

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 the earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.1 AESTHETICS 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 that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area is located on West Stockton Boulevard, just west of and adjacent to State Route (SR) 99 between Sheldon Road and Laguna Boulevard in the City of Elk Grove. The existing West Stockton Boulevard Bridge (W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge) is on a two-lane, north/south road and was constructed in 1956.

Two housing developments exist near the proposed project area. One is located adjacent to the project area, southwest of the project limit and south of Laguna Creek, while the other is located further away from the project area, northwest of the project limit on West Stockton Boulevard. Immediately west of the existing bridge, the project area consists of open space covered with vegetation consisting of tall grasses brush. Bridges for SR 99 and East Stockton Boulevard are located to the immediate east of the existing bridge. No trees or large bushes are within the project area.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No Impact. There are no identified scenic vistas within or in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, the proposed project would have no effect on a scenic vista.

- b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No Impact. No roadway in the area is designated as a state scenic highway. The nearest state highway is SR 99, which is located east of and adjacent to the project site and does not have a scenic designation in Sacramento County; therefore, the project would not damage any scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Additionally, no other scenic resources, such as rock outcroppings, trees, or historic building exist within or near the project area. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts to scenic resources in or near the project area.

- c) *Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project consists of replacement of an existing bridge with a new bridge. The new bridge would not be perceptibly higher or of substantially different architectural character as to create a significant change in the existing visual character of quality of the project site and its surroundings after project completion. Views of Laguna Creek from locations within and near the project area would not be adversely affected by the proposed project, therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts to the area's existing visual character.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Street lighting exists along the west side of the West Stockton Boulevard roadway within the project limits. These streetlights would need to be relocated to accommodate the additional width of the new bridge and roadway approaches, however, the project would not include installation of additional lighting or features that would create new sources of substantial light or glare; therefore, there would be a less than significant impact to new sources of day or nighttime views in the area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3.2 AGRICULTURE 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</p>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project area is primarily residential to the southwest and far northwest. West of the project area is zoned as “Agricultural/Residential –5 (flood combining land use)” and maintained as open space. State Route (SR) 99 and East Stockton Boulevard bridges lay immediately east of the project area. The Agricultural/Residential land to the west is designated as both Graze Land and Farmland of Local Importance and is maintained as open space, but is not used for grazing or agricultural purposes. SR 99 is just east of and adjacent to the project site.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. The proposed project would take place immediately west of SR 99 between Sheldon Road and Laguna Boulevard on West Stockton Boulevard within the City’s right-of-way. The area immediately west of and adjacent to the project site is zoned for Agricultural/Residential (flood combined) land use, and has been designated Farmland of Local Importance, however Laguna Creek, trails, and open areas lie in this area and there is no land in the vicinity used for agricultural purposes. Additionally, there are no areas identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

The project would replace an existing bridge with a new bridge, and, while the bridge would be longer and slightly wider, the new bridge would not substantially encroach on land designated as agricultural land, and would not result in the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the project would have no impact on conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. Refer to discussion a), above. There are no parcels in the project site under Williamson Act contract. Furthermore, there are no agricultural activities taking place within the project vicinity. Finally, the new bridge would not substantially encroach onto land designated as agricultural land or result in the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses; therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.

- c) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?*

No Impact. Refer to discussions a) and b), above. The proposed project would not convert adjacent agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.3 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:				
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 in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

REGIONAL SETTING

The proposed project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which consists of nine counties or portions of counties stretching from Plumas County in the north to Mariposa County in the south. The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin lies to the west, and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is located to the south. The Sierra Nevada Mountain Range surrounds Sacramento County to the east and the Coastal Range towards the west. These mountain ranges direct air circulation and dispersion patterns. Temperature inversions can trap air within the Valley, thereby preventing the vertical dispersal of air pollutants.

Light winds and atmospheric stability provide frequent opportunities for pollutants to accumulate in the atmosphere. Wind speed and direction also play an important role in the dispersion and transport of air pollutants. Wind at the surface and aloft can disperse pollution by mixing vertically and by transporting it to other locations. The prevailing winds during the summer are from the north and west. These winds, known as “up-valley winds,” originate with coastal breezes that enter the Valley through breaks in the coastal ranges, particularly through the Carquinez Straits in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Ozone, which is classified as a “regional” pollutant, often affects areas downwind of the original source of precursor emissions. Ozone can be easily transported by winds from a source area. Winds from the west transport ozone from the Bay Area to the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. Ozone precursor transport depends on daily meteorological conditions.

Other primary pollutants, carbon monoxide (CO), for example, may form high concentrations when wind speed is low. During the winter, Sacramento County experiences cold temperatures and calm conditions that increase the likelihood of a climate conducive to high localized CO concentrations.

Surface radiant cooling can also cause temperature inversions. On clear winter nights, the ground loses heat at a rapid rate, causing air in contact with it to cool. Once formed, radiation inversions are similar to subsidence inversions with respect to their effects on pollutant dilution. As a result, conditions in Sacramento County are conducive to the containment of air pollutants.

Air Pollution Sources and Current Air Quality

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is responsible for the management of air pollutant emissions. The District regulates air quality through its permit authority for most types of stationary emission sources, and through its planning and review activities for other sources.

Federal and California ambient air quality standards have been established for the following five critical pollutants: nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate, carbon monoxide, and ozone. Ozone pollution is the most conspicuous type of air pollution and is often characterized by visibility-reducing haze, eye irritation, and high oxidant concentrations (i.e., “smog”). Ozone is a pollutant of particular concern in the Sacramento Valley.

Particulate matter is another pollutant of concern in the Sacramento Valley. Particulate matter of less than 10 microns in diameter, commonly called PM₁₀, and less than 2.5 microns in diameter, commonly called PM_{2.5}, refers to substances that can be inhaled into the lungs and can potentially cause serious health problems. Common sources of particulate matter include construction and demolition activities, agricultural operations, burning, and traffic.

In general, there are four major sources of air pollutant emissions in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin including motor vehicles, industrial plants, agricultural activities, and construction activities. Motor vehicles account for a significant portion of regional gaseous and particulate emissions. Local large employers, such as industrial plants, can also generate substantial regional gaseous and particulate emissions. In addition, construction and agricultural activities can generate significant temporary gaseous and particulate emissions (dust, ash, smoke, etc.).

Applicable Federal and State standards for each regulated pollution category are provided in **Table 3.3-1**. The applicable standard for each pollution category, for environmental documentation purposes (i.e., identification of significant impacts), is whichever is most stringent of the Federal or State standards. Based on existing monitoring data located nearest the project site, the City of Elk Grove and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin are not in compliance with ozone or PM₁₀ standards.

Ozone Emissions

The most severe air quality problem in the Sacramento Air Basin is the high level of ozone. Ozone can cause eye irritation and impair respiratory functions. Accumulations of ozone depend heavily on weather patterns and thus vary substantially from year to year. Ozone is produced in the atmosphere through photochemical reactions involving reactive organic compounds (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). Numerous small sources throughout the region are responsible for most of the ROG and NO_x emissions in the Basin.

Suspended PM₁₀ Emissions

PM₁₀ refers to particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter—those that can be inhaled and cause health effects. Common sources of particulate include demolition, construction activity, agricultural operations, traffic and other localized sources such as fireplaces. Very small particulate of certain substances can cause direct lung damage or can contain absorbed gases that may be harmful when inhaled. Particulate can also damage materials and reduce

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

visibility. Twenty-four hour PM₁₀ standards are exceeded occasionally at the Elk Grove monitoring station. The annual geometric mean has also been exceeded during that same time frame. Currently, Sacramento County is in attainment status for Federal PM₁₀ standards and is in non-attainment status for State standards.

**TABLE 3.3-1
FEDERAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard	Federal Standard
Ozone	1-Hour	0.09 ppm	0.12 ppm
	8-Hour	0.07 ppm	0.08 ppm
PM ₁₀	24-Hour	50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	Annual	20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
PM _{2.5}	24-Hour	--	65 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
	Annual	12 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
Carbon Monoxide	8-Hour	9.0 ppm	9 ppm
	1-Hour	20 ppm	35 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual	--	0.053 ppm
	1-Hour	0.25 ppm	--
Sulfur Dioxide	Annual	--	0.030 ppm
	24-Hour	0.04 ppm	0.14 ppm
	3-Hour	--	--
	1-Hour	0.25 ppm	--
Lead	30-Day Avg.	1.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	--
	Calendar Quarter	--	1.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$

ppm = parts per million

$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ = Micrograms per Cubic Meter

Source: California Air Resource Board Ambient Air Quality Standards Chart, 05/06/05.

Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Because CO is emitted primarily by motor vehicles and is non-reactive, ambient CO concentrations normally follow the spatial and temporal distributions of vehicular traffic. CO concentrations are also influenced by meteorological factors such as wind speed and atmospheric mixing. High levels of CO can impair the transport of oxygen in the bloodstream and thereby aggravate cardiovascular disease and cause fatigue, headaches, and dizziness. The standards for CO are being met in the Sacramento Air Basin and the SMAQMD does not expect that the standards will be exceeded in the near future.

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)

The major sources of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), essential to the formation of photochemical smog, are vehicular, residential, and industrial fuel combustion. NO₂ is the “whiskey brown” colored gas evident during periods of heavy air pollution. NO₂ increases respiratory disease and irritation and may reduce resistance to certain infections.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The standards for NO₂ are being met in the Sacramento Air Basin and the SMAQMD does not expect that the standards will be exceeded in the near future.

Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)

The major source of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) is the combustion of high-sulfur fuels for electricity generation, petroleum refining, and shipping. In humid atmospheres, sulfur oxides can react with vapor to produce sulfuric acid, a component of acid rain. SO₂ can irritate the lungs, damage vegetation and materials, and reduce visibility. The standards for SO₂ are being met in the Sacramento Air Basin and the SMAQMD does not expect that the standards will be exceeded in the near future.

Lead (Pb)

Gasoline-powered automobile engines are a major source of airborne lead, although the use of leaded fuel is being reduced. Lead can cause blood effects such as anemia and the inhibition of enzymes involved in blood synthesis. Lead may also affect the central nervous and reproductive systems. Ambient lead levels have dropped dramatically as the percentage of motor vehicles using unleaded gasoline continues to increase. The standards for lead are being met in the Sacramento Air Basin and the SMAQMD does not expect that the standards will be exceeded in the future.

Air Quality Standards

Federal

The 1977 Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) required the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to identify National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) to protect public health and welfare. NAAQS have been established for the six criteria air pollutants (these are included in **Table 3.3-1**).

In June of 1997, the EPA adopted new ozone and PM₁₀ standards. The EPA intends to phase out the 1-hour ozone standard of 0.12 ppm and replace it with an 8-hour standard of 0.08 ppm. The EPA also adopted an additional standard for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}). Although monitoring is currently in effect, the planning process to determine compliance with these new standards and the development of control programs to meet these standards, if needed, is not yet completed.

Pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal CAA, the EPA has classified air basins (or portions thereof) as either "attainment" or "non-attainment" for each criteria air pollutant, based on whether or not the NAAQS have been achieved.

State

In 1988, the State of California passed the California Clean Air Act (CCAA, State 1988 Statutes, Chapter 1568), which established more stringent State ambient air quality standards and set forth a program for their achievement. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) establishes state air basins and implements state ambient air quality standards (AAQS), as required in the CCAA, and cooperates with the Federal government in implementing pertinent sections of the Federal Clean Air Bill Amendments. Further, CARB is responsible for controlling stationary and mobile source air pollutant emissions throughout the State. Like its Federal counterpart, the CCAA designates areas as attainment or non-attainment, with respect to the state AAQS.

Sacramento County is in the CARB-designated Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). In addition to Sacramento County, the SVAB includes Yolo and Solano Counties to the west, and eight other counties to the north and east.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Regional

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is the agency responsible for monitoring and regulating air pollutant emissions from stationary, area, and indirect sources within Sacramento County and throughout the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. The District is also responsible for monitoring air quality and setting and enforcing limits for source emissions. CARB is the agency with the legal responsibility for regulating mobile source emissions. The District is precluded from such activities under State law. The SMAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing regional air quality plans under the State and Federal CAA. The current regional clean air plan addresses ozone and PM₁₀ and identifies strategies for progressive reduction in emissions of ozone precursors and particulate matter.

Under the State standards, Sacramento County is in “Non-Attainment” for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} and in “Attainment” or “Unclassified” for other criteria pollutants. Sacramento County is also in “Non-Attainment” for Federal ozone and PM₁₀ standards, but is considered in “Attainment” or “Unclassified” for other Federal criteria pollutants.

City of Elk Grove

The Elk Grove General Plan Air Quality Element has policies and objectives for reduction of consumption of fossil fuels and the reduction of the use of private motor vehicles in favor of alternative forms of transportation.

Standards of Significance

According to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a project will normally have a significant impact on air quality if it will “violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations”.

For localized pollutants, such as carbon monoxide, an increase in concentrations that would result in a predicted violation of the most stringent State or Federal standard (20.0 ppm for 1-hour or 9.0 ppm for 8-hours) is considered to represent a significant impact. This assessment provides for two types of localized area pollutant impact analysis, (1) street and highway improvements, and (2) traffic volumes and construction impacts.

For purposes of this study, an impact is considered significant if one or more of the following conditions occur from implementation of the project:

- Regional air quality emission exceed standards;
- Local air quality emission exceed standards;
- Significant construction related air quality impacts occur; and/or
- The creation of objectionable odors.

SMAQMD has established thresholds for certain pollutants. For localized pollutants, such as CO, an increase in concentrations that would result in a predicted violation of the most stringent State or Federal standard [20.0 ppm for 1-hour or 9.0 ppm for 8-hours] is considered to represent a significant impact. For regional pollutants, such as ozone precursors (NO_x and ROG), SMAQMD establishes thresholds for both project-related operational pollutant increases and construction-related increases (reference **Table 3.3-2** and **Table 3.3-3**).

TABLE 3.3-2
SMAQMD SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA OPERATIONAL EMISSION THRESHOLDS

Ozone Precursor Emissions	Emission Thresholds lbs./day
NO _x	65
ROG	65

Source: Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County, July 2004.

TABLE 3.3-3
SMAQMD SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA CONSTRUCTION-RELATED EMISSION THRESHOLDS

Ozone Precursor Emissions	Emission Thresholds lbs./day
NO _x	85

Source: Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County, July 2004.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in ozone, PM₁₀, carbon monoxide, reactive organic compounds, or nitrogen oxides due to grading, excavation, and the use of construction equipment. These impacts would be minimal due to the limited area of the project and short-term construction period. Additionally, an air quality model was conducted using the *Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 5.1* program. The model determined that construction impacts would not exceed threshold levels; therefore impacts to applicable air quality plans would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Sacramento County is in non-attainment status for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The proposed project would involve construction activities that would result in the use of heavy equipment that generate dust, exhaust, and tire-wear emissions in addition to the use of paints and coatings, which may temporarily increase the air pollutants in the area. The short-term occurrence of emissions may result in an increase in regional pollutants, such as ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, reactive organic compounds, or nitrogen oxides. The proposed project would have relatively minimal grading activity and would not require extensive earth moving activities.

Construction air quality impacts are generally attributable to dust generated by equipment and vehicles. Fugitive dust is emitted both during construction activities and as a result of wind erosion over exposed earth surfaces. Clearing and earth moving activities comprise a major source of construction dust emissions, but traffic and general disturbances of soil surfaces during construction also generate significant dust emissions. Further, dust generation is dependent on soil type and soil moisture.

Adverse effects of construction activities cause increased dust-fall and locally elevated levels of total suspended particulate. Dust-fall can be a nuisance to neighboring properties or previously completed developments surrounding or within the project area, and may require frequent washing during the

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

construction period. Further, asphalt-paving materials used during construction would present temporary, minor sources of hydrocarbons that are precursors of ozone.

An air quality model was conducted by the City of Elk Grove to estimate potential air quality impacts from the proposed project using the *Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 5.1* program, available from the Sacramento Air Quality Management District. **Table 3.3-4** below summarizes emissions that may result from the project. See **Appendix A** for information on inputs used in the *Road Construction Emissions Model*.

**TABLE 3.3-4
CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES FOR THE WEST STOCKTON BOULEVARD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT
PROJECT (ROAD CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS MODEL, VERSION 5.1)**

Emission Estimates for W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge Replacement					Exhaust	Fugitive Dust
Project Phases (English Units)	ROG (lbs/day)	CO (lbs/day)	NOx (lbs/day)	PM10 (lbs/day)	PM10 (lbs/day)	PM10 (lbs/day)
Grubbing/Land Clearing	7	39	47	2	2	0
Grading/Excavation	8	41	50	3	3	0
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	8	44	50	3	3	0
Paving	3	13	23	1	1	0
Maximum (pounds/day)	8	44	50	3	3	0
Total (tons/construction project)	0	2	3	0	0	0

Notes:

- Where Value is >1, then "0" is displayed
- Project Start Year: 2006
- Project Length (months): 5.3
- Total Project Area (acres): 1.0
- Maximum Area Disturbed/Day (acres): 0.0086
- Total Soil Imported/Exported (yd³/day): 6.35
- PM₁₀ estimates assume 50% control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures if a minimum number of water trucks are specified.
- Total PM₁₀ emissions shown are the sum of exhaust and fugitive dust emissions.

Results of the air quality model indicated that project impacts associated with the construction activities of this project would not exceed construction emission thresholds established by SMAQMD, and the projects impacts would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would replace an existing bridge on an existing roadway. The new bridge would accommodate the same number of lanes as currently exists (one through-lane in each direction) and would also include roadway shoulders, striping for a bicycle lane, and a sidewalk, which would increase safety and facilitate pedestrian movement through the area.

Although the project would generate minor short-term air quality impacts as a result of construction activities, it would not result in long-term or cumulatively considerable increases in air quality pollutant emissions for which Sacramento County is currently in non-attainment (PM₁₀ and ozone precursors) since the project would not construct traffic generating features nor modify the roadway's capacity. The pollutant increase associated with construction activities would be temporary and at less than significant levels.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- d) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Elk Grove General Plan considers residences to be "sensitive receptors" in relation to air quality issues. There are residences nearby the proposed construction activities however, construction-related impacts to the adjacent residences and nearby business would be short-term in nature and pollutants from construction would not be constant and would dissipate rapidly from the emissions source. Furthermore, the project would not result in increased traffic since the project does not include any trip-generating features nor would it modify roadway capacity.

- e) *Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel powered equipment that emits exhaust fumes and use of roadway sealants that emit odors during application. However, equipment emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday and the exhaust odors are expected to dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the equipment. Additionally, the odors from roadway sealants would only be emitted during a short period of time during application, and would not affect a large area. Some residents who live near, or who pass by, the construction site may find these odors objectionable but the infrequency of the emissions, rapid dissipation of the exhaust into the air, and short-term nature of the construction activities would result in objectionable odors being a less than significant impact.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

In July and August of 2005, a Natural Environment Study (NES) was conducted for the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project by consulting biologists, Marcus H. Bole and Associates, to evaluate the potential impacts of the project on biological resources. Visual and auditory searches for habitat and presence of wildlife were conducted for a three-acre area in and around the project area. The biological evaluation included surveys for listed species and their habitat, wetland resources, and riparian habitat within the project area. Particular attention was focused upon potential special-status species and their habitats.

The limits of the Environmental Study Area (ESL) consist of a mix of residential, open space, and urban/roadway areas. All of these areas have been modified from their former natural condition and are currently subject to routine disturbance from on-going drainage channel maintenance activities and nearby urban and residential uses. Only remnants of natural features and vegetation occur within the study area.

NATURAL COMMUNITIES

The natural communities occurring within the Study Area are discussed below. Common wildlife and plant species observed, or expected to occur, in these areas and special-status species and sensitive plant habitats observed, or expected to occur, in these areas are also addressed below. The natural communities occurring within the project area include non-native grassland, a creek, and a creek bypass channel.

Non-Native Annual Grassland

Non-Native Annual Grassland covers large portions of the project area. Although this community type is often referred to as grassland, it also contains some introduced and native forbs. The dominant grasses within the ESL were hare barley (*Hordeum marinum ssp. leporinum*), Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*), wild oat (*Avena sp.*), rip-gut brome (*Bromus diandrus*) and soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*). Dominant forbs in the non-native annual grassland included, yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), and rose clover (*Trifolium hirtum*), coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*).

Native and Non-native Trees

No trees were identified within or near the project area.

Seasonal Wetland Habitat

The Corps defines wetlands as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions (Environmental Laboratory, 1987).” Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and seasonally-saturated or inundated areas such as vernal pools.

One potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetland was noted within the bypass channel area adjacent to the project. This site is probably wet during the winter and spring, and dried out later in the spring and summer depending on seasonal precipitation and flooding and urban irrigation run-off. This seasonal wetland was largely dominated by Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum murinum ssp. gussoneanum*), perennial ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*), rabbit's foot grass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*), and curly dock (*Rumex crispus*). No special-status seasonal wetland plant species were observed within the potential seasonal wetland area. Because the area lies outside the project area and, due to the topography of the area, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly impact this seasonal wetland area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Laguna Creek

Laguna Creek is a perennial stream that courses through the middle of the Study Area. This stream is a low gradient, slow moving stream that supports both wetland and riparian vegetation throughout its system, including arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), cattails (*Typha latifolia*), spike rush (*Eleocharis macrostachya*), sheep sorrel (*Rumex acetosella*), curly dock, fiddle dock, tule/bulrush (*Scirpus sp.*), nutsedge (*Cyperus eragrostis*), and along the waters' surface yellow waterprimrose (*Ludwigia peploides*), and duckweed (*Lemna minuscula*).

Laguna Creek represents potential habitat for several animal species. Wildlife observed in association with Laguna Creek includes common moorhen (*Gallinula chloropus*), cliff swallow (*Petrochelidon pyrrhonota*), marsh wren (*Cistothorus palustris*), red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), and great-tailed grackle (*Quiscalus mexicanus*). Laguna Creek represents potential habitat for the giant garter snake and the Northwestern Pond turtle.

Bypass Channel

Adjacent to the Laguna Creek is the Laguna Creek Bypass channel. During winter season storms, water from Laguna Creek overtops the weir located between the Laguna Creek channel and the Bypass channel and enters the Bypass channel where it is conveyed downstream. During the summer or low-storm flow months, parts of the bypass channel are intermittently wet from the overflow of irrigation water from surrounding residential and commercial areas. The vegetation within the Bypass channel is comprised of non-native upland grasses, such as, barley, ryegrass, and soft chess, and some wetland vegetation of English plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), mint (*Mentha sp.*), and nutsedge. Some slow flowing water was present at this site during the August 2005 survey.

SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES AND SENSITIVE HABITATS

The following discussion describes the plant and animal species that have been afforded special recognition by federal, state, or local resource agencies or organizations. Listed and special-status species are of relatively limited distribution in the Sacramento region and may require specialized habitat conditions. Listed and special-status species are defined as:

- Listed or proposed for listing under the state or federal Endangered Species acts;
- Protected under other regulations (e.g. Migratory Bird Treaty Act);
- CDFG Species of Special Concern;
- Listed as species of concern by CNPS or USFWS; or,
- Receive consideration during environmental review under CEQA.

Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies and those that are protected under CEQA, Section 1600 of the CDFG Code, or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

A list of special-status species and sensitive habitats known to occur within the region was compiled from a review of CNDDDB occurrence records within 10 miles of the project area, a review of the USFWS lists for special-status species occurring within the Florin quadrangle, and CNPS literature. **Table 3.4-1** includes the common name and scientific name for each species, regulatory status (federal, state, local, CNPS), habitat descriptions, and potential for occurrence within the project area. The following set of criteria has been used to determine each species' potential for occurrence on the site:

- Present; Species and/or habitats known to occur on the site, based on CNDDDB records, and/or was observed to occur on the site during the field survey(s). General habitat is present and species may be present.
- Absent; Species and/or habitats are not known to occur on or in the site vicinity and there is no suitable habitat for the species on site-OR-Species were surveyed for during the appropriate season with negative results for the species. No further work needed.

TABLE 3.4-1
REGIONAL SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES AND HABITATS OF CONCERN

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
Habitats					
<i>Northern Hardpan Vernal Pools</i>		--; --; --; --	These pools occur on old, acidic, iron-silica cemented soils including Corning, Redding, and San Joaquin soil series. Topography is typified by hogwallows and mima mounds which occur on aggregations most commonly on old alluvial fans ringing California's Central Valley	Absent	No vernal pools were observed on-site during field surveys.
Plants					
<i>Gratiola heterosepala</i>	Boggs Lake hedge- hyssop	--; CE; --; 1B	Found on the margin of vernal pools.	Absent	No: Vernal pool habitat is not present within project area.
<i>Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii</i>	Delta Tule Pea	--; --; --; 1B	Found in freshwater and brackish marshes and swamps.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat is not present within project area.
<i>Downingia pusilla</i>	Dwarf downingia	--; --; --; 2	Found in vernal pools.	Absent	No: Vernal pool habitat is not present within project area.
<i>Legenere limosa</i>	<i>Legenere</i>	FSC; --; --; 1B	Found in vernal pools.	Absent	No: Vernal pool habitat is not present within project area.
<i>Juglans hindsii</i>	<i>Northern California black walnut</i>	FSC; --; --; 1B	Found in riparian forests and riparian woodlands.	Absent	No: Not observed in project area
<i>Hibiscus lasiocarpus</i>	<i>Rose Mallow</i>	--; --; --; 2	Perennial marshes, ponds, and wet banks.	Absent	No: Not observed in project area
<i>Sagittaria sanfordii</i>	<i>Sanford's arrowhead</i>	FSC; --; --; 1B	Ditches and other freshwater, perennial features	Absent	Low: habitat present but not observed in project area

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
<i>Orcuttia viscida</i>	<i>Sacramento Orcutt grass</i>	FE; CE; -- ; 1B	Large, deep vernal pools.	Absent	No: Vernal pool habitat is not present within project area.
<i>Orcuttia tenuis</i>	<i>Slender Orcutt grass</i>	FT; CE; -- ; 1B	Vernal pools.	Absent	No: Vernal pool habitat is not present within project area.
Wildlife					
Invertebrates					
<i>Anthicus antiochensis</i>	Antioch dunes anthicid beetle	FSC; --; -- ; --	Found on loose sand on sand bars and sand dunes.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Linderiella occidentalis</i>	California linderiella	FSC; --; -- ; --	Vernal pools, some seasonal wetlands.	Absent	No: Vernal pool habitat is not present within project area.
<i>Branchinecta mesovallensis</i>	Midvalley fairy shrimp	FSC; --; -- ; --	Vernal pools and swales.	Absent	No: Vernal pool habitat is not present within project area.
<i>Anthicus sacramento</i>	Sacramento anthicid beetle	FSC; --; -- ; --	Found in sand slip-faces among willows.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	Valley elderberry longhorn beetle	FT; --; --; --	Associated with its' host plant the elderberry shrub (<i>Sambucus</i> spp.).	Absent	No: Elderberry shrubs not present in project area.
<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	Vernal pool fairy shrimp	FT; --; --; --	Vernal pools, some seasonal wetlands.	Absent	No: Vernal pools are not present in project area.
<i>Lepidurus packardi</i>	Vernal pool tadpole shrimp	FE; --; --; --	Vernal pools, some seasonal wetlands.	Absent	No: Vernal poos are not present in project area.
Amphibians/Reptiles					
<i>Phrynosoma coronatum frontale</i>	California horned lizard	FSC; CSC; --; --	Found in open or scrub dry grasslands, wooded grasslands, and riparian habitats with low rocks to serve as basking areas.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>	California red-	FT; CSC;	Requires a permanent water source	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
	legged frog	--; --	and is typically found along quiet slow moving streams, ponds, or marsh communities with emergent vegetation.		
<i>Ambystoma californiense</i>	California tiger salamander	FPT; CSC; --, --	Valley and foothill grasslands with suitable breeding pools.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Thamnophis gigas</i>	Giant garter snake	FT; CT; -- ; --	Agricultural wetlands and other wetlands such as irrigation and drainage canals, low gradient streams, marshes, ponds, sloughs, small lakes, and their associated uplands.	Present	High: Suitable habitat present, but not observed in project area.
<i>Emmys marmorata marmorata</i>	Northwestern pond turtle	FSC; CSC; --; --	Permanent water bodies with basking sites such as logs and rocks.	Present	High: Suitable habitat present, but not observed in project area.
<i>Spea hammondi</i>	Western spadefoot toad	FSC; CSC; --; --	Grasslands with suitable long lasting rain pools for breeding.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Fish					
<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	Chinook salmon, winter-run	FE; CE; -- ; --	River and stream tributaries to the Sacramento River Basin.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to Sacramento River Basin not present.
<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	Chinook salmon, Central Valley fall/late fall-run (Critical Habitat)	FC; CSC; --; --	River and stream tributaries to the Sacramento River Basin.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to Sacramento River Basin not present.
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	Central Valley steelhead	FT; --; --; --	River and stream tributaries to the Sacramento River Basin.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to Sacramento River Basin not present.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	Delta smelt (Critical Habitat)	FT; CT; -- ; --	River and stream tributaries to the Sacramento River Basin.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to Sacramento River Basin not present.
<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>	Green sturgeon	FC; CSC; --; --	River and stream tributaries to the Sacramento River Basin.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to Sacramento River Basin not present.
<i>Lampetra hubbsi</i>	Kern brook lamprey	FSC; CSC; --; --	Found in the lower reaches of the Merced, Kaweah, Kings, and San Joaquin Rivers.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to rivers not present.
<i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i>	Longfin smelt	FSC; CSC; --; --	River and stream tributaries to the Sacramento River Basin.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to Sacramento River Basin not present.
<i>Lampetra tridentata</i>	Pacific lamprey	FSC; --; -- ; --	Found in rivers throughout California. Species is anadromous.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to rivers not present.
<i>Lampetra ayresi</i>	River lamprey	FSC; CSC; --; --	Found in rivers throughout California. Species is anadromous.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to rivers not present.
<i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>	Sacramento splittail	FSC; CSC; --; --	River and stream tributaries to the Sacramento River Basin.	Absent	No: Suitable connectivity to Sacramento River Basin not present.
Birds					
<i>Branta canadensis leucopareia</i>	Aleutian Canada goose	FD (FSC); CSC; -- (Wintering)	Winter resident of agricultural lands.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	American peregrine falcon	FD (FSC); CE; --; -- (Nesting)	Nests on high cliffs, banks, dunes or mounds in woodland, forest, and coastal habitats, near a permanent water source.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Bald eagle	FT; CE; --; --	Large bodies of open water with suitable wintering trees (large trees).	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
Riparia riparia	Bank swallow	--; CT; --; - -	Require fine-textured or sandy banks or cliffs to dig horizontal nesting tunnels along large rivers.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Phalacrocorax auritus	Double-crested cormorant	--; CSC; --; --	Found along coast, inland lakes, in fresh, salt, and estuarine waters.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Buteo regalis	Ferruginous hawk	FSC; CSC; - -; -- (Wintering)	A winter resident common to open grassland habitats in California, but also found in various woodlands and brushy forests.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Grus Canadensis tabida	Greater sandhill crane	--; CT fully protected; - -; -- (Nesting & Wintering)	Nests in wet meadows interspersed with emergent marsh habitat. Winters in agricultural croplands and irrigated pastures.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Carduelis lawrencei	Lawrence's goldfinch	FSC; --; --; -- (Nesting)	Nests in open oak or other arid woodland and chaparral habitats near water.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Melanerpes lewis	Lewis' woodpecker	FSC; --; --; -- (Nesting)	Open, deciduous, and conifer habitats with a brushy under story, and scattered snags and live trees for nesting and perching.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Empidonax traillii brewsteri	Little willow flycatcher	--; CE; --; - - (Nesting)	Nests in shrubby riparian vegetation with saturated soil conditions or near a water source.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Lanius ludovicianus	Loggerhead shrike	FSC; CSC; --; -- (Nesting)	Open habitats with scattered shrubs, trees, posts, fences and utility lines for perches.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
<i>Numenius americanus</i>	Long-billed curlew	FSC; CSC; --; -- (Nesting)	Frequent wet meadow habitats, large coastal estuaries, upland herbaceous areas including croplands. Nest built in grass lined depressions on open ground.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Limosa fedoa</i>	Marbled godwit	FSC; --; --; --	Winter visitant, found on estuarine mudflats, sandy beaches, open shores, saline emergent wetlands, and adjacent wet upland fields	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Charadrius montanus</i>	Mountain plover	FSC; CSC; --; -- (Wintering)	Open and flat valley grasslands and short-grass prairies.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Picoides nuttallii</i>	Nuttall's woodpecker	--; --; SLC; --	Permanent resident of low elevation riparian deciduous and oak woodland habitats.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Baeolophus inornatus</i>	Oak titmouse	--; --; SLC; --	Occurs in montane hardwood and hardwood-conifer woodlands, and montane and valley foothill riparian habitats in cismontane California.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Selasphorus rufus</i>	Rufous hummingbird	FSC; --; --; --	Found in a valley foothill hardwood, valley foothill hardwood-conifer, riparian, and various chaparral habitats during northward and southward migrations; in montane riparian, aspen and high mountain meadows during southward migration.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	Swainson's	FSC; CT; --	Nests in isolated trees or riparian	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
	hawk	; -- (Nesting)	woodlands adjacent to suitable foraging habitat (agricultural fields, grasslands, etc.).		
Agelaius tricolor	Tricolored blackbird	FSC; CSC; --; -- (Nesting colony)	Freshwater marsh with emergent vegetation.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Chaetura vauxi	Vaux's swift	FSC; CSC; --; -- (Nesting)	Nests within large hollow cavities in live trees or snags in coniferous forest habitats.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Athene cunicularia hypugaea	Western burrowing owl	FSC; CSC; --; -- (Burrow sites)	Grasslands with friable soil for burrowing.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Plegadis chihi	White-faced ibis	FSC; CSC; --; -- (Rookery site)	Inhabits large freshwater emergent wetlands. The nesting colony typically occurs hidden within dense stands of vegetation such as reeds or willows.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Elanus leucurus	White-tailed kite	FSC; CFP; --; --	Yearlong resident in valley and coastal lowlands and is rarely found away from agricultural areas.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Other raptors (hawks, owls and vultures) and nesting birds.		MBTA and §3503.5 Department of Fish and Game Code	Nests in a variety of communities including cismontane woodland, mixed coniferous forest, chaparral, montane meadow, riparian, and urban communities.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Mammals					
Myotis volans	Long-legged myotis bat	FSC; --; -- ; --	Woodland and forest communities above approximately 4,000 feet	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
			above MSL. Roosts in rock crevices, buildings, under tree bark, in snags, mines, and caves.		
<i>Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii</i>	Pacific western big-eared bat	FSC; CSC; --; --	Typically occurs in mesic habitats, and requires caves, crevices, mines, tunnels, buildings or structures for roosting.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Sylvilagus bachmani riparius</i>	Riparian brush rabbit	FE; CE; --; --	Found in riparian communities with dense vegetation. Distribution limited to areas along the Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Neotoma fuscipes riparia</i>	Riparian woodrat	FE; CSC; --; --	Found in riparian communities with dense vegetation. Found along rivers in the northern San Joaquin Valley.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Perognathus inornatus</i>	San Joaquin pocket mouse	FSC; --; --; --	Annual grassland and scrub habitats with fine-textured soil conditions, confined to the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys of California.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
<i>Myotis ciliolabrum</i>	Small-footed myotis bat	FSC; --; --; --	Occurs in a wide variety of habitats, primarily in relatively arid wooded and brushy uplands near water, roosting in caves, buildings, mines, and crevices.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	General Habitat Description	Habitat Present/ Absent	Potential for Occurrence and Rationale
Myotis yumanensis	Yuma myotis bat	FSC; CSC; --; --	Reside in open forests and woodland habitats with sources of water over which to feed. Roost in colonies within buildings, mines, caves, and crevices.	Absent	No: Suitable habitat not present in project area.
Federally Listed Species:			California State Listed Species:		CNPS* List Categories:
FE = federal endangered			CE = California state endangered		1A = plants presumed extinct in California
FT = federal threatened			CT = California state threatened		1B = plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
FSC = federal species of concern			CR = California state rare		2 = plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but common elsewhere
FD = delisted			CSC = California Species of Special Concern		3 = plants about which we need more information
FC = candidate			CFP = California Fully Protected		4 = plants of limited distribution
PT = proposed threatened			Other Special-status Listing:		
FPD = proposed for delisting			SLC = species of local or regional concern or conservation significance		

SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES POTENTIALLY OCCURRING WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

Giant Garter Snake

The giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*) is listed as a state/federally threatened species. This species is found in a variety of aquatic habitats in central California, including agricultural wetlands and other wetlands such as irrigation and drainage canals, low gradient streams, marshes, ponds, sloughs, small lakes, and their associated uplands. There is one record of this species occurring within five miles of the project area (CNDDDB 2005).

Laguna Creek contains suitable habitat for the giant garter snake. In addition, the project area is within the historic range of this species. This species is known to occur within five miles of the project area from CNDDDB records (CNDDDB 2005) and within waterways that are directly hydrologically linked to the project area. The USFWS includes the giant garter snake on its list of species that could potentially be impacted by projects within the Florin USGS quadrangle. There are no barriers to the species' movement into the study area.

Focused surveys for giant garter snake were conducted during the drafting of the NES. Since aquatic habitats with Laguna Creek could provide potential habitat for this species, there is a reasonable expectation that the species are present onsite within existing bed and banks of Laguna Creek. No critical habitat has been designated for this species within the project area and therefore no impact to this species' critical habitat is expected.

Northwestern Pond Turtle

The Northwestern pond turtle (*Emmys marmorata marmorata*) is a state and federal species of concern. This species is found in a variety of aquatic habitats in central California, including permanent water bodies with basking sites such as logs and rocks. There is a record of this species occurring within five miles of the project area (CNDDDB 2005) and within waterways that are directly hydrologically linked to the project area.

Laguna Creek contains suitable habitat for the Northwestern pond turtle. The project site is within the historic range of this species. This species is known to occur within five miles of the project area from CNDDDB records (CNDDDB 2005) and within waterways that are directly hydrologically linked to the project area. There are no barriers to the species' movement into the study area.

Focused surveys for Northwestern pond turtle were conducted during the drafting of the NES. The Northwestern pond turtle was not observed within the bed, banks or upland habitats within the study area. Since aquatic habitats with Laguna Creek could provide potential habitat for this species, there is a reasonable expectation that the species could use the site for transit or foraging opportunities. No critical habitat has been designated for this species within the project area and therefore no impact to critical habitat for this species is expected.

Swainson's Hawk

The Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is listed by the CDFG as a threatened species. It has no federal status. No critical habitat has been designated for this species. The species' breeding range includes western Canada, the western United States, and northern Mexico. The species migrates to South America following the breeding season. In the Central Valley of California, Swainson's hawks leave their southbound migration in September and October and return to begin nesting in March. The Central Valley population is concentrated in Yolo, San Joaquin, and Sacramento counties.

Suitable foraging habitat is necessary to provide an adequate energy source for adults and nestlings. In the Central Valley, Swainson's hawks have adapted to forage for prey items primarily in agricultural fields. Potential foraging habitat exists within the project area.

Typical nesting habitats are riparian corridors or isolated trees within flying distances of suitable foraging habitat. Tree species commonly selected are Valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), Fremont's cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), and willow (*Salix* spp.) although a wide variety of exotic and other native tree species have been utilized. No suitable nesting habitat has been identified within the project area, since there are no trees within or adjacent to the project area.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Cliff Swallow

The existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge provides potential nesting habitat for cliff swallows (*Hirundo pyrrhonota*), which are a native bird species subject to protection under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Active cliff swallow nests were observed under the bridge in the summer of 2005. These nests were washed away by storm water during heavy rains in December 2005 and January 2006. It is anticipated that cliff swallows will return to the bridge in spring of 2006 and will rebuild nests under the bridge.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project 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?*

SPECIAL-STATUS PLANTS

No Impact. The project is not expected to affect any federal or state candidate, sensitive, or special plant species because none are known to occur or are anticipated at the project site.

SPECIAL-STATUS WILDLIFE

Giant Garter Snake and Northwestern Pond Turtle

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle have been identified as having a low potential for occurring within the project area. These species rely on freshwater marsh and low gradient streams for its habitat. Because of this, it is expected that giant garter snakes and Northwestern pond turtles would most likely occur near or in Laguna Creek. These species are not likely to occur elsewhere with the project ESL, such as roadways or bridges. While no giant garter snakes or Northwestern pond turtles were identified within the project area, construction activities associated with the project could have a **potentially significant impact** to the giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle habitat **unless mitigation measures are incorporated.**

Project implementation would require the replacement of the W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge, as well as excavation of small amounts of unpaved upland soil near the creek. Construction of the project would involve dewatering the project area, grading, excavation and use of heavy vehicles and equipment in the project area. Such construction could result in direct injury or "take" of giant garter snakes and/or Northwestern pond turtles. It is not expected that any of these temporary impacts would result in changes or significant impacts to downstream habitats or aquatic resources. The loss of giant garter snake or Northwestern pond turtle individuals would be considered a significant impact. The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce the project's impacts to wetland and upland habitats that may provide potential habitat for these special-status reptile species.

Approximately 0.00076 acres of new fill from the replacement bridge support piles would be placed within giant garter snake/Northwestern pond turtle aquatic habitat. The fill of approximately 0.00076 acres of

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

aquatic giant garter snake/Northwestern pond turtle habitat from the installation of new bridge support piles would be considered a permanent loss of habitat and subject to mitigation through the purchase of mitigation credits at a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-approved Mitigation Bank.

An unpaved soil area immediately adjacent to the paved West Stockton Boulevard roadway would also need to be excavated to accommodate the increased length and width of the new bridge. This area, since it is unpaved and within 200' of giant garter snake aquatic habitat, would be considered upland giant garter snake habitat. It is anticipated that approximately 0.046 acres of upland giant garter snake habitat would be permanently lost due to the project, and would be subject to mitigation through the purchase of mitigation credits at a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-approved Mitigation Bank or payment of an in-lieu fee.

Mitigation Measures

MM 3.4.1a To minimize potential impacts to the northwestern pond turtle and the giant garter snake during construction, the project shall implement the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's *Standard Avoidance and Minimization Measures During Construction Activities in Giant Garter Snake (*Thamnophis gigas*) Habitat*. The Standard Avoidance Measures include, but are not limited to, minimizing disturbed areas to only those required to complete project construction, limiting construction windows to warm months when snakes are more likely to be active and be able to avoid construction activities, and restoration of the construction area after completion of construction. See **Appendix B** for the full text of the *Standard Avoidance* document.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to the start of and during construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

MM 3.4.1b To protect any giant garter snakes or Northwestern pond turtles encountered during construction, any giant garter snake or Northwestern pond turtle found on the project site must be avoided and left alive and uninjured. If a giant garter snake or Northwestern pond turtle becomes trapped or retreats into any area subject to construction, construction in the vicinity of the snake or turtle shall stop and the City of Elk Grove and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service shall be notified immediately. Construction shall not be re-initiated until a qualified biologist has either removed the snake or turtle from the construction area or, after thorough inspection, determined that the snake or turtle has vacated the construction area.

Timing/Implementation: During construction activities and included in construction contracts.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

MM 3.4.1c To compensate for the permanent loss of giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle habitat, the project shall provide compensatory mitigation per the requirements of the Fish and Wildlife Service's January 24, 2005 *Programmatic Biological Opinion on the Effects of Small Highway Projects on the Threatened Giant Garter Snake in Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties, California*, or as required by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service during Section 7 consultation. The *Programmatic Biological Opinion* compensation requirements include, but are not limited to, restoration of the construction area after completion of construction and purchase of credits at a U.S. Fish and Wildlife-approved giant garter snake mitigation bank, or payment of an in-lieu fee to a U.S. Fish and Wildlife-approved giant garter snake mitigation fund to compensate for the permanent loss of habitat. See **Appendix B** for the full text of the *Programmatic Biological Opinion* document. Mitigation shall

occur in such a way as to provide for no net loss of giant garter snake habitat after project completion.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to the start of, during, and after construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures **MM3.4.1a**, through **MM3.4.1c** would reduce the projects impacts to giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle a **less than significant** level.

Swainson’s Hawk

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated Open areas within and adjacent to the project area contain potential foraging habitat for the Swainson’s hawk. The project site is within the historic range of this species. Nests of this species are known to occur within one mile of the project area, according to Sacramento County and DFG records. There are no barriers to the species’ movement into the study area. The City of Elk Grove has determined in its Updated Swainson’s Hawk Ordinance, July 4, 2004, that parcels of five (5) acres or more in size are recognized to be the minimum acreage required for viable foraging habitat. The proposed project site lays adjacent within a corridor of open space that follows Laguna Creek and the Laguna Creek Bypass Channel, and comprises an open area greater than five acres, and which has the potential to be used as foraging habitat by the Swainson’s hawk.

Implementation of the project would result in the loss of approximately 0.046 acres (2,000 sq. ft) of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce impacts to Swainson’s hawk:

Mitigation Measure

MM 3.4.2 To compensate for the permanent loss of potential foraging habitat, it is anticipated that the City of Elk Grove would purchase mitigation credits from a CDFG-approved Swainson’s Hawk Mitigation Fund at a 1:1 ratio. Final compensatory mitigation requirements and ratios will be determined under consultation with CDFG.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to project construction.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that potential impacts to Swainson’s hawk would be minimized to a **less than significant level after mitigation**.

NATIVE BIRDS

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge provides potential nesting habitat for cliff swallows. It is anticipated that cliff swallows will return to the bridge in spring of 2006 and will rebuild nests under the bridge. The disturbance of the active nests from the project’s construction activities associated with the bridge widening may have a potentially significant impact unless mitigation measures are incorporated.

Mitigation Measure

MM 3.4.3 If possible, prevent nest establishment on the bridge structure prior to beginning bridge construction activities. Nest prevention methods include, but are not limited to, installation of a

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

barrier (such as netting) to prevent bird access to the bridge and/or continued removal of deposited mud material under the bridge early in the nesting season to prevent construction of habitable nests. If nest prevention cannot be accomplished prior to the start of construction, and birds establish nests on the bridge, the nests shall be protected from construction activity that would disrupt nesting activities until the nestlings fledge. After the nestlings have fledged, the nests shall be inspected by a qualified biologist to confirm the absence of eggs and nestlings, prior to nest removal and commencement of bridge construction activities. Alternatively, the City will consult as appropriate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the CA Dept. of Fish and Game to discuss the potential loss of nests of native birds covered by the MBTA to obtain, if necessary, a permit authorizing activities that may otherwise result in MBTA violations.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to and during bridge construction.*

Enforcement/Monitoring: *City of Elk Grove.*

The implementation of the mitigation measure **MM 3.4.3** would bring the project into compliance with the MBTA, and reduce the project's impacts on native birds to a **less than significant after mitigation**.

- b) *Would the project 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies and those that are protected under CEQA, Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Construction activities associated with the bridge replacement would result in the disturbance of wetland and riparian habitat at Laguna Creek. This is considered a potentially significant impact unless mitigation is incorporated. The disturbance of this habitat is further discussed in c) below. Please reference the below discussion for mitigation measures associated with the disturbance of wetland and riparian habitats within the project area that would reduce the project's impacts to **less than significant after mitigation**.

- c) *Would the project 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 wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?*

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Construction activities associated with bridge replacement would result in the temporary disturbance, as well as permanent fill, of waters of the U.S. (Laguna Creek). This is considered a potentially significant impact unless mitigation is incorporated.

A biologist from Marcus H. Bole & Associates conducted field surveys of the study area in July and August 2005, and drafted a Draft Wetland Delineation report for the project area. The project area was systematically surveyed to ensure total search coverage, with special attention given to identifying those portions of the study area with the potential for supporting special-status species and sensitive habitats. Wetlands associated with Laguna Creek were identified in the surveys, and are considered Jurisdictional water of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

It is estimated that implementation of the project would result in the temporary disturbance of wetland associated with Laguna Creek. The loss would occur as a result of dewatering the project area to allow for bridge demolition and construction. The project would also result in the permanent loss of approximately 0.00076 acres of wetland associated with Laguna Creek, as a result of the addition of piles into Laguna Creek that would be used to support the replacement bridge.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Prior to beginning construction, the City will obtain all necessary permits from the appropriate resource agencies. These permits shall include:

- 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement – State of California Department of Fish & Game
- 401 Water Quality Certification Agreement – California Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Section 404 Permit – United States Army Corps of Engineers

To compensate for the loss of creek habitat, the project will provide compensatory mitigation per the requirements of the conditions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which regulates activities that take place within jurisdictional waters of the United States. It is anticipated that the proposed project would qualify to use a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit 14, Linear Transportation Project, which regulates activities required for the construction, expansion, modification, or improvement of linear transportation crossings in waters of the U.S. Section 19(c) of NWP 14 requires compensatory mitigation for the loss of jurisdictional waters at a minimum of one-for-one ratio, unless the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District Engineer determines in writing that some other form of mitigation would be more environmentally appropriate and provides a project-specific waiver of this requirement.

Mitigation Measure

MM 3.4.4a To compensate for the temporary impacts to Laguna Creek, such as the loss of streamside vegetation due to construction activities, a creek restoration plan shall be developed and implemented to restore the areas of Laguna Creek temporarily impacted by project construction to pre-construction conditions.

Timing/Implementation: After completion of project construction.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

MM 3.4.4b To compensate for the permanent impacts to Laguna Creek, such as the loss of waters of the U.S. due to fill, it is anticipated that the City of Elk Grove will purchase mitigation credits at a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-approved wetland mitigation bank, or pay an in-lieu fee to a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-approved wetland mitigation fund at a minimum ratio of 1:1. Final determination on if compensatory mitigation credits will be purchased from a mitigation bank or if an in-lieu fee will be paid, and final determination of the ratio of compensatory mitigation will be made by the District Engineer during City consultation with Army Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Mitigation shall occur in such as way as to result in no net loss of waters of the U.S. after project completion.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to and during project construction.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

After mitigation, no net loss of waters of the U.S. or wetlands would occur due to implementation of the proposed project. Because the project would result in no net loss of Waters of the U.S. after mitigation, the project would result in **less than significant impacts after mitigation**.

- d) *Would the project 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. There are no known wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites within the project area. With the exception of Laguna Creek, the site consists primarily of roadway/bridge landscape

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

and is considered to have a low biological value. Laguna Creek represents potential habitat for giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle. The segment of Laguna Creek under the existing W. Stockton Boulevard Bridge will require dewatering to allow for bridge demolition and construction. Measures set forth in MM 3.4.1a and MM 3.4.1b would serve to reduce impacts to giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle during project construction to less than significant levels. Additionally, no suitable habitat was identified for resident, migratory, or wildlife fish species within the project area.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

Less than Significant Impact. The project is consistent with City of Elk Grove General Plan Policies and Ordinances. No trees exist within the project area that would be subject to projection to the City of Elk Grove Tree Preservation Ordinance. Mitigation measure MM 3.4.2 is consistent with the City of Elk Grove Swainson's Hawk Ordinance.

- f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?*

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.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 geological 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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project will receive federal funding, therefore archaeological and historical investigations were conducted to comply with review criteria presented in the January 2004 *Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California* (PA). The West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project is also subject to the legal requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code 21000 et seq.) 1970, as amended.

City of Elk Grove Cultural Resources staff conducted archaeological and historic investigations for the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project completed in September 2005. Archaeological and historic investigations included: a records search at the North Central Information Center at California State University, Sacramento; a sacred lands search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission; and pedestrian surface survey of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project. Previous and current archaeological investigations for the project area did not identify any cultural resources (e.g., prehistoric and/or historic sites or buildings constructed prior to 1958).

The proposed project would replace the existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge. The new bridge would have an increased span longer than that of the existing bridge and would also be slightly longer. Replacement of the existing bridge would require complete demolition of the existing bridge and excavation of existing bridge support columns and abutments. The existing approach roadway, utilities, curbs, landscaping, street lighting, drainage systems, and traffic striping would be modified as necessary to accommodate the lengthened and widened bridge.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION

The record search for the project identified five previous surveys near or within the APE for the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project. These previous surveys include: Historic Property Survey Report –

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Negative Findings Laguna Creek Bridge Highway 99 PM 14.3 (Noble 1994); Draft Environmental Impact Report for Park Meadows (Formerly Kramer Ranch) General Plan Amendment, Community Plan Amendment, Rezone, Tentative Subdivision Map and Abandonment (County of Sacramento Department of Environmental Review and Assessment 1994); Draft Environmental Impact Report Lower Laguna Creek Drainage Master Plan (Michael Brandman Associates 1995); Draft Environmental Impact Report Park Meadows North Community Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Tentative Subdivision Map (Michael Brandman Associates 1996); and Reconnaissance Archeological Survey of the Morrison Stream Group in Sacramento County, California (Johnson 1974). These five previous surveys covered the entire project area for the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project.

Archaeological and historical investigations for the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project did not identify any prehistoric sites or historical archaeological sites in the project APE. Pedestrian surface survey, however, did identify two isolated features near the project APE and a weir across Laguna Creek. The features are a low earthen berm on the south side of Laguna Creek near the southeast boundary of the project APE and what appears to be an old road alignment that is approximately 100 feet long on the north side of Laguna Creek near the northeast boundary of the project APE. Neither of these features was identified in previous surveys that covered the project APE and they appear to be the result of recent construction activities in the area. The weir is located immediately west of the W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge, and is a recent structure (constructed in the 1990s by Sacramento County) designed to improve hydraulics in the area. In addition, the project APE is previously disturbed by: construction of the existing bridge, East Stockton Boulevard, SR 99 and its associated bridges spanning Laguna Creek; residential and other construction activities; installation of infrastructure (e.g., utility facilities); agriculture; and erosion, flooding, and redeposition of fill along Laguna Creek. Therefore, the archaeological sensitivity of the project area is generally low, and the vertical or subsurface project APE primarily consists of either disturbed contexts (e.g., areas previously disturbed by construction of the existing bridge and surrounding roads). In summary, there are no prehistoric sites, historic sites, or isolated artifacts within the project APE. The APE primarily consists of previously disturbed contexts.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?*

No Impact. Archeological and historical investigations did not identify any cultural resources (e.g. prehistoric sites, historic sites, or buildings) located within the project area that meet the CEQA criteria as presented in §15064.5; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on a historical resource. The existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge was constructed in 1956, however the bridge does not meet other criteria that would make it eligible for inclusion in a federal or state list of historic resources, and the bridge does not meet the definition of a historic resource as presented in CEQA §15064.5

- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, there are no identified historical or archaeological resources, as defined in §15064.5, located within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project should have no impact on an archaeological resource. However, should a previously unidentified or unanticipated archaeological resource be discovered during project construction, the City of Elk Grove requires the following pursuant to the Archaeological and Paleontological Policy HR-6-Action 2 of the General Plan:

The Planning Division shall be notified immediately if any prehistoric, archaeological, or paleontological artifact is uncovered during construction. All construction must stop and an 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.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- c) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?*

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no identified unique paleontological resources or sites, or unique geological features located within the project. Therefore, the proposed project should have no impact on a unique paleontological resource or site, or a unique geological feature. However, should a previously unidentified or unanticipated paleontological resource be discovered during project construction, the City of Elk Grove General Plan Archaeological and Paleontological Policy HR-6-Action 2 would be followed.

- d) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would be subject to State law regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains and it is not anticipated that any human remains would be encountered during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, potential impacts from the proposed project are considered less than significant.

While it is not expected that human remains would be discovered during project construction, should any previously unidentified or unanticipated human remains be discovered during project construction, the City of Elk Grove requires the following pursuant to General Plan Archaeological and Paleontological Policy HR-6-Action 2:

All construction must stop if any human remains are uncovered, and the County Coroner must be notified according to Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the procedures outline in CEQA Section 15064.5 (d) and (e) shall be followed.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

REGIONAL GEOLOGY

The proposed project site is located in the Great Valley geomorphic province in Central California. The filling of a large structural trough or downwarp of the underlying bedrock formed this province. The Great Valley is an elongate, northwest-trending structural trough situated between the Sierra Nevada Mountains on the east and the Coast and Cascade Ranges on the west. The Great Valley has been and is presently being filled with sediments primarily derived from the Sierra Nevada. The greatest depth of sediments lay along the eastern margin of the trough.

PROJECT GEOLOGY

The project site is located in a relatively flat area at an approximate surface elevation of 22 feet above mean sea level. The general topographic gradient is in a general westerly direction. Soils in the area are primarily composed of silt loam.

FAULTS AND SEISMICITY

Sacramento County is less affected by seismic events and other geologic hazards than other portions of the State. Nevertheless, some property damage has occurred in the past. The damage that was experienced has largely been the result of major seismic events occurring in adjacent areas, especially the San Francisco Bay area and, to a lesser extent, the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. The areas of Sacramento County most vulnerable to seismic and geologic hazards are those areas subject to liquefaction, shaking, and subsidence. The Central Valley, like most of California, is a seismically active region.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Would the project 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no known faults crossing through the proposed project site or in the vicinity of the project. The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake hazard zone. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts concerning fault rupture hazards.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the project area is not located within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake hazard zone, the project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Building Code. 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) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

No 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 within these areas.

iv) *Landslides?*

No Impact. The project site and the surrounding vicinity are located on a flat area containing no major slopes. The maximum land surface slope within the project area is less than one percent.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would be comprised of replacing the W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge over Laguna Creek and would include removal of fill from within Laguna Creek, as well as minor excavation of soil adjacent to Laguna Creek. Project construction would include minor amounts grading. These activities would occur in an area currently underneath the paved West Stockton Boulevard roadway, adjacent to the existing paved roadway, and within the banks of Laguna Creek. The project would also be subject to the City Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance and the requirements of the Clean Water Act. Due to the limited nature of earth movement in the project area, it is not anticipated that the project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- c) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. The project site is relatively flat and not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Construction would not require major earth moving activities to accommodate the project; therefore, unstable earth conditions or significant changes to the geologic substructure or topography would not occur.

- d) *Would the project 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. Soils with high clay content are usually expansive. Minerals in certain clays swell with increased moisture content and then contract during dry periods. The project site contains soils with high clay content, however they have not been identified as expansive. All bridge improvements from the proposed project would be designed so that grades are constructed in such a way as to prevent water from collecting on or adjacent to pavements, thereby discouraging soil saturation adjacent to the roadbed. Therefore, the project would be considered to have a less than significant impact.

- e) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. Neither septic tanks nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no impact associated with septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 §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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A material is considered hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state, or local agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. A hazardous material is defined in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as follows:

A substance or combination of substances which, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may either (1) cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness; or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or environment when improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of or otherwise managed. (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66261.10)

Chemical and physical properties cause a substance to be considered hazardous. Such properties include toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity. CCR, Title 22, Sections 66261.20-66261.24 define the aforementioned properties. The release of hazardous materials into the environment could potentially contaminate soils, surface water, and groundwater supplies.

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. In addition, the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department maintains records of toxic or hazardous material incidents, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) keeps files on hazardous material sites.

Most hazardous materials regulation and enforcement in Sacramento County is managed by the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department. Most hazardous materials regulation and enforcement in the City of Elk Grove is overseen by the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department that refers large cases of hazardous materials contamination or violations to the Central Valley RWQCB and the California State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). It is not at all uncommon for other agencies such as the Air Pollution Control District and both the Federal and State Occupational Safety and Health Administrations (OSHA) to become involved when issues related to hazardous materials arise.

Several hazardous material databases were searched to determine the potential for the presence of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in the project area. These databases are listed below.

FEDERAL RECORD SOURCES:

- NPL – National Priority List;
- CERCLIS – Comprehensive Environmental Response, compensation, and Liability Information System;
- ERNS – Emergency Response Notification System;
- TRIS – Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System;
- SNAP – Superfund NPL Assessment Program Database;
- EPA’s Envirofacts – Environmental Protection Agency Envirofacts Database.

STATE RECORD SOURCES:

- CAL-SITES – Contains potential or confirmed hazardous substance release properties;
- CORTESE – “Cortese” Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List;
- SWF/LF (SWIS) – Solid Waste Information System;
- LUST – Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System;
- CA UST – Active Underground Storage Tank Facilities.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public. Small amounts of hazardous materials would be used during construction activities (i.e., fuel, solvents, roadway resurfacing and restriping materials, and equipment maintenance materials). As indicated above, hazardous materials would primarily be used during construction of the project and are not anticipated to result in any adverse health or environmental impact to people in the vicinity of the project site. Additionally, any hazardous material uses would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling of hazardous materials.

- b) *Would the project 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?*

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction activities that may be associated with the release of hazardous materials would include refueling and minor maintenance of construction equipment on location, which could lead to minor fuel and oil spills. The use and handling of hazardous materials during construction activities would occur in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CalOSHA) requirements. Should any fuel and/or oil spills occur, these would take place in areas near sensitive receptors including waters. Although any potential spill would be minor, such spills could be considered potentially significant unless the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

Mitigation Measure

MM 3.7.1 Prior to start of construction, the construction contractor shall designate staging areas where fueling and oil-changing activities will take place. The staging area(s) shall be reviewed and approved by City of Elk Grove’s Environmental Mitigation Monitor and the Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Manager prior to the start of construction. 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 residences, day care facilities, and schools. Staging areas shall not be located near any stream, channel, or wetlands. The proposed staging areas shall be identified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

Timing/Implementation: Prior to start of construction and during project construction.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would confine fueling and oil-changing activities to specific areas that would avoid potential entry of spills into local water systems or onto soils. With this measure and compliance with other applicable hazardous material regulations, potential impacts are considered **less than significant**.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

No Impact. Currently there are no existing or proposed daycare/preschools, elementary, middle, or high schools within one-quarter (0.25) mile of the project area; therefore, no impact is expected concerning hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or wastes near schools.

- d) *Would the project be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Elk Grove completed a hazardous materials list database search on December 20, 2004 and found that no hazardous materials sites are located within the project area, and it is unlikely that the project site would be affected by contamination from hazardous materials. Additionally, the area surrounding the project site has been recently and extensively disturbed by construction activities associated with construction of the nearby bypass weir that separates Laguna Creek from the Laguna Creek Bypass channel, and by the reconstruction of the SR 99 and East Stockton Boulevard bridges to the east of the project area. Because the area surrounding the project area has been extensively and recently disturbed, it is unlikely that any previously undiscovered hazardous materials, such as underground fuel tanks, would be discovered and disturbed by the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. Airport-related hazards are generally associated with aircraft accidents, particularly during takeoffs and landings. Airport operation hazards include incompatible land uses, power transmission lines, wildlife hazards (e.g., bird strikes), and tall structures that penetrate the imaginary surfaces surrounding an airport.

The nearest airport/airstrip is the Sunset Sky ranch Airport, located approximately four (4) miles southeast of the project site in Elk Grove, CA; therefore, the project site is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Planning Area (CLUP) of this facility, according to the City of Elk Grove Draft General Plan, nor does it include any structures or equipment anticipated to penetrate the navigable airspace of the Sunset Sky ranch Airport.

- 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?*

No Impact. See discussion e), above. There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project area. The nearest airstrip is located approximately four (4) miles southeast of the project site. Normal operations of this facility would not result in safety related or other adverse impacts to people working at or near the project area.

- g) *Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Less than Significant 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

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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 resource (environment), and the public and private properties involving hazardous materials.”

The project would not impede or conflict with the objectives or policies of the identified emergency response plans and evacuation plans, and although the West Stockton Boulevard roadway may be partially or entirely closed for periods of time during construction, implementation of an approved Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would ensure emergency vehicle access would not be impeded. Please see Section 3.15 Traffic and Circulation for an analysis of the project’s potential impacts associated with emergency vehicle access and a TMP.

- h) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. The project area is primarily residential to the southwest and far northwest and Agricultural/Residential (flood combining land use) to the immediate west, consisting of land maintained as open space. As such, the site is not adjacent to or in close proximity to wildland areas. Additionally, the Elk Grove Community Services District Fire Department would provide fire and emergency services at the site in the event of an emergency.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.8	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	Would the project:			
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i)	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area includes Laguna Creek, a perennial creek that serves a large part of the City of Elk Grove as drainage. As the general gradient in the project area lies toward the west, waters flows from east to west under W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge.

The project proposes to replace the existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge with a new bridge that is longer and slightly wider. The volume and direction of water flow in the area would not be altered by the project.

The project area is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Central Valley RWQCB develops and enforces water quality objectives and implementation plans that safeguard the quality of water resources in its region. Specifically, the RWQCB identifies potential water quality concerns, confirms and characterizes water quality problems through assessments, remedies problems through imposing or enforcing appropriate measures, and monitors problem areas to assess effectiveness of remedial measures.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of the proposed project could result in the violation of water quality standards or water discharge requirements during the project construction period unless mitigation is incorporated.

Potential water quality impacts would primarily occur during construction of the project. Construction-related impacts to water quality are potentially significant. Mitigation measure **MM 3.8.1**, described below, specifies actions to prevent violation of water quality standards.

Measures would also be included in the grading plans that would minimize erosion potential and water quality degradation for the project area in accordance with the City's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance and the NPDES requirements. The purpose of the NPDES permit is to protect water quality from development areas that would discharge into a surface water body. During construction of the project, the City's construction contractor must eliminate non-storm water discharges to storm water systems, the contractor must develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and perform monitoring of discharges to storm water systems. The State has published a set of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for both pre- and post-construction periods, which would be applied to the project. The contractor would identify the appropriate BMPs in coordination with the City's SWPPP Manager for the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure

MM 3.8.1 Prior to construction, a sediment control plan and a SWPPP shall be prepared by the contractor and submitted to the City for approval. The sediment control plan shall be designed to limit the effects of soil erosion and water degradation during construction. This plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the RWQCB's NPDES permit requirements, and shall include (but not be limited to) the following measures:

- Timing of work within Laguna Creek (targeted for the dry months between May 1 – October 1, when feasible);
- Use of sediment control measures that utilize sediment traps, barriers, covers, or other methods approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board;

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- Plans for appropriate deposition and storage of excavated material;
- Construction phasing; and
- Cover all stockpiles of fill material during extended periods of rain.

Timing/Implementation: *During project design and construction.*

Enforcement/Monitoring: *City of Elk Grove Development Services.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that potential water quality impacts are reduced to **less than significant** levels.

- b) *Would the project 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)?*

Less than Significant Impact. Less than 2,000 sq. ft. of additional pavement would be added as a result of the project. The impact of the proposed bridge replacement would be minimal in terms of adverse effects on groundwater resources. The proposed project does not contain elements that either add to or draw from groundwater. Additionally, the project area is not near any pre-existing well.

- c) *Would the project 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project area within Laguna Creek would be subject to some excavation to provide for the additional length of the new bridge. Additionally, small areas adjacent to the bridge could be subject to minor grading. Excavation and grading would be conducted pursuant to the City of Elk Grove's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, the requirements of the Clean Water Act, and the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, to ensure that drainage in the area follows historic drainage patterns. Drainage through and near the project area would follow historic drainage patterns, and historic water volumes and velocity would not change from existing conditions.

The drainage pattern of the project area would not be substantially altered, nor substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff and the drainage pattern would remain flowing in the historic drainage pattern, and less than significant impacts from erosion and siltation are expected from project implementation.

- d) *Would the project 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to discussion c), above. Less than 2,000 square feet of new pavement would be added as a result of the project. Although added impervious surfaces would constitute slight increases in runoff, the increase would not be substantial and the project area would be supplied with adequate storm drains.

A small area currently paved as part of the West Stockton Boulevard roadway abutting the existing bridge would be excavated to provide for a longer replacement bridge. While this would create small amounts of new creek channel areas under the new bridge, Laguna Creek water flows would continue to run in the historical drainage pattern, with no substantial change to water surface level, volume, or velocity as a result of

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

project implementation. Additionally, the bridge would be designed and constructed to adequately convey flows during flood events; therefore, it is anticipated that the project would result in less than significant impacts from on- or off-site flooding.

- e) *Would the project 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. The project would cause a very slight increase in the quantity of runoff generated in a storm event through the increase in impervious surface area associated with the added pavement. The quantity of additional run-off generated from the project would not be substantial, and storm drains would be sized and constructed in accordance with City of Elk Grove standards.

The operation of the proposed project would include use of the new bridge by motor vehicles, and other uses associated with local roadways. These uses may result in the deposit of various materials on the bridge roadway and adjacent areas that constitute urban pollution. These materials include heavy metals, engine oil and other automobile wastes (e.g., antifreeze, transmission fluid, rubber, etc.) that can be transported in surface water runoff during storm events. These additional sources of polluted runoff, however, would be minimal and would occur even without the implementation of the project, as it is an existing facility.

- f) *Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in e) above, the project area would accumulate small quantities of heavy metals, oil and grease, as well as other chemicals used by motor vehicles that may be released during first rains. The amount of additional polluted runoff generated in the project area would be insignificant compared to existing conditions.

The potential for impacts to ground water quality is unlikely due to the low permeability of the soils in the area. Low permeability soils tend to prevent leaching of contaminants into the ground water aquifer in quantities that could degrade the ground water quality. Therefore, impacts related to water quality are considered to be less than significant.

- g) *Would the project 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. While there is housing adjacent to the project area, the housing is currently outside of the FEMA 100-year flood hazard area. Implementation of the project would not substantially alter Laguna Creek's historic flow direction, volume, or velocity from existing conditions. Implementation of the project would not result in changes to the 100-year flood hazard area, and no changes to flood threats at nearby housing would occur.

- h) *Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would replace an existing bridge. The new bridge would be longer and slightly wider than the existing bridge, and would required replacement of existing bridge support columns currently in the Laguna Creek channel.

The new bridge would be designed and constructed to adequately accommodate Laguna Creek flows during flood episodes. Additionally, the new bridge support columns would be sized and placed in the creek in such a way as to not impede or redirect flood flows. It is anticipated that the project would have a less than significant impact on impeding or redirecting flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- i) *Would the project 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. See responses g) and h) above. The project would not create new risk of flooding in or near the project area. Additionally, the project site is not located on a levee or dam, and would have no impact from flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or a dam.

- j) *Would the project be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?*

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

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project area is located on West Stockton Boulevard, just west of and adjacent to SR 99 between Sheldon Road and Laguna Boulevard in the City of Elk Grove. Land uses in the project area include residential to the southwest and far northwest and Agricultural/Residential (flood combining land use) to the immediate west. The Agricultural/Residential land to the west is designated as both Graze Land and Farmland of Local Importance and is maintained as open space while Laguna Creek runs through the site.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The proposed project would replace the existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge on the existing roadway with a longer span bridge. The proposed project would also install shoulders and sidewalks to improve accessibility and pedestrian safety, however no barriers to movement between segments of the surrounding established communities would be installed, nor would established communities be physically divided as a result of this project.

b) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. The proposed project would comply with all Elk Grove General Plan policies, as they relate to road projects. The project would be consistent with the City of Elk Grove’s General Plan, Zoning Code, and Circulation Plan.

c) *Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact. No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans are in place now or applicable to the project area. The project would have no impact with regard to these types of plans.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.10	MINERAL RESOURCES	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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Mineral extraction activities do not occur in the vicinity of the project site. Neither West Stockton Boulevard or Sheldon Road, nor other roadways in the vicinity of the project, serve as routes for traffic involved in mineral extraction activities.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project 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?*

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. The proposed bridge replacement 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. The project is not located in an Aggregate Resource Area as identified by the City Land Use Diagram, nor is any important mineral resource known to be located on the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact created from the implementation of the proposed project.

- b) *Would the project 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?*

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

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.11 NOISE 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 of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a 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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Planned and approved growth in the surrounding area has resulted in new housing developments northwest and southwest of the proposed project area. Additionally, SR 99 is immediately east of and adjacent to the project site, which contributes to increased noise levels for nearby residents.

NOISE BACKGROUND

Noise is often described as unwanted sound, which can be detected through any pressure variation in air that the human ear can detect. Noise has been linked directly to human health and, aside from general annoyances, excessive noise is a source of discomfort, interferes with sleep, and disrupts communication and relaxation.

The perceived loudness of sounds is dependent upon many factors, including sound pressure level and frequency content. However, within the usual range of environment noise levels, perception of loudness is relatively predictable, and can be approximated by weighing the frequency response of a sound level meter by means of the standardized A-weighting network. There is a strong correlation between A-weighted sound levels (expressed as

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

dB(A) and community response to noise. For this reason, the A-weighted sound level has become the standard tool of environmental noise assessment. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted levels.

Community noise is commonly described in terms of the “ambient” noise level, which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. A common statistical tool to measure the ambient noise level is the average, or equivalent, sound level (L_{eq}), which corresponds to a steady-state A-weighted sound level containing the same total energy as a time-varying signal over a given time period (usually one hour). The L_{eq} is the foundation of the composite noise descriptor, L_{dn} , and shows a strong correlation with community response noise.

The Day-night Average Level (L_{dn}) is based upon the average noise level over a 24-hour day, with a +10 decibel weighting applied to noise occurring during nighttime (10:00p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) hours. The nighttime penalty is based upon the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposures as though they were twice as loud as daytime exposures. Because L_{dn} represents a 24-hour average, it tends to disguise short-term variation in the noise environment.

Acoustical Terminology

The following terminology has been used for purposes of this NIA:

Acoustics:	The science of sound.
Ambient Noise Level:	The composite of noise from all sources near and far. In this context, the ambient noise level constitutes the normal or existing level of environmental noise at a given location.
A-Weighting:	A frequency-response adjustment of a sound level meter that conditions the output signal to approximate human response.
CNEL:	Community Noise Equivalent Level. The average equivalent sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of approximately five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7 p.m. to 10p.m. and ten decibels to sound levels in the night before 7 a.m. and after 10 p.m.
Decibel, dB:	A unit for describing the amplitude of sound, equal to 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio of the pressure of the sound measured to the reference pressure, which is 20 micropascals (20 micro-newtons per square meter).
DNL/L_{dn}:	Day/Night Average Sound Level. The average equivalent sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of ten decibels to sound levels in the night after 10:00 p.m. and before 7:00 a.m.
L_{eq}:	Equivalent Sound Level. The sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given sample period. L_{eq} is typically computed over 1, 8 and 24-hour sample periods.
$L_{eq}(h)$:	The hourly value of L_{eq} .
L_{max}:	The maximum noise level recorded during a noise event
L_n:	The sound level exceeded "n" percent of the time during a sample interval (L_{90} , L_{50} , L_{10} , etc.). L_{10} equals the level exceeded 10 percent of the time.

$L_n(h)$:	The hourly value of L_n .
Noise Exposure Contours:	Lines drawn about a noise source indicating constant levels of noise exposure. CNEL and DNL contours are frequently utilized to describe community exposure to noise.
SEL or SENEL:	Sound Exposure Level or Single Event Noise Exposure Level. The level of noise accumulated during a single noise event, such as an aircraft over flight, with reference to a duration of one second. More specifically, it is the time-integrated A-weighted squared sound pressure for a stated time interval or event, based on a reference pressure of 20 micropascals and a reference duration of one second
Sound Level:	The sound pressure level in decibels as measured on a sound level meter using the A-weighting filter network. The A-weighting filter de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequency components of the sound in a manner similar to the response of the human ear and give good correlation with subjective reactions to noise.

Note: CNEL and DNL represent daily levels of noise exposure averaged on an annual basis, while L^{\wedge} represents the average noise exposure for a shorter time period, typically one hour

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Guidelines set forth in the City of Elk Grove general plan must be followed for transportation noise sources. Safety concerns must also be analyzed to determine the need for appropriate mitigation resulting from increased noise due to increased traffic adjacent to the project and other evaluations such as the need for noise barriers and other noise abatement improvements. Criteria levels are given as A-weighted decibels. **Table 3.11-1** below summarizes the maximum allowable noise exposure from transportation noise sources.

General Plan Policy NO-6 addresses allowable noise increases from roadway improvement projects, such as the proposed West Stockton Boulevard Bridge Replacement Project. This policy acknowledges that noise increases associated with planned roadway improvements may exceed the levels established in **Table 3.11-1**. General Plan Policy NO-6 is as follows:

NO-6 It is anticipated that roadway improvement projects (such as widening of existing roadways) will be needed to accommodate build-out of the General Plan. Therefore, existing noise-sensitive uses may be exposed to increased noise levels due to roadway improvement projects as a result of increased roadway capacity, increases in travel speeds, etc. It may not be practical to reduce increased traffic noise levels consistent with those contained in Table NO-C [Table 3.11-1]. Therefore, the following criteria shall be used as a test of significance for roadway improvement projects, which are not directly tied to a development project:

- Where existing traffic noise levels are less than 60 dB L_{dn} at the outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive uses, a +5 dB L_{dn} increase in noise levels due to roadway improvement projects will be considered significant; and
- Where existing traffic noise levels range between 60 and 65 dB L_{dn} at the outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive uses, a +3 dB L_{dn} increase in noise levels due to roadway improvement projects will be considered significant; and

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- Where existing traffic noise levels are greater than 65 dB L_{dn} at the outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive uses, a +1.5 dB L_{dn} increase in noise levels due to roadway improvement projects will be considered significant.

**TABLE 3.11-1
ELK GROVE GENERAL PLAN MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NOISE EXPOSURE, TRANSPORTATION NOISE SOURCES**

Land Use	Outdoor Activity Areas ¹ Ldn/CNEL, dB	Interior Spaces	
		Ldn/CNEL, dB	Leq, dB
Residential	602	45	--
Residential subject to noise from railroad tracks, aircraft over flights, or similar noise sources which produce clearly identifiable, discrete noise events (the passing of a single train, as opposed to relatively steady noise sources such as roadways)	602	40	--
Transient Lodging	60	45	--
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	602	45	--
Theaters, Auditoriums, Music Halls	--	--	35
Churches, Meetings Halls	602	--	40
Office Buildings	--	--	45
Schools, Libraries, Museums	--	--	45
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	70	--	--

¹ Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.

² Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn/CNEL may be allowed provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with this table.

Source: City of Elk Grove General Plan Noise Element.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?*

CONSTRUCTION-RELATED NOISE

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction activities could increase noise levels temporarily in the vicinity of the project. Noise from materials handling, paving, stationary equipment, pile driving, and other sources would contribute to the generation of noise. The actual noise levels at any particular location would depend on a variety of factors, including the type of construction equipment or activity involved, distance to the source of the noise, obstacles to noise that exist between the receptor and the source, time of day, and similar factors. These increases would be temporary, intermittent, and limited to

daytime hours. However, while receptors near the project site would be subjected to only temporary increases in noise levels during the construction period, noise from construction activities, particularly any pile-driving activities that may be required to install the new bridge support columns, could be substantial. While impacts from construction noise would be reduced by the City of Elk Grove General Plan Noise Element, which limits construction hours near residential uses to the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. (General Plan Noise Action NO-3-Action 1), additional mitigation would be necessary to reduce noise from pile-driving activities to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure

MM 3.11.1 Pile-driving activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. On Sunday, pile-driving activities shall be limited to the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Timing/Implementation: During project construction.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Elk Grove Development Services.

TRAFFIC-RELATED NOISE

No Impact. Because the project would not bring traffic closer to sensitive receptors, nor would it increase the amount of traffic moving through the area, no increases in noise in the area would occur after project implementation.

- b) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Potential groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would most likely occur as part of construction pile-driving activities associated with the project. While these construction activities would be temporary in nature, and City of Elk Grove Noise Action NO-3-Action 1 would reduce impacts from construction-associated groundborne vibration and groundborne noise levels, groundborne noise and vibration from pile-driving activities could be substantial. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.11.1 would serve to further reduce impacts from groundborne noise and vibration to less than significant levels.

- c) *Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

No Impact. As stated in response a) above, the project would not result in increased traffic moving through the area, nor would it bring traffic closer to sensitive receptors. As a result, no increases in noise are expected as a result of the proposed project.

- d) *Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Less than Significant Impact. Noise generated from construction vehicles and activities would result in periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the construction site. However these increases would be temporary, intermittent, and limited to daytime hours. City of Elk Grove Noise Action NO-3-Action 1 would ensure less than significant impacts from temporary construction noise.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The nearest airport/airstrip is the Sunset Skyranch Airport in Elk Grove, CA approximately four (4) miles southeast of the project site; therefore, there would be no impact associated with public airports.

- f) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. Refer to response e) above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., 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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project area is a bridge crossing Laguna Creek, located on West Stockton Boulevard with Sheldon Road laying to the north of the project area, and Laguna Boulevard laying to the south. Residential developments lay adjacent to the project area to the south, and further away from the project area to the north. West of the bridge is open space, and the SR 99 and East Stockton Boulevard bridges lay to the east of the W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

No Impact. The proposed project is a bridge replacement project that is consistent with the Circulation Element of the Elk Grove General Plan, which seeks to eliminate functionally obsolete bridges by replacing them with new bridges. The replacement of the W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge would not induce growth above that which is expected from planned and approved residential development in the area, the project is expected to have no impact on growth inducement in the area.

- b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. No homes would be taken as part of the proposed project; therefore there would be no need to construct replacement housing.

- c) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. As discussed in b) above, the project would not involve the taking of any housing, and would, therefore, not displace any people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3.13 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 following public services:</p>				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project area is serviced by the Elk Grove Police Department for police protection and by the Elk Grove Community Services District (EGCSD) for fire and emergency medical services, as well as park and recreation services. Educational services are provided through the Elk Grove Unified School District. Maintenance of public facilities, including the project area bridge and Laguna Creek, is provided by the City.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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 following public services:

a) *Fire protection?*

No Impact. The proposed project would not include a residential or commercial component that would increase human presence in the area, nor would it result in the need for additional facilities to service the project area; therefore, there would be no need for additional governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, and other performance objectives for fire protection.

b) *Police protection?*

No Impact. Refer to response a), above. There would be no need for additional governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, and other performance objectives for police protection.

c) *Schools?*

No Impact. Refer to response a), above. The proposed project would not result in an increased demand for schools. As such, there would be no need for additional governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios for schools.

d) *Parks?*

No Impact. Refer to response a), above. The proposed project would not result in an increased demand for parks. As such, there would be no need for additional governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios for parks.

e) *Other public facilities?*

No Impact. Refer to response a), above. The proposed project would not include a residential or commercial component that would increase human presence in the area; therefore additional public services would not be required.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.14 RECREATION				
a) Would the project 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"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Elk Grove General Plan contains goals and policies established to conserve existing national, state, and regional recreation areas, as well as encouragement for the development of additional recreational opportunities to meet the City’s needs, however there are no known plans to develop new recreational facilities within the project area. There is a paved multi-use trail adjacent to the project area that follows the Laguna Creek Bypass Channel adjacent to a segment of West Stockton Boulevard. This trail would not be modified or impacted by the bridge replacement project.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. The proposed project is a bridge replacement project that would not create any new demands for any type of recreational facilities; therefore, the project would have no impact on increased use of existing local recreational facilities.

- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of existing facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

No Impact. The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore no impacts to the environment would occur as a result of construction or expansion of these.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project consists of the replacement of the existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge with a new bridge. The existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge consists of two through lanes (one in each direction) with a sidewalk. This segment of West Stockton Boulevard is used primarily by local residences for access between their homes and nearby arterial roadways (Sheldon Road to the north and Laguna Boulevard to the south) and commercial areas.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project cause an increase in traffic that 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)?*

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not cause or result in a substantial increase in existing traffic trips on the roadway, since no trip-generating land uses are associated with the project (i.e., residential developments, commercial centers, etc.). Additionally, the number of through lanes across the bridge would not be modified from existing conditions.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Short-term construction activities may temporarily disrupt traffic through the area. The contractor would complete a Traffic Control Plan and submit it to the Public Works Department for approval. Because any potential traffic disruption resulting from the project would be construction-related and, thus, temporary in nature, the overall impacts are considered less than significant.

- b) *Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

No Impact. Overall, the project would cause no impact to the LOS established by the City of Elk Grove or the County of Sacramento because the project contains no growth inducing land uses/businesses/residential development, or modification to the number of through lanes across the bridge.

- c) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or increase traffic levels that would result in a substantial safety risk. The project does not propose any structures that would impede a height limitation in close proximity to an airport; therefore, no impacts on air traffic patterns would occur as a result of this project.

- d) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

No Impact. The project proposed to replace an existing bridge structure with a new bridge. While the new bridge would be longer and slightly wider than the existing bridge, it would not be substantially different from the existing bridge. No design feature of this project would present additional hazards or incompatible uses such as sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or turning radius of non-standard design.

- e) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

Less than Significant Impact. The project would replace an existing two-lane bridge with a new two-lane bridge, and would result in no changes to existing emergency access after project construction. During construction, it is anticipated that W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge would be closed during some or all portions of bridge demolition and construction. As a result the project may potentially slow or eliminate emergency access through the project area during construction. However, as part of project development, City Public Works would develop plans for alternative emergency access, and submit these alternatives to emergency service providers for approval prior to the start of construction. For areas not addressed in the bridge closure plan developed by Public Works, the contractor would be required to submit a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that would include an emergency access plan to accommodate emergency traffic during the construction period, and this plan would be provided to emergency agencies (i.e., fire and police departments) prior to the start of construction. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on emergency access.

- f) *Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?*

No Impact. No land uses are proposed that would generate a demand for parking. The proposed project would not cause the loss of on-street parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on parking capacity.

- g) *Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

No Impact. The proposed project was developed based the City of Elk Grove General Plan and is consistent with its goals and objectives. No conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs would occur as a result of implementation of this project.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 that 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Utilities located in and surrounding the project area include water services provided by the Elk Grove Water Services District (EGWSD) and the Sacramento County Department of Water Resources (SCDWR), electricity provided by Sacramento Metropolitan Utilities District (SMUD), natural gas provided by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), telephone services provided by Frontier Communications, and cable television provided by Comcast Cable. Solid waste services in the project area are provided by Central Valley Waste Services. The City of Elk Grove maintains storm drainage facilities associated with West Stockton Boulevard and Laguna Creek.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

No Impact. The proposed project would not produce additional wastewater; therefore, there would be no impact.

- b) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. Refer to response a), above. The project would have no impact on water or wastewater treatment facilities.

- c) *Would the project 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would relocate one existing storm water drainage outlet several feet west (downstream) of its current location immediately adjacent to the existing W. Stockton Blvd. Bridge to accommodate the new, wider bridge, however the project would not involve the modification of existing storm water drainage patterns (the project area's historic drainage flow). A small portion of an area adjacent to Laguna Creek and currently under the existing West Stockton Boulevard roadway would be excavated to accommodate the increased length of the new bridge, however, the flow patterns, flow volume, and velocity of Laguna Creek would not be altered; therefore, the modifications to Laguna Creek would be negligible and would not result in significant environmental effects.

- d) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project may temporarily require minimal amounts of water to supply irrigation to replacement vegetation that would be installed after project construction, which existing water supplies are capable of supplying. The amounts required for vegetation establishment irrigation would not be substantial and would not require the procurement of additional entitlements or resources.

- e) *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?*

No Impact. The proposed project would not produce additional wastewater; therefore, there would be no impact.

- f) *Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

Less than Significant Impact. Solid waste generated by the proposed roadway improvement project would be limited to bridge and roadway pavement demolition and construction debris, including asphalt and concrete. Solid waste disposal of demolition and construction materials, including the disposal of any hazardous wastes that may be encountered, would occur in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Disposal would occur at permitted landfills. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate the need for new solid waste facilities and the project's impacts would be considered less than significant.

- g) *Would the project comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

No Impact. The proposed project would conform to all applicable state and federal solid waste regulations; therefore, there would be no impact.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project 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 rare or endangered plants or animals, 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) Does the project 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Does the project 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 rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would result in both temporary and permanent fill of Laguna Creek. Laguna Creek provides potential habitat for giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle. Mitigation measures **MM 3.4.1a** through **MM 3.4.1c** have been identified to ensure **less than significant** impacts to giant garter snake and Northwestern pond turtle. Additionally, mitigation measure **MM 3.8.1** has been identified to ensure **less than significant** impacts to soil erosion and water degradation.

- b) *Does the project 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.*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i) states that a Lead Agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact of a project is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. As stated in the question above, the assessment of the significance of

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

the cumulative effects of a project must be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects.

Overall, the project would make no significant contribution to cumulatively significant impacts associated with existing or proposed projects in the City of Elk Grove. The project would replace an existing bridge and is not anticipated to substantially increase the use of the facility.

Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.4 Biological Resources and 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality would insure protection of special-status species during construction, no net loss of habitat, and protection of water quality during construction.

Construction of the proposed project along with other construction within the City and County could impact air quality, but proposed project's contribution would be negligible and short-term, and at less than significant levels; therefore, cumulative impacts of the project are considered **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Sacramento County has non-attainment status for ozone and PM₁₀. The proposed project would utilize construction equipment for the bridge replacement activities. Construction activities such as the use of heavy equipment that generate dust, exhaust, and tire wear emissions and from paints and coatings may increase the air pollutants in the area temporarily, however these impacts would be short term and limited in nature, and would be less than significant.

Noise generated during construction could be significant, especially during pile-driving activities. Mitigation measure **MM 3.11.1** has been identified to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels during project construction. It is not anticipated that operational noise levels would change from existing conditions after completion of the project.

Lastly, construction activities could pose threats to area residents and construction contractors by the use of fuels and chemicals associated with fueling construction equipment and other construction activities. See Section 3.7 for discussion of potential hazards. Mitigation measure **MM 3.7.1** would reduce the impacts related to hazardous materials to **less than significant**.