguna South Channel culvert to support the widened roadway to the east. The retaining wall would be built into a recently engineered levee and would not be easily noticeable from the roadway, but would be visible from some residences on the northwestern corner of the development.</p> <p><b>AD</b></p> <p>Development of AD would increase adverse affects on the visual character of the area over those described for the PP and AC from adding a sidewalk on the south side of Elk Grove Boulevard adjacent to SLNWR, filling additional wetlands, removing two more elderberry bushes and associated small trees in the riparian area south of Laguna South Channel, and placement of the roadway and a 10-foot wide gravel utility maintenance road closer to riparian areas and Laguna South Channel, North Drainage.</p>		<p>to plant replacement trees within the project area, the replacement trees shall be planted as close to the project area as possible. Preference shall be given for use of the largest replacement trees available when selecting replacement trees. These trees shall be placed strategically to provide immediate visual benefit, such as within the proposed 12-foot wide medians of Franklin Boulevard and along the eastern border of the SLNWR.</p> <p>Monitoring for the success of replacement trees shall occur on a once-yearly basis for a period of three years after planting. At the end of the three-year period, the replacement trees must demonstrate successful establishment to achieve a “no net loss” of trees (on a per-inch basis) from the project. If the success rate for the replacement trees is unacceptable, the City shall consult with a certified arborist to evaluate the mitigation plan and determine appropriate remediation to achieve a “no net loss” of trees from the project.</p>	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, there would be no road widening and no impact to the visual resources in the project area.</p>	N		

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Impact 5.2.2</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in the introduction of new nighttime light and glare sources associated with the proposed project that could adversely affect adjacent areas from light “spilling over” and could increase the sky glow in the region.	LS	None Required.	
<b>AA</b> Under the no Project alternative, no additional lights would be added in the project area, and there would be no impact from light and glare.	N		
<b>Impact 5.2.3 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the proposed project in combination with other approved and proposed projects would result in the further conversion of the area’s rural landscape to residential, commercial, and other land uses with a more urbanized landscape. This would contribute to the alteration of some of the visual resources in the region.	LS	None Required.	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project Alternative, the project would not be constructed and therefore would not contribute to the degradation of visual resources or result in the creation of additional light and glare.	N		

*S - Significant**PS - Potentially Significant**LS – Less Than Significant**CS – Cumulative Significant**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**N – No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset			
Impact 5.3.1			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Construction activities at the proposed project locations may result in encountering unknown hazardous materials beneath the ground surface.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.3.1</b></p> <p>If contaminated soil is encountered or if suspected contamination is encountered during project construction, work shall be halted in the area, and the type and extent of the contamination shall be identified. A qualified professional, in conformance with the applicable regulatory agency guidelines (EPA, California RWQCB, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, and/or the Elk Grove Community Services District Fire Department) should develop a contingency plan to dispose of any contaminated soil.</p>	LS
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative there would be no ground disturbance because construction activities would not occur.</p>	N		
Impact 5.3.2			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Construction of the proposed project could result in the release of hazardous materials.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.3.2</b></p> <p>Prior to the start of construction, the construction contractor shall designate staging areas where fueling and oil-changing activities will take place. No fueling and oil-changing activities shall be permitted outside the designated staging areas. The staging areas, as much as practicable, shall be located on level terrain and away from sensitive land uses such as the SLNWR, residences, and schools. Staging areas shall not be located near any stream, channel, or wetland. All</p>	LS

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		staging areas shall be identified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Elk Grove as part of the NPDES permit process.	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative there would be no construction activities so no hazardous materials would be used at the site.	N		
<b>Impact 5.3.3</b>			
<b>PP, AA, AB, AC, AD</b> The proposed project may expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	LS	None Required.	
<b>Impact 5.3.4 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to exposure of the public to hazards during construction and operation.	LS	None Required.	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative the project would not be constructed so there would be no risk of exposure of the public to hazards.	N		

*S - Significant**PS - Potentially Significant**LS – Less Than Significant**CS – Cumulative Significant**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**N – No Impact*

**2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>			
<b>Impact 5.4.1</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Construction-related traffic associated with construction of the project may impact the LOS of local roadways and intersections.</p>	LS	None Required.	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, no construction would occur, and there would be no impact regarding construction-related traffic.</p>	N		
<b>Impact 5.4.2</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Although traffic volumes due to planned and approved development in the project area would increase on area intersections and roadways, traffic operations would remain within the City of Elk Grove’s acceptable LOS under opening day project conditions.</p>	LS	None Required.	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Although no roadway improvements would occur under the No Project alternative, traffic volumes would still increase as a result of planned and approved development in the area. However, traffic operations would remain with the City of Elk Grove’s acceptable LOS.</p>	LS	None Required.	
<b>Impact 5.4.3</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Planned and approved development within the project area would cause an increase in traffic volumes on area</p>	LS	None Required	

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
intersections, contributing to an unacceptable LOS under future year 2025 plus project conditions. However, the proposed project would result in roadways and intersections operating at better LOS than without the project.			
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project Alternative, no roadway or intersection improvements would be made to accommodate the Year 2025 predicted increases in traffic volumes and vehicle trips due to planned residential and commercial growth outlined in the City of Elk Grove General Plan and East Franklin Specific Plan. This alternative would result in a significant impact to most intersection and roadway segments in the project area, as they would operate at unacceptable levels of service.</p>	S	The future year 2025 no project conditions would result in practically all study intersections and roadway segments projected to operate at LOS "F" conditions under Year 2025 AM and PM peak hour periods with the existing intersection lane geometrics and control. As shown in Tables 5.4-7 and 5.4-8, four of the five intersections would operate at LOS "E" or LOS "F" in one or both of the AM/PM peak hour, and three of the six roadway segments would operate at LOS "F" under future 2025 conditions without the project. No mitigation measures are available other than the project to mitigate for this impact. Implementing AA would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to LOS traffic conditions.	SU
<b>Impact 5.4.4 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Implementation of the General Plan as well as future development within the City and adjacent areas would contribute to the degradation of the project study intersections and roadway segments to unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative conditions. However, the proposed roadway improvements would serve to alleviate some of the congestion caused by build-out of the City as planned under the General Plan.</p>	LS	None Required	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, increases in traffic volumes and congestion are predicted for most intersection and roadway segments within the project area by Year 2025 due to cumulative growth. Existing lane geometrics and controls with</p>	CS	No mitigation measures are available other than the project to mitigate for this impact.	CS

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
no improvements would cause a cumulatively significant impact to traffic operations, level of service, and safety.			
<b>Noise</b>			
<b>Impact 5.5.1</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Construction activities associated with the proposed project would temporarily increase noise levels in nearby areas.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.5.1a</b></p> <p>Site preparation and construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm whenever such activity is adjacent to residential uses (Elk Grove General Plan Policy NO-3-Action 1). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. If nighttime work will be required, no construction equipment shall be used that would exceed the nighttime noise standard dBA.</p> <p><b>MM 5.5.1b</b></p> <p>The project applicant shall prepare construction specifications that require the contractor to perform the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All construction equipment shall have appropriate mufflers in good working condition.</li> <li>• Locate stationary construction equipment and construction staging areas as far from residential and other noise sensitive uses as feasible.</li> <li>• Install temporary or portable acoustic barriers around the equipment and staging area when within 100 feet or less of residential properties or other sensitive uses.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM 5.5.1c</b></p> <p>Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted on a</p>	<p>LS</p>

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		sign no larger than 4 foot by 8 foot at all construction entrances to allow for surrounding property owners to contact the job superintendent. If the City or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party.	
<b>AA</b> Under the no project alternative, there would be no new construction and, therefore, no impact from construction noise.	N		
<b>Impact 5.5.2</b>			
<b>PP, AA, AB, AC, AD</b> Predicted year 2025 traffic noise levels could result in the exceedence of applicable noise exposure standards at some nearby noise-sensitive land uses. The increase in traffic noise levels would occur with or without the proposed project or alternatives and is a less than significant impact.	LS	None Required.	
<b>Impact 5.5.3 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AA, AB, AC, AD</b> Growth and development in the project area will continue to generate increased traffic on Franklin Boulevard. Implementation of the proposed project and alternative AD would not move traffic closer to sensitive receptors along the roadway. Alternatives AB and AC would result in moving traffic closer to sensitive receptors on the east side of Franklin Boulevard. The project, along with approved and planned development and transportation projects in the area, would increase traffic volumes within the project area, which would increase transportation related noise levels in excess of the City of Elk Grove noise standards	LS	None Required.	

*S - Significant**LS – Less Than Significant**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**PS - Potentially Significant**CS – Cumulative Significant**N –No Impact*

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Air Quality</b>			
<b>Impact 5.6.1</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project may emit pollutants and PM <sub>10</sub> that exceed the thresholds set by the SMAQMD.	LS	None Required	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, there would be no construction; hence, there would be no impact from construction emissions.	N		
<b>Impact 5.6.2</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> The project may subject sensitive receptors to short-term, temporary construction emissions. However, no odor producing uses are proposed on the project site.	LS	None Required	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, no construction would occur, thus there would be no impacts to sensitive receptors from construction emissions or odors.	N		
<b>Impact 5.6.3</b>			
<b>PP, AA, AB, AC, AD</b> Increased volumes of traffic to the project area could result in elevated concentrations of carbon monoxide. However, the increases in carbon monoxide concentrations would not result in violations of any state or federal ambient air quality standard for this pollutant.	LS	None Required	

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS - Less Than Significant*

*CS - Cumulative Significant*

*SU - Significant and Unavoidable*

*N - No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Impact 5.6.4 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AA, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the proposed project along with expected growth in the area could exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter.	LS	None Required	
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<b>Impact 5.7.1</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Soil disturbance associated with construction activities for the proposed project could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to local drainages and waterways.	PS	<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> <b>MM 5.7.1</b> The project would require an NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities, which requires the project applicant and/or contractor to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City or its contractor shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be administered through all phases of grading and project construction. The SWPPP shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) which describe the site, erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures and maintenance responsibilities, water quality monitoring and reporting during storm events (which will be responsibility of the construction contractor), corrective actions for identified water quality problems and non-storm water management controls. The SWPPP shall address spill prevention and include a countermeasure plan describing measures to ensure proper collection and disposal of all pollutants handled or produced on the site during construction, including sanitary wastes, cement, and petroleum products. The measures included in the SWPPP	LS

*S - Significant**PS - Potentially Significant**LS - Less Than Significant**CS - Cumulative Significant**SU - Significant and Unavoidable**N - No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		shall ensure compliance with applicable regional, state and federal water quality standards. These measures shall be consistent with the City's Guidance Manual for On-Site Stormwater Quality Control Measures and Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance which may include (1) restricting grading to the dry season; (2) protecting all finished graded slopes from erosion using such techniques as erosion control matting and hydroseeding; (3) protecting downstream storm drainage facilities from sedimentation; (4) use of silt fencing and hay bales to retain sediment on the project site; (5) use of temporary water conveyance and water diversion structures to eliminate runoff; and (6) any other suitable measures. The SWPPP shall be submitted to and approved by the City and the Central Valley RWQCB. The City shall require all construction contractors to retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on each construction site.	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact to surface water quality from sedimentation or erosion because there would be no construction.</p>	N		
<p><b>Impact 5.7.2</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Constituents found in roadway runoff from increased impervious surfaces may degrade surface water quality.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.7.2</b></p> <p>The City shall implement post-construction BMPs to ensure that long-term water quality is protected. The BMPs shall be designed, constructed and maintained to meet a performance standard established by the City and shall conform to the provisions of the NPDES permit. The City shall monitor the effectiveness of the BMPs selected. Monitoring activities, along with funding for monitoring, shall be established and shall include, but not be limited to, initial setup, annual</p>	LS

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N – No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>maintenance, and annual monitoring.</p> <p>The project shall implement actions and procedures established to reduce the pollutant loadings in storm drain systems. The two main categories of these BMPs are “source control” and “treatment control.” Treatment Control BMPs involve physical treatment of the runoff, usually through structural means. Source control BMPs are usually the most effective and economical in preventing pollutants from entering storm and non-storm runoff. Source control BMPs relevant to the proposed project that shall be implemented include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provide a permanent storm drain message “No Dumping – Flows to Creek” or other approved message at each storm drain inlet. This may be accomplished with a stamped concrete impression (for curbs) or manufactured colored tiles, which are epoxied in place adjacent to the inlet (for parking lots and areas without curbs).</li> <li>2) BMPs shall be used and designed to provide filtration of pollutants in project runoff. The project engineer shall consult with the City when designing these features, and designs shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to approval of the project plans. Water quality control features shall be consistent with the City’s NPDES permit.</li> <li>3) Street and storm drain maintenance activities. These activities control the movement of pollutants and remove them from pavements through catch basin cleaning, storm drain flushing, street sweeping, and by regularly removing illegally dumped material from storm channels and creeks. (The City of Elk Grove would be responsible for regular storm drain maintenance within the public right of way).</li> </ol>	

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, constituents found in the existing roadway runoff may degrade surface water quality. However, these are already treatment controls in place for the existing roadway. No increase in impervious surfaces would occur with this alternative.</p>	LS	None Required	
<p><b>Impact 5.7.3</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Development of the project may result in increased surface runoff and localized flooding.</p>	LS	None Required	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, there would be no increases in the volume of storm water runoff, as there would not be any road widening or storm water drainage system alterations.</p>	N		
<p><b>Impact 5.7.4 Cumulative Impact</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>The project could contribute to the cumulative effects of degradation of regional water quality, changes to runoff patterns, and the potential for increased flooding.</p>	CS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.7.4</b></p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measures MM 5.7.1 and MM 5.7.2 would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative groundwater, water quality, and flooding impacts to less than significant.</p>	LS
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, there would be no increases in the volume of storm water runoff, as there would not be any road widening.</p>	N		

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N – No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Geology and Soils</b>			
<b>Impact 5.8.1</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Development of the project improvements would involve grading, the use of heavy machinery, and other earth movement. There is the potential for soil erosion due to excavation and grading activities.	LS	None Required	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact regarding soil erosion and ground stability because there would be no construction.	N		
<b>Impact 5.8.2</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Proposed pavement and utilities could incur significant damage as a result of underlying expansive or unstable soil properties. The project would be required to comply with all codes and standards relative to soils and foundation engineering.	LS	None Required	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact regarding unstable and expansive soils because there would be no construction.	N		
<b>Impact 5.8.3 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> The proposed roadway improvements could incur significant damage as a result of underlying expansive or unstable soil properties. Individual projects must comply with city requirements for roadways.	LS	None Required	

*S - Significant**PS - Potentially Significant**LS – Less Than Significant**CS – Cumulative Significant**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**N – No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact regarding cumulative unstable and expansive soils because there would be no construction.</p>	<p>N</p>		
<p><b>Biology and Natural Resources</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 5.9.1</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in direct discharge into vernal pools that provide potential habitat to these special status species, and discharge into sub-basins that are hydrologically connected to other vernal pools near the project site.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>PP, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.9.1</b></p> <p>The City of Elk Grove shall perform the following actions to achieve no net loss of habitat for impacts to vernal pool crustaceans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For portions of vernal pools that lie within the existing conservation easement held by the Stone Lake National Wildlife Refuge: four (4) acres of wetted vernal pool habitat will be preserved for each acre of wetted vernal pool habitat that is affected, and two (2) acres of vernal pool habitat will be created for each one (1) acre of vernal pool acreage that is affected.</li> <li>• For portions of affected vernal pools that lie outside the Stone Lake National Wildlife Refuge: two (2) acres of wetted vernal pool habitat is preserved for each one (1) acre of wetted vernal pool habitat that is effected, and one (1) acre of vernal pool habitat is created for each one (1) acre of vernal pool acreage that is effected.</li> </ul> <p>The vernal pool mitigation may be accomplished through one of the following methods:</p>	<p>LS</p>

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		(1) The mitigation will be accomplished through purchase of vernal pool credits from an USFWS approved bank; or (2) Preserve and create vernal pool habitat on a site adjacent to or associated with the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge; (3) Payment into a USFWS in-lieu fee program; or (4) A combination of the above methods, as practicable.	
<b>AA, AB</b> Under the no project alternative (AA) and Alternative AB, no impacts to vernal pool habitat would occur.	LS	None Required	
<b>Impact 5.9.2</b>			
<b>PP, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the project would result in removal of three elderberry bushes within 20 feet of the project construction limits, resulting in direct impacts to potential habitat of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB).	PS	<b>PP, AC, AD</b> <b>MM 5.9.2a</b> To avoid and minimize impacts to elderberry bushes remaining between 20 and 100 feet of project construction limits the City or its designee shall retain a qualified biologist approved by the USFWS to coordinate and supervise avoidance protection measures for elderberry bushes located at the project site following Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle established by the USFWS in 1999. <b>MM 5.9.2b</b> Mitigation to compensate for the three valley elderberry plants that would be removed as a part of the project shall conform to the measures established in the <i>Conservation Guidelines for the valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle</i> , by the U.S. Department of the Interior, USFWS, revised July 9, 1999. The following is a summary of those measures.	LS

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>Elderberry shrubs within 20 feet of project and alternative construction limits, will be transplanted to a conservation area (which may include SLNWR) approved by the USFWS. A qualified monitor will be on-site for the duration of the transplanting of the elderberry shrub to insure that no unauthorized take of VELB occurs. Transplantation shall be conducted between November and mid-February, if feasible. The conservation area receiving the transplant must be at least 548 square meters (1,800 square feet) in size. As many as five (5) additional elderberry plantings and up to five (5) associated native species plantings may also be planted within this area. The transplanted shrub shall receive supplemental watering through the first summer.</p> <p>In addition to the transplanting requirements, each elderberry stem measuring 2.5 cm (1.0 inch) or greater in diameter at ground level must be replaced in the conservation area with elderberry seedlings or cuttings at the ratios presented in <b>Table 5.9-6</b> shown in section 5.9, Biology. In addition, native species will be planted in the conservation area at ratios presented in the USFWS VELB Guidelines.</p>	
<p><b>AA, AB</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative (AA) no construction would occur, thus no elderberry bushes/VELB would be directly impacted. Under AB, Franklin Boulevard would not be widened to the west except at two bus turnout locations in areas that would not impact elderberry bushes/VELB.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required</p>	

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Impact 5.9.3</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in temporary and direct disturbance to potential Swainson's hawk nesting or foraging habitat.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.9.3</b></p> <p>If construction is proposed during the Swainson's Hawk breeding/nesting season (March 1 to September 15), two focused surveys for active nests shall be conducted within a 1.0-mile radius of the project site. The surveys shall take place at least one week apart within 30 days of construction, with the second taking place within two days prior to the start of construction. If active Swainson's hawks/raptors nests are found within 1.0-mile of the construction site, the City shall consult with CDFG and a qualified biologist shall be retained by the City and clearing and construction shall be postponed or halted within 250 feet of the nests (or another buffer acceptable by CDFG) until additional nesting attempts no longer occur. If an active nest tree is found on the project site prior to construction and is proposed for removal, then appropriate permits from CDFG shall be obtained and mitigation implemented pursuant to CDFG guidelines. Periodic monitoring shall continue throughout construction to ensure no new nests are constructed once construction begins.</p>	LS
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No project alternative, there would be no construction and therefore no impact to potential Swainson's hawk nesting or foraging habitat.</p>	N		
<b>Impact 5.9.4</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Development of the proposed project would result in temporary disturbance and permanent alteration of site</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.9.4</b></p> <p>The City shall retain a qualified biologist to complete</p>	LS

*S - Significant**PS - Potentially Significant**LS – Less Than Significant**CS – Cumulative Significant**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**N – No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
conditions that could support burrowing owl.		<p>mitigation established by the DFG to “avoid and minimize impacts to burrowing owls at a project site and preserve habitat that will support viable owl populations.” The biologist shall complete preconstruction surveys of suitable burrowing owl habitat at the project site and within surrounding areas (up to 150 feet outside the project area) no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbance activities. If burrowing owls are detected within the project area, the following shall apply (as outlined in DFG guidance):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the nonbreeding season (September 1<sup>st</sup> through January 31<sup>st</sup>), no disturbance should occur within approximately 160-foot radius of an occupied burrow. During the nesting season (February 1<sup>st</sup> through August 31<sup>st</sup>), occupied burrows should not be disturbed within a 250-foot radius unless a qualified biologist approved by the DFG verifies through noninvasive methods that either (1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (2) that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival;</li> <li>• To offset the loss of foraging and burrow habitat on the project site, equivalent acres of foraging habitat per breeding pair or unpaired resident bird, should be acquired and permanently protected. The protected lands should be adjacent to occupied burrowing owl habitat and at a location acceptable to the DFG. Protection of additional habitat acreage per pair or unpaired resident bird may be applicable based on DFG guidance;</li> <li>• When destruction of occupied burrows is unavoidable, existing unsuitable burrows should be</li> </ul>	

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		enhanced (enlarged or cleared of debris) or new burrows created (by installing artificial burrows per DFG design specifications) at a ratio of 2:1 on the protected lands site; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If owls must be moved away from the disturbance area, passive relocation techniques (as outlined by the DFG [i.e., use of one-way doors]) should be used rather than trapping. At least one or more weeks will be necessary to accomplish this and allow the owls to acclimate to alternate burrows.</li> <li>• If no burrowing owls are detected during the preconstruction survey, no further action is necessary</li> </ul>	
<b>AA</b> Under the No project alternative, there would be no construction and therefore no impact to potential burrowing owl nesting habitat.	N		
<b>Impact 5.9.5</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the project would result in potential temporary and direct disturbance to nesting raptors and migratory birds (excluding burrowing owl and Swainson’s hawk).	PS	<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> <b>MM 5.9.5</b> If construction is proposed during the breeding/nesting season for local avian species (typically March 1 through August 31), a focused survey for active nests of raptors and migratory birds within and in the vicinity of (no less than 100-feet outside project boundaries, where possible) the project site shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist. If an active nest is located during preconstruction surveys, USFWS and/or DFG (as appropriate) shall be notified regarding the status of the nest. Furthermore, construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance of the nest until it	LS

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*

**2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>is abandoned or the biologist deems disturbance potential to be minimal. Restrictions may include establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 100-feet around the nest) or alteration of the construction schedule.</p> <p>No action is necessary if no active nests are found or if construction will occur during the nonbreeding season (generally September 1 through February 28).</p>	
<p><b>AA</b> Under the No project alternative, there would be no construction and therefore no impact to potential raptor or migratory bird nesting or foraging habitat.</p>	<p>N</p>		
<p><b>Impact 5.9.6</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AC, AD</b> Development of the project would result in temporary disturbance and permanent alteration of vernal pools and nearby grassland that could support potential breeding habitat for western spadefoot toad.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>PP, AC, AD</b> <b>MM 5.9.6</b> Implementation of mitigation measure 5.9.1 for creation and preservation of vernal pool habitat would compensate for any potential loss of habitat for this species.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p><b>AA, AB</b> Under the No Project alternative (AA) and AB, there would be no impact to western spadefoot toad because no potential habitat would be disturbed.</p>	<p>N</p>		
<p><b>Impact 5.9.7</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Development of the project would result in temporary disturbance and permanent alteration of grasslands near Laguna South Channel North Drainage that could support</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> <b>MM 5.9.7</b> A preconstruction survey for western pond turtle shall be</p>	<p>LS</p>

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
potential breeding habitat for the northwestern pond turtle.		conducted three days prior to the onset of construction activities adjacent to Laguna South Channel North Drainage, and every subsequent day while activities occur adjacent to Laguna South Channel North Drainage. The survey area shall encompass a 100-foot radius of the area to be affected. If juvenile or adult turtles are found within the survey area, the individuals should be moved at least 500 feet downstream in suitable habitat. If a turtle nest is found within the survey area, construction activities should not take place within 30 meters of the nest until the turtles have hatched, or the eggs have been moved to an appropriate location. Furthermore, one-way barrier fencing shall be constructed within 100 feet of Laguna South Channel North Drainage to prevent turtles from moving into the construction area to nest, hibernate, or aestivate, while allowing turtles already in the construction area to move back to water. .	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative there would be no impacts to the northwestern pond turtle because no potential aquatic or upland habitat would be disturbed.</p>	N		
<p><b>Impact 5.9.8</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Development of the project would result in temporary disturbance and permanent alteration of grasslands near Laguna South Channel North Drainage that could support potential upland habitat used as winter retreats for the giant garter snake.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.9.8</b></p> <p>To avoid and minimize impacts to potential giant garter snake habitat the following shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow the Standard Avoidance and Minimization Measures During Construction Activities in Giant Garter Snake Habitat established by the USFWS, November 13, 1997 (Programmatic Consultation; Service file number 1-1-97-F-149);</li> </ul>	LS

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use exclusionary fencing to avoid wetland and other areas outside of the proposed construction right-of-way;</li> <li>• survey for the giant garter snake within the project area 24 hours prior to the onset of construction and any time activities are halted for more than two weeks thereafter;</li> <li>• allow any giant garter snake encountered to move away from construction activities on their own; and</li> <li>• prohibit the use of plastic, monofilament, jute, or similar erosion control matting that could entangle snakes at the project site.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative there would be no impacts to the giant garter snake because no potential aquatic or upland habitat would be disturbed.</p>	N		
<p><b>Impact 5.9.9</b></p>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Implementation of the project could result in the disturbance of jurisdictional waters of the US and wetlands regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.</p>	PS	<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p><b>MM 5.9.9</b></p> <p>The City of Elk Grove shall compensate for impacts to jurisdictional waters that cannot be avoided by using a minimum mitigation ratio of 1.2:1 to achieve no net loss of wetlands utilizing one or a combination of the following methods for habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve and create wetland habitat on a site</li> </ul>	LS

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N – No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		adjacent to or associated with the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve and create wetland habitat on an appropriate off site location(s) approved by USACOE</li> <li>• Purchase of wetland credits from a USACOE approved mitigation bank; or</li> <li>• Payment into a USACOE In-lieu fee program</li> </ul> Wetland mitigation methodology and location will be agreeable to the USACOE. The City of Elk Grove shall verify successful mitigation of any wetland impacts.  Appropriate permits (i.e., Section 404 and 401 under the Clean Water Act), shall be obtained prior to issuance of grading permits. The City of Elk Grove shall comply with all permit conditions and employ best management practices and measures (established by the ACOE) to minimize and compensate for potential impact to any jurisdictional waters. In addition, wetland delineation and mitigation details shall be noted on the design plans for the project.	
<b>AA</b> There would be no construction or disturbance of Waters of the US and wetlands under the No Project alternative.	N		
<b>Impact 5.9.10 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Development of the project could result in disturbance to local special status species and removal of up to seven Valley oak trees.	PS	<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> <b>MM 5.9.10</b> Implementation of mitigation measures MM 5.9-1 through MM 5.9.9 in this section, MM 5.1.1, and MM 5.2.1 would reduce the overall contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts resulting from completion of the project.	LS

*S - Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*N –No Impact*

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, construction would not occur and site conditions would not change.	LS	None Required	
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
<b>Impact 5.10.1</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> The proposed project is not located in an area known to contain historical, archeological, paleontological, or other cultural resources.	N		
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact to known historical, archaeological, paleontological, or other cultural resources because there would be no construction.	N		
<b>Impact 5.10.2</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> The project could destroy or disturb currently unknown cultural resources that lie buried on the project site.	LS	None Required  Should a previously unidentified or unanticipated archaeological resource, paleontological resource, or human remains be discovered during project construction, the City of Elk Grove requires the construction contractor to implement the following actions pursuant to the Archaeological and Paleontological Policy HR-6-Action 2 of the General Plan.	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact to unknown historical, archaeological, paleontological, or other cultural resources because there would be no construction.	N		

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Impact 5.10.3 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to disturb any known historical, archaeological, paleontological, or other cultural resources on the project site.	LS	None Required	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact to known or unknown historical, archaeological, paleontological, or other cultural resources because there would be no construction.	N		
<b>Agricultural Resources</b>			
<b>Impact 5.11.1</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in the conversion of approximately 1.22 acres of land zoned for agricultural use, and considered grazing land under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Under the different project alternatives, the amount of grazing land converted to urban uses (specifically roadway use) ranges from 0.95 acre to a maximum of 3.021 acres. The land is part of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and is used for cattle grazing.	LS	None Required	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact to agricultural lands and no loss of grazing land because there would be no construction within the SLNWR-managed parcel.	N		

*S - Significant**PS - Potentially Significant**LS – Less Than Significant**CS – Cumulative Significant**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**N –No Impact*

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Impact 5.11.2 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>The project would convert approximately 1.22 acres of Grazing Land to urban uses. The alternatives AB, AC, and AD would convert 0.95 acre to 3.02 acres of Grazing Land to urban uses. This loss would contribute to the cumulative loss of farmland in the region.</p>	LS	None Required	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, there would be no cumulative impact to or loss of agricultural lands because there would be no widening of the roadway into SLNWR lands.</p>	N		
<b>Public Services</b>			
<b>Impact 5.12.1</b>			
<p><b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b></p> <p>Fire protection, law enforcement, and emergency crews responding to a call for service at the construction site or in the area of construction may not arrive within the minimum response considered acceptable by the agencies.</p>	LS	None Required	
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project alternative, there would be no impact on emergency response services from construction activities because the roadway would not be widened and no construction would occur.</p>	N		

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Impact 5.12.2</b>			
<b>PP, AD</b> Project construction would require encroachment into existing utility right-of-ways, and may temporarily impact existing utilities in the area.	LS	None Required	
<b>AB, AC</b> Project construction would require encroachment into an existing SRCSD easement that could significantly impact construction and maintenance of a future sewer interceptor within this easement.	S	No mitigation measures are feasible for the impact AB and AC would have on the installation of the SRCSD/CSD-1 future sewer interceptor on the east side of Franklin Boulevard. The sewer interceptor cannot be moved to the west side of Franklin Boulevard due to the SNLWR.	SU
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no impact to utilities because the roadway widening would not occur.	N		
<b>Impact 5.12.3</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> Project operation would cause a slight increase in the maintenance of the new roadway and associated improvements.	LS	None required	
<b>AA</b> Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no impact to maintenance and operation of public services, because the project would not be constructed.	N		
<b>Impact 5.12.4 Cumulative Impact</b>			
<b>PP, AB, AC, AD</b> The project in combination with other proposed and approved projects, would incrementally increase the demand for	LS	None required	LS

*S - Significant**PS - Potentially Significant**LS – Less Than Significant**CS – Cumulative Significant**SU – Significant and Unavoidable**N – No Impact*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
maintenance of the roadway, storm water drainage, and landscaped areas. Provision of service occurs on a project-by-project basis.			
<p><b>AA</b></p> <p>Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no cumulative impact on public services and utilities, because the project would not be constructed.</p>	N		

*S - Significant*

*PS - Potentially Significant*

*LS – Less Than Significant*

*CS – Cumulative Significant*

*SU – Significant and Unavoidable*

*N –No Impact*