



Project Title: Pleasant Grove School Road Cemetery Expansion (EG-07-071)

Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Elk Grove
Development Services - Planning
8401 Laguna Palms Way
Elk Grove, CA 95758

Project Location: 10232 Pleasant Grove School Road. Elk Grove

Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Elk Grove Cosumnes Cemetery District
Attn: Mike Young
P.O. Box 1533
Elk Grove, CA 95759

Project Engineer's Name and Address: MSA Engineering
Attn: Chris Russell
1340 Blue Oaks Blvd., Suite 200
Roseville, CA 95678

General Plan Designation(s): Rural Residential

Zoning: AR-5 Agricultural-Residential Zone 5 acres Min.

Contact Person: Taro Echiburu

Phone Number: 916.478.3619

Date Prepared: December 2008

Project Description

The proposed project includes the expansion of the existing Pleasant Grove School Road Cemetery (Figure 1). The proposed expansion would occur on an approximately 4-acre portion of an existing 13.53-acre parcel to the east of the existing cemetery. The proposed project would include an additional 2,745 plots for burial, a centrally located gazebo, and aggregate driveways that would also provide parking. The proposed project would include a conditional use permit to operate the expanded cemetery.

Figure 1. Site Plan

Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is a 4-acre portion of a 13.53-acre parcel located on the southeast corner of Pleasant Grove School Road and Mackey Road in Elk Grove (APN 127-0110-003; Figure 2). The site is basically square in shape and is bordered on the south by agricultural fields, on the west by agricultural fields and a school, on the east by agricultural fields and a rural residence, and on the north by Pleasant Grove School Road. The site is relatively flat and no major topographic features exist, such as creeks or rock outcroppings. The project site contains two houses and one shed on the northeast corner of the site that will not be removed as part of the proposed project. One barn is located in the central portion of the project site and will be removed as part of the proposed project. One power pole will also be removed as part of the proposed project. All trees on-site will be preserved in place and will not be removed as part of the proposed project.



Figure 2. Project Site

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist and corresponding discussion on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use / Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Planner's Signature

Date

Taro Echiburu

Planner's Printed Name

City of Elk Grove

Development Services - Planning

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Pleasant Grove School Road Cemetery Extension project, as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the information shows that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) No Impact. The area surrounding the project site is rural residential, vacant land, and a school. There is no scenic vista in the project area; therefore, no impact to a scenic vista would occur.

b) No Impact. No state “designated scenic highways” or “eligible scenic highways” are located in the vicinity of the project site¹. There are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings located on the project site. All on-site trees are to remain as part of the proposed project and will not be removed. Due to the lack of scenic resources and historic buildings, the project would result no impact to scenic resources.

c) Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the project would not significantly affect the visual character or quality of the site and surroundings as the only structure proposed is the gazebo. The project site is located in an area designated for Rural Residential, with surrounding land uses such as a school, cemetery, rural residential and vacant land. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to the visual character of the site and surrounding area.

d) Less than Significant Impact. Development of the project site would not create significant additional light sources in the project area because other than a gazebo, the project does not involve the construction of any above ground structure. In addition, the project does not propose the installation of new lighting equipment or fixtures. Nevertheless, any proposed lighting on the site will be required to conform to the City’s Light Ordinance, which is designed to ensure that no effects to neighboring properties occur from light sources at the project site. Therefore, impacts to visual character, including light and glare, are considered less than significant.

¹ California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Sacramento County, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) *Less than Significant Impact.* According to the California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map (2006 FMMP) development of proposed project would not result in the loss of any prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. The 2006 FMMP shows the project site as Farmland of Local Importance. The Farmland of Local Importance designation includes lands which do not qualify as Prime, Statewide, or Unique designation but are currently irrigated crops or pasture or nonirrigated crops; land that would be Prime or Statewide Designation and have been improved for irrigation but are now idle; and lands which currently support confined livestock, poultry operations, and aquaculture. Therefore a less than significant impact to prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance is anticipated with this development.

b) *No Impact.* The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract (Elk Grove General Plan Draft EIR, Figure 4.1-2). The existing zoning for the project site is Agricultural Residential Zone 5 (AR-5) and would not change under the proposed project. Therefore; this impact is considered less than significant.

c) *Less than Significant Impact.* Refer to discussions a) and b), above.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in significant construction-related air quality impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a-e) Less than Significant. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) has established criteria and plans for reducing air emissions. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Attainment Plan, or the goals and objectives of the City's General Plan. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan on either a short-term or long-term basis. The proposed project also falls well below identified screening level criteria presented by the SMAQMD for analyzing the impacts a project has on air quality.

Furthermore, the proposed project only includes the construction of one structure (gazebo) and the installation of an aggregate driveway system. No mass grading is proposed as part of the proposed project as individual burial plots will be developed as needed. The development of the burial plots would involve minimal ground disturbance that would occur intermittently and would be short in duration. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

f) No Impact. The proposed project would not create objectionable odors because the proposed project is the expansion of an existing cemetery.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

The project site has been farmed for many decades, so very little native vegetation remains on-site. Most of the site is covered by grain-hay stubble with native and introduced trees found on the perimeter of the property and around the existing home. As stated in the project description of this initial study, all trees will remain as a result of the proposed project. A Biological Resources Evaluation Report was conducted for the project site by Wilson Biological Consulting in July 2008. This report is available for review in the City's Planning Department and is referenced below in the appropriate impact section.

*City of Elk Grove
January 09*

*Pleasant Grove School Rd. Cemetery Expansion IS/MND
EG-07-071*

a) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Biological Resources Assessment Report conducted for the project site utilized information from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Natural Diversity Database, and site visits to determine listed species that could occur on the project site. It was determined that the project site has suitable habitat for a variety of special status species including the Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). The project site also contains ten Northern California black walnut (*Juglans hindsii*) trees and contains 47 Valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) and qualifies as Valley oak woodland. As stated in the project description, no trees are proposed for removal as a part of the project. Most of the trees on-site are located along the perimeter of the site and some trees are located around the existing residence that is to remain. A less than significant impact to special status tree resources is expected.

Chapter 16.130 of the City's Municipal Code (Swainson's Hawk Ordinance) states that the reduction in foraging habitat can occur through requests for zoning changes of agriculturally zoned lands to land use designations that enable land to be reduced to parcel sizes too small to support Swainson's hawk foraging habitat or through requests for land use entitlements for non-agricultural uses that are incompatible with the maintenance of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has determined that parcels of land of five (5) acres or more in size are recognized to be the minimum acreage required for viable foraging habitat. The proposed project would only develop approximately 4-acres of a 14-acre parcel. The City has determined that out of the 4-acre project site, 3.2 acres are undeveloped and would constitute viable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat because it is contiguous with other vacant land which in total exceeds five acres. Since the site has the appropriate vegetation type and is within a mile of a known Swainson's hawk nest, the loss of 3.2 acres would be significant because when combined with other vacant rural/agricultural land surrounding the project site there are more than five acres of potential foraging grounds for the hawk. Therefore, development of the site is determined to be a potentially significant adverse effect on Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.

The following mitigations measures will reduce all special status species impacts to a less than significant level as identified in the Biological Resources Assessment Report.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 1 (Biological Resources – Swainson's Hawk Foraging Habitat) In order to mitigate for the 3.2-acre loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, the applicant shall implement one of the following City of Elk Grove's approved mitigation alternatives.

Monitoring Action

Prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, or the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall:

- Preserve 1.0 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost (3.2-acres). This land shall be protected through a fee title or conservation easement acceptable to the CDFG and the City of Elk Grove as set forth in Chapter 16.130.040(a) of the City of Elk Grove Municipal Code as such may be amended from time to time and to the extent that said Chapter remains in effect, OR

- Submit payment of Swainson's hawk impact mitigation fee per acre of habitat impacted (payment shall be at a 1:1 ratio) to the City of Elk Grove in the amount set forth in Chapter 16.130 of the City of Elk Grove Code as such may be amended from time to time and to the extent that said chapter remains in effect, OR
- Submit proof that mitigation credits for 3.2-acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat have been purchased at a California Department of Fish and Game approved mitigation bank.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, or the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, whichever occurs first.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services-Planning in consultation with CDFG

Mitigation Measure 2 (Biological Resources – Nesting Swainson's hawk and other Raptors)

In order to mitigate potential adverse impacts to Swainson's hawk and other nesting raptors to a less than significant level, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist contracted by the applicant or by the City and funded by the applicant. The survey shall be conducted within 30 days of the start of construction activities for a 1/2-mile radius. In addition, a survey of the project site and areas within 500 feet of the project site shall be conducted once in April and once in May if construction activities are expected to occur in these months. If active raptor nests are found, the applicant shall consult with the Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and ground clearing and construction activities shall be postponed or halted until all young have fledged and additional nesting attempts no longer occur. If a nest tree is found on the subsequent 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.

Monitoring Actions:

- Prior to issuance of building or grading permits, the applicant shall provide Development Services-Planning written verification that a qualified biologist has been retained by the applicant to perform the pre-construction survey. This action may be waived if the biologist will be contracted by the City at the applicant's expense.
- No earlier than 30 days before commencement of construction activities, including land clearing, the qualified biologist shall submit and certify to the Planning Director, the results of the pre-construction survey. Failure to submit the required survey results will delay the approval to initiate construction activities, including land clearing.
- No later than April 30, the qualified biologist shall submit and certify to the Planning Director, the results of the 500-foot site perimeter survey. Failure to submit the required survey results will cause any construction activity to be halted until such results are submitted and approved by the Planning Director. If no construction activities have taken place, failure to submit the required survey results will delay the approval to initiate construction activities, including land clearing.
- No later than May 31, the qualified biologist shall submit and certify to the Planning Director, the results of the 500-foot site perimeter survey. Failure to submit the required survey results will cause any construction activity to be halted until such results are submitted and approved by the Planning Director. If no

construction activities have taken place, failure to submit the required survey results will delay the approval to initiate construction activities, including land clearing.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, or the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, whichever occurs first, and as indicated in the monitoring actions above

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

Mitigation Measure 3 (Biological Resources –Burrowing Owls, and Other Special-Status Species)

In order to reduce impacts to burrowing owls and other special-status species to a less than significant level, the applicant shall conduct a pre-construction survey to identify whether any of the targeted species exist on the site. Within thirty days of the commencement of any clearing, grading or construction that would occur during the nesting/breeding season (February 1 through September 1, or at any time of year for burrowing owl), a field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of burrowing owls, and other special-status species occur on the site. These surveys shall include all areas in or within 250 feet of the construction zone. In the event that nesting special status species (other than Swainson’s hawk) are found, a 250-foot no-construction zone shall be established around the nest until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist. The applicant shall consult with CDFG to determine the measures necessary to mitigate or avoid impacts to the species. Any required permits or approvals shall be obtained from CDFG prior to disturbance of the site. Mitigation measures may include flagging the burrow to avoid disturbance, passive relocation, active relocation to move owls from the site, or other measures required by the biologist or CDFG.

Monitoring Actions:

- Prior to the approval of any grading and/or building permits for the development of the site, applicant or project owner shall submit to the City a copy of any/all required CDFG or USFWS permits and verification of any required consultation.
- Prior to the commencement of any clearing, grading or construction, the applicant shall submit to Development Services – Planning for approval, a copy of the survey results including evidence of consultation with CDFG and their recommendations, if applicable.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to any site disturbance, such as clearing or grubbing, or the issuance of any permits for grading, building, or other site improvements, whichever occurs first, and as indicated in the monitoring actions above

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services, Planning in consultation with California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), as needed.

b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies and those that are protected under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including riparian and wetland areas.

Additionally, riparian and wetland habitats are protected under the City of Elk Grove General Plan. There are no designated sensitive habitats on the project site and a less than significant impact is expected. It is important to note that there are two small areas of Himalayan blackberry thickets (which usually occur in wetlands) along the western boundary of the site. However, the proposed project will not disturb this area of the parcel because it is beyond the scope of the current cemetery expansion and the blackberries are thought to be at this location due to irrigation occurring on the adjacent site.

c) No Impact. No wetlands or vernal pools were identified in the proposed project area. The project site contains no jurisdictional water features or wetlands. Therefore, the project has no impact.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. There are no stream corridors and no known native resident or migratory fish species on the site. However, a den of coyotes (*Canus latrans*) with three pups was observed within the blackberry thickets on the western perimeter of the site. Coyotes are not protected under State or federal law and Coyotes are very adaptable to many habitats. It should also be noted that the proposed project will not adversely affect the blackberry thickets and a less than significant impact is expected.

e) No Impact. The Elk Grove General Plan contains policies aimed at protecting trees and the City's Municipal Code contains regulations for tree preservation and protection (City of Elk Grove Municipal Code Chapter 19.04 and 19.12). No trees are proposed for removal as a result of the project. Furthermore, the project proponent would be required to adhere to the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance.

f) No Impact. The City of Elk Grove does not at present have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan; therefore, there would be no impact to these types of plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a-d) Less than Significant Impact. The project site is not located in a culturally sensitive area as depicted in the Elk Grove General Plan EIR Figure 4.11-1, Cultural Resources Sensitivity Map. In addition, the project site has been disturbed in the past for agricultural activities. The property in question is neither eligible for nor designated as a historic resource in the Elk Grove Register of Historic Resources, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places. The property is not associated with events or people significant to the history of the City, state, or nation. The property does not embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. The property has not yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. The barn/shed that is to be demolished as a result of the proposed project has been modified extensively and does not represent a unique resource.

Pursuant to current State law, if prehistoric or historic cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during any ground-disturbing activities, all work in the area shall stop immediately and the City shall be notified of the discovery. No work shall be done in the area of the find and within 100 feet of the find until a professional archaeologist can determine whether the resource(s) is significant. If necessary, the archaeologist shall develop mitigation measures consistent with the CEQA Guidelines in consultation with the appropriate state agency and, if applicable, a representative from the Native American Heritage List. A mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for approval. Mitigation in accordance with this plan shall be implemented before any work is done in the area of the resource find. Therefore, impacts to archaeological resources are considered less than significant.

The proposed project will be required to comply with State law regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains as described above. It is not anticipated that any human remains will be encountered during construction of the proposed project because the site and surrounding area have been previously disturbed to accommodate development. However, should any previously unidentified or unanticipated human remains be discovered during

project construction, the City of Elk Grove requires mitigation consistent with General Plan Archaeological and Paleontological Policy HR-6-Action 2, which states the following:

- The Planning Division shall be notified immediately if any prehistoric, archaeological, or paleontologic artifact is uncovered during construction. All construction must stop and any archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate action.
- All construction must stop if any human remains are uncovered, and the County Coroner must be notified according to Section 7050.5 of the California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the procedures outlined in CEQA section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed.

Therefore, potential impacts to human remains are considered less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a)

i) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project does not expose people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. Only one structure, a gazebo, is proposed for construction and the Uniform Building Code contains applicable construction regulations for earthquake safety that would ensure less than significant impacts. The potential for ground rupture, lateral spreading, liquefaction, landslides or earthquake induced settlement beneath

the gazebo constructed on the site is considered to be low. According to the Elk Grove General Plan, no major active faults transect San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties. The nearest faults in the project area include the Willows fault zone, approximately 10 miles north of the City of Elk Grove limits, the Bear Mountain Fault located approximately 20 miles to the east, and the Midland Fault approximately 20 miles to the west. The entire City of Elk Grove is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Study Zone and surface evidence of faulting has not been observed. However, due to the proximity to the San Andreas Fault Zone and other active faults, the Planning Area may experience ground shaking, but would not experience major catastrophes. In addition, it is City policy to support efforts by federal, state, and other local jurisdictions to investigate local seismic and geological hazards and support those programs that effectively mitigate these hazards; therefore, impacts related to seismic hazards are considered less than significant.

ii) *Less than Significant Impact.* In populated areas, the greatest potential for loss of life and property damage is a result of ground shaking from a nearby earthquake. The degree of damage depends on many interrelated factors. Among these factors are the Richter magnitude, focal depth, distance from the causative fault, source mechanism, duration of shaking, high rock accelerations, type of surficial deposits or bedrock, degree of consolidation of surficial deposits, presence of high ground water, topography, and design, type, and quality of construction.

No active or potentially active faults underlie the City of Elk Grove based on published geologic maps. The project area is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Study Zone and surface evidence of faulting has not been observed. However, due to the proximity to the San Andreas Fault Zone and other active faults, the project area may experience ground shaking, but would not experience major catastrophes.

In addition, the proposed project only includes the construction of one gazebo and does not include other buildings or development that could put people at risk. As a result, the risk of adverse effects from ground shaking would be reduced to a minimum and is considered to be less than significant.

iii) *Less than Significant Impact.* Liquefaction is most likely to occur in deposits of water-saturated alluvium or similar deposits of artificial fill. Within Sacramento County, the Sacramento downtown area and the Delta are the only areas that are subject to potentially significant liquefaction problems. The City of Elk Grove is not located within these areas. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

iv) *No Impact.* The project site and the surrounding vicinity are relatively flat; therefore, the likelihood of landslides is minimal and no impact is anticipated.

b) *Less than Significant Impact.* Construction of the proposed project would involve minor excavation activities that would not result in any substantial soil erosion. The project would develop burial plots as needed and would not conduct any substantial grading. A less than significant impact is expected.

c) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project area is relatively flat and landslides are not anticipated. Therefore the proposed project would have a less than significant impact relating to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d) *Less than Significant Impact.* The Soil Survey of Sacramento County, California (USDA Soil Conservation Service, April 1993) shows the specific soil types found on the site to be San Joaquin silt loam (0 to 1 percent slopes). Soils with high clay content and high shrink-swell potential, like those at the project site, are usually expansive due to the minerals that swell with increased moisture content and then contract during dry periods. However, the only structure proposed would be the gazebo and would not pose a substantial risk to life and or property. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

e) *No Impact.* The project does not propose any septic tanks and or wastewater systems; therefore no impact is anticipated by this project.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) No Impact. The proposed project would not involve the routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse environmental impact from hazards and hazardous materials.

b) Less than significant Impact. Small amounts of hazardous materials may be used during construction activities (i.e., equipment maintenance, fuel, and solvents). However, impacts associated with are considered less than significant because any hazardous materials used would be limited to construction equipment and required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling of hazardous materials.

c) No Impact. The Pleasant Grove Elementary School is located within one-quarter mile of the project site. However, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, no impact to schools would occur.

d) No impact. Under Government Code Section 65962.5, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a list of hazardous substance sites. This list, referred to as the "Cortese List", includes CALSITE hazardous material sites, sites with leaking underground storage tanks, and landfills with evidence of groundwater contamination. The project site is not listed on the Cortese list².

e, f) No Impact There are no public airports or private airstrips within two miles of the project site. No impact is anticipated by the proposed project.

g) No impact. Upon incorporation, the City of Elk Grove adopted the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Disaster Plan (SCMDP), which was established to address planned response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters and technological incidents. The Plan focuses on operational concepts relative to large-scale disasters, which can pose major threats to life and property requiring unusual emergency responses. Additionally, the City adopted the Sacramento County Area Plan (SCAP), which is used as a guideline for hazardous material related accidents or occurrences. The purpose of the SCAP is "To delineate responsibilities and actions by various agencies in Sacramento County required to meet the obligation to protect the health and welfare of the populace, natural resources (environment), the public, and private properties involving hazardous materials." The proposed project would not impede or conflict with the objectives or policies of the identified emergency response plans and evacuation plans; therefore, no impact is anticipated.

h) No impact. The project site is surrounded by rural residential and vacant lands that have been disked for weed control. The site is not adjacent to or in close proximity to wildland areas. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

² DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List),
http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Source:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would add burial plots to the City of Elk Grove. This action is not expected to increase the amount of impervious surface in the area. Under the City’s Development Plan Review process, the project would be required to meet all applicable local and regional water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, thereby avoiding violation of such standards or requirements. Impacts to water quality standards and waste discharge requirements are considered to be less than significant.

b) Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not increase groundwater consumption and would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge because the project is not located in a recharge area. Therefore, a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table is not anticipated and impacts associated with groundwater supplies are considered less than significant.

c), d) and e) Less than Significant Impact. The project would not directly alter the course of any stream or river as none are located on the site. The project would not involve the construction of impervious surfaces on a site that currently is predominately agricultural land. The project does not propose any sewer connections. Therefore, impacts to drainage and runoff are considered less than significant.

f) Less than Significant Impact. The project is not expected to substantially degrade water quality. Due to the nature of the project, there will be no substantial increase in impervious surfaces, and no activities are expected that could degrade water quality. A less than significant impact is expected.

g) and h) Less than Significant Impact. The project does not propose any residential structures as a part of the development. The proposed project site is located within FEMA floodplain Zone X, an area determined to be outside of the 100-year and 500-year flood plains³. Therefore the project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.

i) No Impact. The proposed project site is located outside the Folsom Dam Failure Flood Area, which is the nearest dam. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam.

j) No Impact. The project is not located near any ocean, coast, or seiche hazard areas and would not involve the development of residential or other sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project would not expose people to potential impacts involving seiche or tsunami. No potential for mudflows is anticipated. There is no impact associated with the proposed project.

³ FIRM Map, Community Panel Number 0602620330D, revised July 6, 1998. Sacramento County, California.
 City of Elk Grove
 January 09
 Pleasant Grove School Rd. Cemetery Expansion IS/MND
 EG-07-071

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation

a) No Impact. The expansion of the cemetery would not divide an established community, but would provide a service to the community in which it is located. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The project proposes to expand operation of a cemetery in an area designated in the Elk Grove General Plan as Rural Residential, and zoned as Agricultural-Residential Zone 5 (AR-5). This use is allowed in this zoning designation with a conditional use permit. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.

c) No Impact. The City of Elk Grove does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the project would have no impact on these types of plans.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) No Impact. The proposed project would not use or extract any mineral or energy resources and would not restrict access to known mineral resource areas. According to Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) Special Report 156, the project area is located in the MRZ-3 classification. This classification is defined as areas “containing aggregate deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.” No significant mineral resources have been identified in the project area. The Elk Grove General Plan EIR (2003) did not identify any mineral resources in the planning area. Therefore, no impact to mineral resources will occur.

b) No Impact. Refer to discussion a), above. The project would have no impact on mineral resources.

XI. NOISE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) – d) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in temporary periodic increased ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site during construction due to construction vehicles and activities, and during the actual digging of graves throughout the cemetery’s operational lifespan. However, these increases would be temporary, intermittent, and limited to daytime hours. Construction would be restricted to between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., in accordance with the Elk Grove General Plan Noise Policy NO-3-Action 1. In addition, the contractor would be responsible for installing and maintaining effective mufflers on all construction equipment, locating equipment and staging areas as far from residences as possible, and limiting unnecessary idling of equipment. Therefore, temporary construction noise impacts would be less than significant.

Due to the nature of a cemetery, the proposed project will not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Therefore, potential adverse impacts related to noise are considered less than significant because the noise generated by the project is not likely to exceed the existing noise level and the project will be required to conform to the

Municipal Code and Zoning Code standards, which are designed to reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level.

e) and f) No Impact. There are no public airports or private airstrips within two miles of the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with excessive noise levels in conjunction with private airports.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the expansion of an existing cemetery. No residential development is proposed by the project and it does not propose nor require extensions of roads. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse impacts to population and housing.

b)-c) *No Impact.* The project does not involve the construction of housing. No housing will be removed by the project. Therefore, the project will not displace substantial numbers of people or housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in:

Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is located in the Elk Grove Community Services District Fire Department service area. The project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Elk Grove Community Services District Fire Department regarding access, water mains, fire flow, fire alarms, brush clearance, and hydrants. Increased demands for fire service are not expected due to the nature of the project and impacts to fire protection services are considered less than significant.

b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is located within the service area of the City of Elk Grove Police Department. The proposed project is not expected to adversely affect police services in the area. Therefore, adverse impacts to police protection would be less than significant.

c) *No Impact.* The project site is located within the Elk Grove Unified School District (EGUSD). The project does not propose any housing. There would be no impact to schools.

d) *No Impact.* The project site is located within the boundaries of the Elk Grove Community Services District Department of Parks and Recreation service area. State law requires each new residential development to dedicate land for park facilities or pay an in-lieu fee to cover the cost of acquiring park land elsewhere. The project does not propose any housing. There would be no impacts to parks and recreation.

e) *Less than Significant Impact.* Water supply is provided to the project site by the Sacramento County Water Agency. The project would be required to comply with the requirements of PG&E for public utility easements and adequate ground clearance from the wires, and that PG&E be

allowed to review project plans. SMUD provides electric service to the project area. No adverse impacts to these services are expected due to the nature of a cemetery.

XIV. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a)-b) No Impact. The project consists of the expansion of an existing cemetery and does not propose any housing. The project does not include recreational facilities, or will increase the use of existing parks, or will require the construction or expansion of existing recreation facilities. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in adverse impacts to recreational resources.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a-g) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not result in a substantial increase in traffic congestion in the project area. Due to the nature of a cemetery, vehicle trips to and from the site would be periodic in nature and would not be in a size or scope to significantly impact established levels of service. Furthermore, most vehicle trips generated by the project would occur on the weekends during a time when there is the least amount of traffic on the roadways. Therefore, the project is considered to have a less than significant impact on traffic and established levels of service.

There are no public airports or private airstrips within 2 miles of the project site. Furthermore, the project does not propose any structures that could affect any air traffic patterns. The project does not have any design features that would increase hazards due to inadequate emergency access, inadequate parking capacity, or conflict with any adopted plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project has been reviewed by the City Public Works

Department and the project must comply with City parking requirements. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a-g) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board as the project does not propose any structures that will increase wastewater discharge. Furthermore, the project will not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. The proposed project will not require the construction of any drainage facilities not already present on the project site. The proposed project is not expected to use any water over what is currently being used on the site for irrigation of landscaping and agriculture. The proposed project will not result in any increase in wastewater demand over what is currently demanded for the site. Solid waste generated by the project site is expected to be minimal. All impacts relating to utilities are expected to be less than significant.

**City of Elk Grove
January 09**

**Pleasant Grove School Rd. Cemetery Expansion IS/MND
EG-07-071**

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this initial study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.* This initial study found that the proposed project has the potential to impact foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk and other special status species protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Mitigation measures were identified and would be imposed upon the project to reduce these potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level (See mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-3). These measures require off-site preservation of comparable habitat or payment of a mitigation fee for Swainson’s hawk habitat, preconstruction surveys for raptors and migratory birds.

b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project would be consistent with the City of Elk Grove General Plan. The project would not create any significant cumulative impacts beyond those described and disclosed in the Elk Grove General Plan EIR adopted by the City Council in 2003. All potential impacts would be reduced through project mitigation measures, implementation of basic regulatory requirements, and/or conditions of approval incorporated into project design.

c) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would not have any direct or indirect adverse impacts on humans because construction effects would be temporary and have been reduced or eliminated by environmental control measures incorporated into the project design. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any direct or indirect adverse impacts on humans.

REFERENCES

Biological Resources Evaluation Report. Wilson biological Consulting. July 2008.

City of Elk Grove General Plan. Elk Grove, CA. 2003, amended 2005.

City of Elk Grove General Plan Draft EIR. Elk Grove, CA. 2003.

City of Elk Grove General Plan Amendment Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. Elk Grove, CA. 2004.

California Department of Conservation. *California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Important Farmland Map.* 2004.

USDA Soil Conservation Service. *Soil Survey of Sacramento County, California.* April 1993