
**ELK GROVE BOULEVARD/SR 99 INTERCHANGE
MODIFICATION PROJECT**

INITIAL STUDY

Prepared by:

City of Elk Grove
Development Services-Planning
8401 Laguna Palms Way
Elk Grove, CA 95758

JULY 2008

INTRODUCTION

Determination..... 1
Purpose of Initial Study..... 2
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts 2

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

I. Aesthetics 4
II. Agricultural Resources 5
III. Air Quality 6
IV. Biological Resources..... 8
V. Cultural Resources 10
VI. Geology and Soils 12
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials..... 14
VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality 16
IX. Land Use and Planning 18
X. Mineral Resources..... 19
XI. Noise 20
XII. Population and Housing 22
XIII. Public Services 23
XIV. Recreation 24
XV. Transportation/Traffic..... 25
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems 27
XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance 29

LIST OF PREPARERS 5-1

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/ Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | |

DETERMINATION

On behalf 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.



July 11, 2008

Signature

Date

Melissa Logue, Environmental Project Manager

City of Elk Grove Development Services-Planning

Printed Name

For

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Elk Grove Boulevard/State Route 99 (SR99) Interchange Modification Project, as proposed, may have a significant effect on the environment. Based upon the findings contained in this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project involves the modification of an existing interchange in a predominantly commercial area that does not include any scenic vistas; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not within a state scenic highway, thus no resources within a state scenic highway would be damaged. No further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) **Potentially Significant.** The City of Elk Grove General Plan EIR (2003) indicates that SR99 from the Calvine Road exit to the juncture of SR99 and the Cosumnes River south of Grant Line Road is a scenic corridor. SR99 is also designated as a Special Sign Corridor by the Elk Grove Zoning Code, which regulates the type, size and location of signs within the view of the traveling public. Additionally, several trees that fall under the City of Elk Grove Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance (19.12.010) would require removal or relocation; therefore this issue will be addressed in the Visual Resources section of the EIR.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would introduce new streetlights into the project area at intersections and bus turnouts for safety purposes. All proposed lighting would be in compliance with City of Elk Grove Development Standards, which requires street lighting to be constructed to minimize adverse affects to day or nighttime views. While this new light source could adversely affect adjacent areas from light “spilling over” and could increase the sky glow in the region, the contribution of the project lighting would be minimal and only for safety purposes at the intersections; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** The project area is classified by the California Department of Conservation as urban and built-up land, which is defined as “land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately six (6) structures to a 10-acre parcel. This land is used for residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional, public administration, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes.” Agricultural land uses do not exist within the project area; therefore no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- b) **No Impact.** According to the Elk Grove General Plan Land Use Policy Map, there are no parcels either designated for agriculture on the project site or zoned for agriculture. In addition, Figure 4.1-2 of the City of Elk Grove General Plan EIR (2003) does not show any Williamson Act Contract lands within the project area; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- c) **No Impact.** Refer to discussions a) and b), above. The proposed project is not located in an area that is designated, zoned, or classified as farmland; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** In July 1997, EPA promulgated a new 8-hour standard for ozone, lowering the standard for ambient ozone to 0.08 parts per million of ozone averaged over eight hours. A project would be considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan if it would be inconsistent with the emissions inventories contained in the regional air quality plan. Emission inventories are developed based on projected increases in population growth and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) within the region. The proposed project, however, would not result in an increase in the population. Vehicle traffic would be redistributed along area roadways, but would not be anticipated to result in a substantial change in overall VMT that would conflict with the projections used for development of regional air quality attainment plans. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would not obstruct implementation of any of the proposed control measures contained in regional air quality plans; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- b) **Potentially Significant.** The construction and development of the proposed improvements would result in the temporary generation of emissions resulting from site grading and excavation, road paving, motor vehicle exhaust associated with construction equipment and worker trips, and the movement of construction equipment, especially on unpaved surfaces. Short-term construction-generated emissions of ozone precursor pollutants (i.e., ROG, NOX), and PM10 were quantified using the SMAQMD’s Road Construction Emissions Model. Estimated daily emissions associated with individual construction processes (e.g., grading, utility installation, paving, etc.) would not exceed the SMAQMD’s significance threshold of 85 lbs/day for NOX. However, some construction activities could occur simultaneously, in which case, maximum daily emissions could potentially exceed the SMAQMD’s significance threshold of 85 lbs/day for NOX; therefore, this issue will be addressed in the Air Quality section of the EIR.

- c) **Potentially Significant.** Implementation of the proposed project would serve to improve traffic conditions in the area and would not result in a substantial increase in criteria air pollutants that would conflict with the emissions inventories used for regional air quality planning purposes; however the project would result in short-term air quality impacts during construction. This issue will be addressed in the Air Quality section of the EIR.

- d) **Potentially Significant.** Implementation of the proposed project would result in short-term emissions of diesel-fueled engines (DPM) during construction associated with the use of off-road diesel equipment for site grading and excavation, paving, demolition, and other construction activities. Particulate exhaust emissions from DPM were identified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC) by the CARB in 1998. This issue will be addressed in the Air Quality section of the EIR.

- e) **Less than Significant.** Implementation of the proposed project would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel-powered equipment that emits exhaust fumes. However, construction-generated emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday and would dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the equipment. In addition, pavement coatings and road striping paints used during project construction would also emit temporary odors. However, similar to mobile-source exhaust emissions, these emissions would also be intermittent and would dissipate rapidly. As a result, short-term construction activities would not expose a substantial number of people to frequent odorous emissions; therefore no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Potentially Significant.** An estimated 3.0 acres of urban habitat would be impacted by the proposed project. No sensitive species of plants would be expected to be present because of the disturbed nature of the project study area, and no sensitive vegetation types are present, however other sensitive animal species may be affected. This issue will be addressed in the Biological Resources section of the EIR.
- b) **Less than Significant.** Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies and those that are protected under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including riparian and wetland areas, however there is no riparian habitat located on the project site; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- c) **Potentially Significant.** A wetland delineation was completed for the project study limits and verified by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on May 2, 2006. The project would not impact the wetland area; however, project construction would result in the filling of approximately 0.004 acres of an intermittent drainage area under the USACE jurisdiction. This issue will be addressed in the Biological Resources section of the EIR.
- d) **Potentially Significant.** Removal of trees associated with the proposed project could result in disturbance to nesting raptor and other migratory birds. Raptors are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. Migratory bird nests and eggs are protected under the MBTA. This issue will be addressed in the Biological Resources section of the EIR.
- e) **Potentially Significant.** The proposed project would impact trees protected by the City of Elk Grove Tree Preservation Ordinance and the City of Elk Grove General Plan Policy CAQ-8. This issue will be discussed in the Biological Resources section of the EIR.
- f) **No Impact.** The City of Elk Grove does not at present have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The records search and other archival research did not identify any previously recorded prehistoric sites, historic sites, features, or isolated artifacts within the project environmental study limits. The Elk Grove Cemetery is not included within the study limits because project related activities will not directly or indirectly affect the cemetery. The sacred lands search did not identify any Native American cultural resources either within or near the study limits. The pedestrian surface survey, however, did identify commercial buildings/structures within the study limits. These buildings were constructed within the last 50 years and do not meet the age requirements for evaluation for the California Register of Historical Resources; therefore, no further analysis of this issue will be discussed in the EIR.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** There are no known archaeological resources within the project area and the project area has been heavily disturbed by construction of roads (e.g., SR99, Elk Grove Boulevard, and East Stockton Boulevard) and commercial properties. Previous surveys in the project area did not identify any prehistoric sites or isolated artifacts. However, should a previously unidentified or unanticipated archaeological resource be discovered during project construction, City of Elk Grove Archaeological and Paleontological Policy HR HR-6-Action 2 of the General Plan would be followed. Additionally, it is Caltrans policy that work be halted in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find (Caltrans *Environmental Handbook, Volume II*, Chapter 1); therefore, no further analysis of this issue will be required in the EIR.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Refer to discussions a) and b), above. It is not anticipated that additional cultural resources, including paleontological resources or unique geological features, would be encountered during construction of the proposed project; therefore, no further analysis of this issue will be required in the EIR.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The Elk Grove Cemetery is located south of Elk Grove Boulevard and east of SR99 at the northeastern edge of the area encompassed by the project environmental study limits. The Elk Grove Cemetery is not included within the study limits because project related activities will not directly or indirectly affect the cemetery. Additionally, archaeological investigations for the project did not identify any

human remains within or adjacent to the project study limits; therefore, the project would not be expected to impact any human remains and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) i) **Less than Significant Impact.** There are no known faults in the project area; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- a) ii) **Less than Significant Impact.** No active or potentially active faults underlie the City of Elk Grove based on published geologic maps. The project area is not located within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone and surface evidence of faulting has not been observed. However, due to the proximity to the San Andreas Fault Zone and other active faults, the project area may experience ground shaking, but would not experience major catastrophes; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- a) iii) **Less than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction is most likely to occur in deposits of water-saturated alluvium or similar deposits of artificial fill. Within Sacramento County, the Sacramento downtown area and the Delta are

the only areas that are subject to potentially significant liquefaction problems. The City of Elk Grove is not within these areas; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- a) iv) **Less than Significant Impact.** A portion of the project site located west of the Elk Grove Cemetery is at an elevation higher than the existing SR99 while the remainder of the project site is relatively flat. A retaining wall would be placed within the area next to the Elk Grove Cemetery property line. In addition, all project related work would be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of all applicable federal, state and local safety regulations; therefore, the likelihood of slope failure in the area west of the Elk Grove Cemetery is less than significant and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would involve grading and excavation activities that may result in short-term wind and water driven erosion of soils. Compliance with the City's NPDES permit and Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance would reduce impacts associated with soil erosion; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** A portion of the project site located west of the Elk Grove Cemetery is at an elevation higher than the existing SR99. The remainder of the project site is relatively level. A retaining wall would be placed within that area next to the Elk Grove Cemetery property line. Prior to final design, a geotechnical report shall be completed to identify any special considerations for project design and construction, such as slope stability and rock excavation. The type, strength, slope, and bedding of soils and rocks will be taken into consideration for design, construction and maintenance/repair operations; therefore no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Soils with high clay content like those within the project area are usually expansive due to the minerals that swell with increased moisture content and then contract during dry periods. Prior to final design, a geotechnical report will be completed to identify any special considerations for project design and construction, including the presence of expansive soils; therefore the proposed project would have a less than significant impact for creating substantial risks to life or property by implementing the engineering recommendations contained in the site-specific geotechnical report and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- e) **No Impact.** The project does not propose the use or construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less than Significant.** The proposed project would not include the routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **Potentially Significant.** The Initial Site Assessment and the Initial Site Assessment Addendum completed by Kleinfelder for the project site determined that the project area contains contamination that could be released during construction. This issue will be addressed in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section of the EIR.

- c) **No Impact.** There are no elementary, middle, or high schools within one-quarter mile of the project area; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- d) **Potentially Significant.** The project would acquire land that is listed on state and county hazardous databases for storing hazardous materials. In addition, residual soil contamination may remain on properties within and surrounding the project area. This issue will be addressed in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section of the EIR.
- e) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Planning Area (CLUP) of this facility; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- f) **No Impact.** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project area; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The City of Elk Grove adopted the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Disaster Plan (SCMDP) and the Sacramento County Area Plan (SCAP). The proposed project would not impede or conflict with the objectives or policies of the identified emergency response plans and evacuation plans; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

Refer to Section XIII for an analysis of the potential impacts associated with emergency vehicle access.

- h) **No Impact.** The project site is located in an area surrounded by commercial and residential development. The site is not adjacent to or in close proximity to wildland areas; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** All construction activities would comply with provisions of the NPDES, SWPPP, BMPs, and the City’s Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance to reduce impacts associated with water quality standards and discharge requirements; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- b) ***Less than Significant Impact.*** The project would add minor amounts of impervious surfaces in the project area. However, the project would not significantly interfere with current groundwater recharge. The proposed project would include minimal excavation to replace a portion of a man-made drainage with a culvert that would extend from an existing culvert beneath the SR99 northbound off-ramp. In addition underground drainage facilities would be extended for the new SR99 northbound loop on-ramp. These features would not significantly interfere with the capacity or flow of water and ground water recharge; therefore no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) ***Less than Significant Impact.*** The proposed project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river. The project would include minimal excavation to replace a portion of a man-made drainage with a culvert that would extend from an existing culvert beneath the SR99 northbound off-ramp. In addition underground drainage facilities would be extended for the new SR99 northbound loop on-ramp. The project would comply with the provisions of the NPDES, SWPPP, BMPs, and the City's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- d) ***Potentially Significant Impact.*** The project would cause an increase in the quantity of runoff generated in a storm event through the increase in impervious area associated with the pavement and sidewalk surfaces. The potential for on-site and off-site flooding impacts from the proposed project will be addressed in the Hydrology/Water Quality Section of the EIR.
- e) ***Potentially Significant Impact.*** Refer to discussion d), above. The potential impacts from the increased quantity and quality of run-off generated from the project to existing and planned storm water capacity will be addressed in the Hydrology/Water Quality Section of the EIR.
- f) ***Potentially Significant Impact.*** The project would accumulate small quantities of heavy metals, oil and grease, as well as an increase in other chemicals used by motor vehicles that may be released during first rains and have the potential to degrade water quality. This issue will be further will be addressed in the Hydrology/Water Quality Section of the EIR.
- g) ***No Impact.*** The proposed project does not include a housing component. The majority of the project site is located within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Zone X (other areas), which is identified as areas determined to be outside the 500-year floodplain¹; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- h) ***No Impact.*** Refer to g) above. No further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- i) ***No Impact.*** Refer to g) above. The proposed project site is located outside the Folsom Dam Failure Flood Area and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- j) ***No Impact.*** The project is not located near any ocean, coast, or seiche hazard areas and would not involve the development of residential or other sensitive land uses. Therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

¹ FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number 060262 0320 E, July 6, 1998.

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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** The modifications to the Elk Grove Blvd/SR99 interchange would not physically divide an established community. The project would not install any additional barriers to movement between various segments of the community; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** The Elk Grove Transportation Capital Improvement Program 2005-2010 (adopted June 22, 2005) identifies the Elk Grove Boulevard/SR99 Interchange Modifications project, so improving the interchange would be consistent with land uses for this area. The project would be consistent with the City of Elk Grove Transportation Capital Improvement Program, the City of Elk Grove General Plan Circulation Element, and the zoning code; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans are in place now or applicable to the project area; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

		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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not use or extract any mineral or energy resources and would not restrict access to known mineral resource areas. The proposed project would not conflict with energy conservation plans, use non-renewable resources in a wasteful manner, or result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** Refer to discussion a), above. No further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less than Significant.** Predicted traffic noise levels were calculated using the FHWA TNM computer model. With implementation of the proposed improvements, predicted traffic noise levels at nearby land uses would not exceed applicable exterior noise abatement criteria. In addition, implementation of the proposed improvements would not result in substantial increases in ambient traffic noise levels at nearby land uses. It is also important to note that predicted increases in traffic noise levels at nearby residential dwellings would not exceed applicable City of Elk Grove General Plan noise criteria for evaluation of increases in traffic noise levels (City of Elk Grove General Plan, Policy NO-6). As a result, predicted increases in traffic noise levels would be considered less than significant; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- b) **Less than Significant.** There are currently no federal, state, or local standards for vibration, however for the protection of fragile and historic structures, Caltrans recommends a more conservative threshold of 0.08 in/sec ppv.² Ground vibration generated by the proposed construction activities would be associated primarily with the onsite use of tractors, haul trucks, and jackhammers; which would result in vibration levels of less than 0.09 in/sec ppv at 25 feet. As a result, predicted vibration levels at the nearest structures, which are located in excess of 25 feet from proposed construction areas, would not be anticipated to exceed 0.2 in/sec ppv. In addition, structures located near the proposed northbound SR-99 onramp are located in excess of approximately 60 feet from the proposed onramp. In comparison to the measured vibration levels commonly associated with vehicle traffic, predicted ground vibration levels at nearby structures associated with vehicle traffic on existing or

² California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2002. Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations.

proposed roads would not be anticipated to exceed the Caltrans-recommended threshold of 0.2 in/sec. Therefore, no significant short or long-term vibration impacts would be anticipated with implementation of the proposed project and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

- c) ***Less than Significant.*** Refer to a) above. No further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- d) ***Potentially Significant.*** The proposed project would result in temporary periodic increased ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site during construction due to construction vehicles and activities. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.
- e) ***No Impact.*** The nearest airport/airstrip is the Sunset Sky ranch Airport, which is located approximately 2.5 miles southeast of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect airport operations, nor would implementation of the proposed project result in the development or relocation of any noise-sensitive land uses in proximity to any airport or airstrip; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- f) ***No Impact.*** There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project area; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** The project would not displace housing, induce growth, or conflict with any general plans or adopted policies. The project would be implemented to accommodate planned growth in the area and would take place in concurrence with the City of Elk Grove Transportation Capital Improvement Program. Given that the project would involve the improvement of an existing interchange and would not in itself induce growth above that which is planned from development in the area, the project is expected to have a no impact on growth in the area; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** No residential structures or houses would be taken as part of the proposed Elk Grove proposed project; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** As discussed in b) above, the project would not involve the removal or relocation of any housing; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project does not include a residential or commercial component that would increase human presence in the area. The project would not result in an increased demand for fire protection service or reduce response times. Traffic controls would be in place during construction and the dates and times of construction would be provided to the City Fire Department to avoid impacts to emergency response times. No further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Refer to a), above. The dates and times of construction would be provided to the City of Elk Grove Police Department, as well as the Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department, to avoid impacts to emergency response times. No further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** Refer to a), above. The proposed project would not directly result in an increased demand for schools; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- d) **No Impact.** Refer to a), above. The proposed project would not directly result in an increased demand for parks; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not require additional public services other than maintenance of the interchange and roadway improvements.

The new access to the Elk Park Village Shopping Center would be constructed prior to closure of the existing access points at the shopping center. A portion of the shopping center parking area would be inaccessible during reconfiguration (duration of less than one month) while the remainder of the parking area would be available and accessible, however, the reconfiguration would result in a “no net loss” of permanent parking spaces. Additionally, the parcel located on the southwest corner of Elk Grove Boulevard and East Stockton Boulevard (APN 125-0030-010) would lose its direct access on East Stockton Boulevard and have an indirect access point through the Park and Ride lot off of the East Stockton Boulevard entrance/exit, which would be improved as a part of the project. These impacts are considered less than significant and will therefore not be analyzed in the EIR.

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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project does not include a residential or commercial component that would result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or facilities. The project would not increase nor create a new demand for any type of recreational facilities; therefore no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** Refer to a), above. The proposed project would not lead to new demand for recreational facilities. Recreational facilities are not in the vicinity of the project area and the project would not require the construction of recreational facilities; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) **Potentially Significant.** The City of Elk Grove has established significance criteria for determining if an increase in traffic is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Based on these guidelines, an impact is considered significant for roadways and intersections if the project causes the facility to change from level of service (LOS) D or better to LOS E or LOS F. For facilities that are, or will be in the cumulative condition, operating at an unacceptable LOS without the project, an impact is considered significant if the project:

- 1) Increases the delay at study intersections by more than five seconds
- 2) Increases the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio by 0.5 or more on a roadway

Based on a Traffic Analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers in May 2008, the proposed project could result in decreases in the level of service and/or increases in delay at a study intersection by more than five sections. This issue will be addressed in the Traffic and Circulation section of the EIR.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- b) **No Impact.** Consistent with California Government Code Section 65089, the Sacramento Transportation Authority acting as the County's Congestion Management Agency, was responsible for preparing, monitoring, and enforcing the County's Congestion Management Plan (CMP). In 1996, Sacramento County adopted a resolution (Resolution No. 96-1276) to be exempt from the CMP in accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 2419 (Bowler), Section 65088.3; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** The Elk Grove/Sunset Sky ranch airport located on Grant Line Road is approximately three miles southeast of the project area. 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 would not propose any structures that would impede a height limitation in close proximity to an airport; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would include several design features that would improve traffic flow and safety. The project would result in improved lane utilization and serve to reduce vehicle queues at intersections in the project area that routinely exceed available storage and block adjacent intersections; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** During construction of all phases of the proposed project, traffic controls would be in place. The dates and times of construction would be provided to the City Fire Department, City Police Department, and County Sheriff's Office to avoid impacts to emergency response times. Additionally, at the completion of the project, emergency access through the intersections would improve from conditions prior to the modifications; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- f) **No Impact.** The proposed project would require reconfiguration of the portion of the existing parking area where a new access would be constructed. There would be a temporary loss of 61 parking spaces out of an available 265 parking spaces during construction (one month or less). However, the reconfiguration would result in a "no net loss" of permanent parking spaces. The number of parking spaces at the Elk Park Village Shopping Center after the reconfiguration would be at least 265 parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on parking capacity and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- g) **No Impact.** The proposed project was developed based on the City of Elk Grove General Plan and is consistent with its goals and objectives. The project design incorporates space for sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and bus turnouts. Therefore, the project would promote adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative methods of transportation and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed roadway improvements would not produce additional wastewater; therefore, no impact would occur and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** The project would not require or generate a demand for either water or wastewater service; therefore, no impact would occur and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project would require extending underground drainage facilities from East Stockton Boulevard along the new SR99 hook on-ramp. The design of drainage facilities would be done in coordination with City drainage/water quality staff so that the project drainage system would allow integration with the City's existing system. The increase in impervious surfaces and water entering the City storm drainage system would not be significant; therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on storm water drainage facilities and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** As an interchange modification project, no increase in demand for water would occur as a result of the project; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- e) **No Impact.** The proposed project does not include any uses that would generate wastewater; therefore, the project would have no impact on wastewater treatment and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** Solid waste generated by the project would be limited to roadway 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. The proposed project would not generate the need for new solid waste facilities; therefore, no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.
- g) **No Impact.** The proposed project would conform to all applicable state, federal, and local solid waste regulations including the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) and the California Solid Waste Re-Use and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (§42900-42911 of the Public Resources Code); therefore, there no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) **Potentially Significant.** The proposed project does have the potential to significantly impact the local environment. Project implementation may impact wetlands, suitable habitat for special status species, and conflict with the City of Elk Grove’s Tree Preservation Ordinance and the City’s General Plan Policy CAQ-8. These issues will be addressed in the EIR.

b) **Potentially Significant.** 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. The assessment of the significance of the cumulative effects of a project must, therefore, be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects.

Construction of the proposed project along with other construction within the City could contribute to cumulative impacts regarding aesthetics, hazardous materials, noise, air quality, and biological resources. These issues will be addressed in the EIR.

c) **Potentially Significant.** The proposed project does have the potential to significantly impact human beings through temporary construction emissions, temporary noise generation, and through the potential release hazardous materials. These issues will be addressed in the EIR.

5.1 LIST OF PREPARERS

CITY OF ELK GROVE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Fritz Buchman, P.E.	City Engineer
Cheryl Creson	Public Works Director
Diane Nguyen, P.E.	CIP Manger
Ted Idlof, P.E.	Project Manager

CITY OF ELK GROVE PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Taro (Lautaro) Echiburu	Environmental Manager
Melissa D. Logue	Environmental Project Manager
Patty Medina	Project Planner
Jed McLaughlin	Project Planner
Roxanne Perry	Graphics

TECHNICAL PREPARERS

Jeanette Owen	Natural Environmental Study
Ambient	Air Quality Impact Analysis
Ambient	Noise Impact Analysis
Fehr & Peers	Traffic Analysis
John Nadolski	Cultural Resources Reports
Rochelle Amrhein	Arborist Reports
Kleinfelder, Inc.	Initial Site Assessment and Addendum

