

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This Section includes edits to the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA (Recirculated Draft EIR/EA). These modifications resulted in response to comments received during the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA public review period, as well as minor staff-initiated changes and corrections.

Revisions herein do not result in new significant environmental impacts, do not constitute significant new information, nor do they alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis. Changes are provided in revision marks (underline for new text and ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text), and are organized by section of the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA.

### 4.2 CHANGES AND EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

#### SECTION 1.4 ALTERNATIVES

Figure 1.4-1, depicting Alternative 2A, and Figure 1.4-2, depicting Alternative 3A, are revised in the northwest quadrant of the project area to reflect a revised alignment of the “connector road,” also known as the “future Lewis Stein Road”, per the comments received from the City of Sacramento. Since figures are fixed and cannot be effectively revised using the underline/strike out method described above, the figures are revised in their entirety and included in this section, below.

#### SECTION 2.1.1 - LAND USE

Table 2.1.1-1 on Page 2.1-13 of the Land Use section is amended to include the following changes to land use designation per comments received on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA:

**TABLE 2.1.1-1  
SURROUNDING LAND USES**

Quadrants	Current Land Uses	Current Zoning	Approved or Planned Plans or Developments
Southeast (City of Elk Grove)	This area consists of churches, residences, two commercial businesses, two dog grooming businesses associated with single-family residential homes, undeveloped parcels, and a Caltrans Park and Ride Lot.	General Commercial (GC), Agricultural-Residential (AR-5), <u>Shopping Center (SC)</u>	Sheldon Pacific, a large residential subdivision, <del>is currently is under construction</del> <u>has recently completed construction</u> in the Southeast quadrant.
Northeast (City of Elk Grove)	This area consists of newly developed residential properties, undeveloped grassy	Laguna Community Floodplain Special	This area is designated as the approved Calvine Special Planning Area. The Community Services District (CSD) is planning a park in

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

Quadrants	Current Land Uses	Current Zoning	Approved or Planned Plans or Developments
	fields, and farm buildings.	Planning Area	this quadrant as part of the mitigation for rapid housing developments and residential growth in the area. The park will be approximately 10 acres. The CSD is currently working with engineers to design access to and from the park that would meet the City's needs and be compatible with the Sheldon Road Interchange improvement project.
Northwest (City of Sacramento)	This area consists of a cemetery, vacant properties, single-family residences, commercial businesses, and a golf driving range facility.	Rural Estates (RE-1/4) and General Commercial (C-2-R)	<del>No development is currently planned in this quadrant.</del> Vacant parcels are located north of existing businesses on West Stockton Boulevard, and vacant parcels, and abandoned homes are located on Sheldon Road. <u>Two residential developments are proposed for construction on the vacant parcels in this quadrant.</u>
Southwest (City of Elk Grove)	This area consists of a supermarket, fast food restaurants, gas station, residential properties, and undeveloped land.	Shopping Center Land Use Zone (SC)	Park Meadow Apartments is a 152-unit apartment complex that was recently approved. Also, Park Meadows residential subdivision is under construction.

### SECTION 2.1.5 - TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION/PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE SYSTEM

Figure 2.1.5-3, depicting Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations in the Year 2005 for Alternative 2A, and Figure 2.1.5-4 depicting Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations in the Year 2005 for Alternative 3A, are revised in the northwest quadrant of the project area to reflect a revised alignment of the “connector road,” also known as the “future Lewis Stein Road”, per the comments received from the City of Sacramento.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

INSERT REVISED FIGURE 1.4-1 (11" X 17" COLOR)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

PAGE 2 OF REVISED FIGURE 1.4-1 (11" X 17" COLOR)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

INSERT REVISED FIGURE 1.4-2 (11" X 17" COLOR)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

PAGE 2 OF REVISED FIGURE 1.4-2 (11" X 17" COLOR)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

INSERT REVISED FIGURE 2.1.5-3 (11" X 17" COLOR)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

PAGE 2 REVISED FIGURE 2.1.5-3 (11" X 17" COLOR)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Insert Revised Figure 2.1.5-4 (11" x 17" Color)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Page 2 Revised Figure 2.1.5-4 (11" x 17" Color)

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

---

Mitigation measure **MM 2.1.5-2** on Page 2.1-70 of the Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle System are revised as follows:

**MM 2.1.5-2** Prior to the start of construction, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) shall be developed in coordination with the City of Sacramento Traffic Engineer that would reduce delays and obstructions caused by construction activities to the greatest extent possible. The Plan developers shall coordinate with public and school transportation providers during plan development to insure that traffic control measures proposed in the plan would meet the needs of the service providers. Construction detours shall be provided to all public and school transportation providers who utilize the project area prior to the TMP's implementation, to avoid impacts to public and school transportation services. The TMP shall be submitted to the City of Elk Grove and City of Sacramento for review and approval prior to the start of construction.

Figure 2.1.5-6 depicting Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations in the Year 2025 for Alternative 2A, and Figure 2.1.5-7 depicting Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations in the Year 2025 for Alternative 3A are revised in the northwest quadrant of the project area to reflect a revised alignment of the "connector road," also known as the "future Lewis Stein Road", per the comments received from the City of Sacramento.

### SECTION 2.1.6 - CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

The last paragraph of Page 2.1-87 of the Cultural and Historic Resources section is amended to include the following language, acknowledging Sacramento County Cemetery Advisory Commission's designation of the San Joaquin Cemetery as "historic," per comments received on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA:

None of the historical sites or other properties (i.e., CRU-93-Sac-1H, CRU-93-Sac-6H, and CRU-93-19H, the San Joaquin Cemetery, and 13 private residences and/or businesses) in the APE is listed in the NRHP. Bridge 24-0137 was previously determined ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP as part of the Caltrans 1988 statewide bridge inventory and current historical investigations reaffirmed this determination. Current research determined that none of the archeological sites, structures or the cemetery in the APE meet any of the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP. The Sacramento County Cemetery Advisory Commission has designated the San Joaquin Cemetery as a Sacramento County Historical Cemetery based on the date of it's first interment, however the criteria used for this designation does not meet the criteria used for determining eligibility of cemeteries for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Similarly, none of the cultural resources in the APE ~~are~~ historical resources for the purposes of CEQA; ~~are~~ listed in the CRHR; meet any of the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the CRHR; or are unique or significant resources under CEQA.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

### SECTION 2.2.1 – HYDROLOGY AND FLOODPLAIN

The fourth paragraph the Affected Environment – Flooding section on Page 2.2-9 of the Hydrology and Floodplain section is revised as follows:

The primary cause for designating the portion of the southeast quadrant as Zone AH is a result of the current design of the bridge on West Stockton Boulevard spanning Laguna Creek, and hydrology of the existing natural Laguna Creek stream channel immediately upstream of the bridge. The West Stockton Boulevard Bridge is currently constructed at a low elevation over Laguna Creek, and has the potential to restrict the flow of Laguna Creek during flood conditions, thus causing a backup that could result in flooding in the area during 100-year flood conditions. Additionally, the existing natural stream channel of Laguna Creek is of insufficient capacity to adequately convey 100-year flood conditions.

The first and second paragraph of Page 2.2-17 of the Hydrology and Floodplain section are revised as follows:

Under the existing configuration of the project area, the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge spanning Laguna Creek is at an elevation low enough to potentially obstruct Laguna Creek flows during 100-year flood conditions, and the existing natural stream channel of Laguna Creek is insufficient to adequately convey 100-year flood flows, resulting in flooding in the area of East Stockton Boulevard under 100-year flood conditions. The current plans to reconstruct the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge and create a bypass overflow channel on Laguna Creek (per the Lower Laguna Creek Drainage Master Plan) would lower the water surface such that the area would be the bridge out of the 100-year floodplain. When this project is completed, it would remove the southeast quadrant of the interchange from the 100-year floodplain and the project would not have any impact to the 100-year floodplain.

While the construction of the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge and creation of a bypass channel for this area of Laguna Creek project is likely, it is not yet completed. Therefore, it must be assumed for the purposes of this document that the Sheldon Road/SR 99 Interchange project would be constructed under current floodplain conditions.

The descriptions of the four drainage configurations beginning on Page 2.2-17 of the Hydrology and Floodplain section are revised as follows:

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Insert Revised Figure 2.1.5-6 (11" x 17" Color)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Page 2 Revised Figure 2.1.5-6 (11" x 17" Color)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Insert Revised Figure 2.1.5-7 (11" x 17" Color)

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Page 2 Revised Figure 2.1.5-7 (11" x 17" Color)

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

---

### *Configuration 1*

The first configuration assumes the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge is not replaced and a Laguna Creek bypass channel is not created, and that the interim condition of the Sheldon Pacific development is maintained<sup>1</sup>. Since the 1,524mm (60”) CMP currently flows at capacity due to both the seasonal wetland and Laguna Creek 100-year flood flow, a parallel or upsized CMP would be required to outlet the interchange water to the Laguna Creek Bypass west of West Stockton Blvd. Bridge. This configuration does not divert the future commercial Sheldon Pacific stormwater into Laguna Creek upstream of the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge. Additionally, the 100-year Laguna Creek flow spills into the historic Whitehouse Creek channel and floods adjacent to East Stockton Boulevard, effectively placing this location within the 100-year floodplain. Due to the passing of the Laguna Creek floodwater in the old Whitehouse Creek alignment, the cross drainage facilities at East Stockton Boulevard must have capacity to convey this flow.

### *Configuration 2*

The second configuration assumes the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge is replaced and a bypass channel on Laguna Creek is constructed, and the interim condition of the Sheldon Pacific development is maintained. Replacing the bridge at West Stockton Boulevard and constructing a bypass channel would decrease the 100-year flood elevation in Laguna Creek. Laguna Creek would no longer spill into the old Whitehouse Creek channel and would not have to be conveyed through the 1,524mm (60”) CMP. The facilities that convey the old Whitehouse Creek would only have to convey the 0.283cms (10cfs) wetlands supply flow and a small portion of overland flow from the adjacent areas. The 1,524mm (60”) CMP would then have approximately ~~1.577~~ 1.133 cms (~~40~~ 40cfs) of capacity that could be used to convey interchange-generated stormwater to the Laguna Creek Bypass Channel west of the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge. Lowering the 100-year Laguna Creek flood elevation would also remove the realigned East Stockton Boulevard from the 100-year floodplain. This configuration does not divert the future commercial Sheldon Pacific stormwater into Laguna Creek upstream of the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge.

### *Configuration 3*

The third configuration assumes that the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge is not replaced and a bypass channel on Laguna Creek is not constructed, and that the Sheldon Pacific commercial development is completed. As part of the Letter of Map Revision issued on August 14, 2003 (Case No. 01-09-157R), a stormwater detention basin must be constructed adjacent to the Sheldon Pacific commercial development. The stormwater generated by the commercial development would be conveyed to this basin and outlet to the realigned Whitehouse Creek, which outfalls to Laguna Creek. The additional stormwater generated by the Sheldon Pacific commercial development would not raise the 100-year flood elevation of Laguna Creek. The 100-year Laguna Creek flow would still spill into the historic Whitehouse Creek channel and flood adjacent to East Stockton Boulevard, effectively placing this portion of the interchange

---

<sup>1</sup> “Interim condition” means the pre-commercial development of the Sheldon Pacific development.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

project within the 100-year floodplain. Due to the passing of the Laguna Creek floodwater in the old Whitehouse Creek alignment, the facilities at East Stockton Boulevard must have capacity to convey this flow. Additionally, the 1,524mm (60”) CMP currently flows at capacity due to both the seasonal wetland and Laguna Creek 100-year flood flow, so a parallel or upsized CMP would be required to outlet the interchange water to the Laguna Creek Bypass west of West Stockton Boulevard Bridge.

### ***Configuration 4***

The fourth and final configuration assumes that the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge is replaced and a bypass channel is constructed on Laguna Creek, and the Sheldon Pacific commercial development is completed. The stormwater detention basin and outlet to the realigned Whitehouse Creek would still require completion as prescribed by the Sheldon Pacific LOMR, but since the 100-year flood elevation upstream of the West Stockton Boulevard Bridge would be reduced, the facilities that convey the old Whitehouse Creek would only have to be sized to ~~flow~~ carry the 0.283cms (10cfs) wetlands supply flow, and a small portion of overland flow from the adjacent areas. Lowering the 100-year Laguna Creek flood elevation would also remove the realigned East Stockton Boulevard from the 100-year floodplain. The 1,524mm (60”) CMP would then have approximately ~~1.577~~ 1.841cms (~~40~~ 65cfs) of capacity that could be used to convey interchange-generated stormwater to the Laguna Creek Bypass Channel.

**Table 2.2.1-2** summarizes the various components and results of the four different possible drainage configurations.

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

**TABLE 2.2.1-2  
SUMMARY OF FOUR POTENTIAL DRAINAGE CONFIGURATIONS**

Configuration Number	Would Configuration Replace W. Stockton Bridge and Construct Bypass Channel	Would Interim Sheldon Pacific Condition be Maintained	Would a Stormwater Detention Basin be Installed	Would Additional CMP Capacity be Needed	Would the Configuration Remove E. Stockton Blvd. from Floodplain	Would a Revision to FEMA Map be Necessary <sup>1</sup>	Would a Hydro Study be Needed <sup>2</sup>	Would a Floodplain Encroachment Report be Needed <sup>2</sup>	Would the Configuration Result in Flooding from Whitehouse Channel
1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
3	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

<sup>1</sup> A FEMA map revision would be necessary if the configuration would remove E. Stockton Blvd. from the 100-year floodplain.

<sup>2</sup> A Hydrology Study and Floodplain Encroachment Report would be needed if the configuration would leave the roadway within the 100-year floodplain.

The final paragraph of Page 2.2-19 of the Hydrology and Floodplain section is revised as follows:

Configurations 2 and 4 assume several projects are constructed (reduction of 100-year flood level, remainder of the Sheldon Pacific commercial development is completed, ~~and~~ West Stockton Boulevard Bridge is replaced, and a bypass channel is constructed on Laguna Creek,) prior to the proposed project. As a result, the project would no longer encroach upon the 100-year floodplain and **no impact** would occur.

### SECTION 2.2.5 – AIR QUALITY

Page 2.2.62 in Section 2.2.5 Air Quality of the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA is revised as follows:

#### ***Construction Impacts***

A Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Roadway Construction Emissions Model (Version 5.1) was used to quantify the project’s emissions during construction. Due to the complexity of a large project such as this, each stage, or “segment” of project construction was analyzed in separate model runs. The entirety of the SMAQMD Roadway Construction Emissions Model, the data used for the model inputs, and model results for each segment is included in **Appendix I.**

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Six (6) distinct construction segments were identified for the project. Without mitigation, Segments 2 through 6 would result in emissions below the daily threshold of 85 lbs. per day of NOx allowed by the SMAQMD. Segment 1, however, would result in a daily NOx emission of 129 lbs. per day of NOx without mitigation.

Application of SMAQMD's Standard Construction Mitigation, as outlined in mitigation measure MM 2.2.5-1b below, would result in a 20% reduction of NOx emissions per day, resulting in 103 lbs. per day of NOx emissions after mitigation for Segment 1. 103 lbs. per day of NOx is above the 85 lbs. per day threshold allowed by SMAQMD, therefore, additional mitigation would be required to further reduce impacts below the threshold for Segment 1.

As outlined in SMAQMD's *Recommended Protocol for Identifying and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts in Mitigated Negative Declarations, January 2005*, "If the construction-related impacts are over the District's threshold of significance, the City will automatically include the District's current standard construction mitigation. If the air quality construction impacts are still over the District's threshold of significance after application of the District's standard construction mitigation (20% NOx reduction), the City will contact the District to confer about an off-site mitigation fee. The District will assist in calculating a specific fee, which will be included as an off-site mitigation measure in the mitigated negative declaration document."

Since the City of Elk Grove desires to mitigate construction-related air quality impacts to levels below the SMAQMD threshold of significance, the City proposes to pay an offset fee of \$8,168 to SMAQMD to compensate for the daily emissions that are anticipated to occur in excess of the SMAQMD threshold of 85 lbs. per day during construction of Segment 1. Mitigation measure MM 2.2.5-1d would require the payment of the offset fee, and would result in adequate compensation for the project's daily emissions to fall below the SMAQMD threshold of 85 lbs. per day of NOx in Segment 1.

Page 2.2-64 in Section 2.2.5 Air Quality of the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA is revised as follows:

**MM 2.2.5-1d** Prior to groundbreaking for the project, the City of Elk Grove shall pay, and obtain proof of payment of, the off-site air quality mitigation fee of \$8,168.00 to SMAQMD.

Page 2.2-65 in Section 2.2.5 Air Quality of the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA is revised as follows:

### ***Construction Impacts***

Heavy earthmoving equipment necessary during construction would generate air pollutants including NOx, CO and PM<sub>10</sub>. Although temporary, construction air quality impacts are considered **potentially significant**. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 2.2.5-1a, MM 2.2.5-1b, ~~and 2.2.5-1c,~~ and 2.2.5-1d would reduce the potential for harm to a **less than significant impact**.

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

---

### SECTION 2.2.6 – NOISE

The second paragraph of Page 2.2-74 of the Noise section is revised as follows:

Although the noise levels increases due to the project is are predicted to be relatively low due to the preponderance of existing noise from SR 99, the predicted exceedance of the applicable NAC warranted consideration of noise abatement measures for this project. One mitigation measure (the use of noise-reducing pavement) to reduce noise has been identified to reduce the project's noise impacts to sensitive receptors below existing noise levels without the project, however it should be noted that this mitigation is not a method approved by Caltrans or FHWA, and The other noise mitigation measures considered for this project were determined to be infeasible and unreasonable under the Federal Highway Administrations and Caltrans criteria for the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (The Protocol). Additionally, use of noise reducing pavement would not be effective in reducing noise along frontage roads (West Stockton Boulevard and East Stockton Boulevard) due to these roads' proximity to SR 99, which is responsible for the preponderance of noise in the area.

The following language is inserted beginning on Page 2.2-75 of the Noise section, prior to the Mitigation Measures Considered discussion:

#### **Mitigation Measures**

It has been well established for some time that roadway characteristics strongly influence tire noise, and that tire noise is the dominant contributor to overall traffic noise levels at speeds above 35 mph<sup>2</sup>. Research in Sacramento County shows that paving roadways with noise reducing pavement, such as rubberized asphalt, can noticeably reduce community noise levels. In fact, research data collected to date indicates that use of noise reducing pavement, like rubberized asphalt, results in an approximately 4 dBA reduction in traffic noise levels in the 500 Hz to 4 KHz frequency range<sup>3</sup>.

These local test results, when considered with other studies conducted nationally and internationally, support the use of noise reducing pavement as a viable noise mitigation option. The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce the traffic noise impacts adjacent to the project area:

**MM 2.2.6-1** Noise reducing pavement shall be applied to Sheldon Road, from Lewis Stein Road to the edge of the overcrossing bridge in the west, and from Power Inn Road to the edge of the overcrossing bridge in the east.

While the efficacy of noise reducing pavement in reducing noise at each sensitive receptor depends on the speed of the traffic in the area, the percentage of large trucks using the roadway, as well as the receptor's proximity to the overwhelming source of noise in the area, SR 99, it is expected that, after mitigation, an average 4dBA reduction in noise could be achieved at the locations of sensitive receptors adjacent to Sheldon Road. Use of noise reducing pavement along

---

<sup>2</sup> Tyre/Road Noise Reference Book, Ulf Sandberg and Jerzy A. Ejsont, Informex, Sweden, 2002.

<sup>3</sup> Report on the Status of Rubberized Asphalt Traffic Noise Reduction in Sacramento County, November 1999.

#### 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

East and West Stockton Boulevards is not considered feasible, since the preponderance of noise along these roadways comes from SR 99, and use of noise reducing pavement along these roadways would not result in an appreciable reduction in noise levels at sensitive receptors along these roadways. Table 2.2.6-5.1 shows the predicted noise levels at each sensitive receptor in the project area under future conditions, after mitigation.

**TABLE 2.2.6-5.1  
EXISTING AND PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS AFTER MITIGATION**

<u>Receptor</u>	<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>NAC</u>	<u>Existing</u> <u>L<sub>eq</sub> / L<sub>dn</sub></u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Future</u> <u>Alt. 2A</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>Future</u> <u>Alt. 3A</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>Impact</u> <u>Type</u> <sup>3</sup>
<u>1</u>	<u>Commercial – Mini Storage</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>Commercial – Honda of Sacto</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>Commercial- Mini Storage</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>Trailer Park</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>Commercial – Unknown Type</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>Commercial – SKM Market</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>Cemetery</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>11</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>12</u>	<u>Commercial – Golf Driving Range</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>13</u>	<u>Commercial – WinCo Foods, Etc.</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>14</u>	<u>Residences</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>15</u>	<u>Residences</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>16</u>	<u>Commercial – Stockman’s Supply</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>To be Acquired by Project</u>		<u>To be Acquired by Project</u>
<u>17</u>	<u>Church</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>18</u>	<u>Commercial – Fence Company</u>	<u>C (72)</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>A/E</u>

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

<u>Receptor</u>	<u>Type of Use</u>	<u>NAC</u>	<u>Existing</u> <u>L<sub>eq</sub> / L<sub>dn</sub></u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Future</u> <u>Alt. 2A</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>Future</u> <u>Alt. 3A</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>Impact</u> <u>Type</u> <sup>3</sup>
<u>19</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>20</u>	<u>Church</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>21</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>22</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>23</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>25</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>26</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>26a</u>	<u>Residences on Alberton Pl.</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>27</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>28</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>29</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>30</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>31</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>32</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>33</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>34</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>35</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>36</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>A/E</u>
<u>37</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>B (67)</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>A/E</u>

The Permanent Impacts discussion of CEQA findings on Page 2.2-83 of the Noise section is revised as follows:

### Permanent Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an exceedance of the Caltrans NAC at 30 locations. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 2.2.6-1 would contribute to a reduction of noise after the project is implemented, and in some cases would reduce future noise levels to the same as or below existing levels under existing no project conditions. No feasible abatement measures have been identified that would effectively reduce the projected noise impacts. Therefore increases to noise are a significant and unavoidable impact. However, the predominance of noise from traffic on SR 99 results in mitigation measure MM 2.2.6-1 being infeasible for reducing noise along East and West Stockton Boulevards, and also results in noise

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

levels in the larger area remaining high after mitigation. Because mitigation is infeasible at sensitive receptor locations along East Stockton Boulevard and West Stockton Boulevard, and because the noise levels at several sensitive receptor locations along Sheldon Road would remain above the NAC after mitigation, impacts from noise would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

### SECTION 2.3.1 - NATURAL COMMUNITIES

The City of Elk Grove consulted with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in March 2005 on the Draft Wetland Delineation prepared for the project in June 2004. Based on differences in the acreages of wetlands identified in the Draft Wetland Delineation and what was identified during the consultation with the Corps of Engineers, the Natural Communities paragraph on Page 2.3-6 of Section 2.3.1 Natural Communities is revised as follows:

The natural communities occurring within the Sheldon Road/State Route 99 interchange project 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. **Figure 2.3.1-1** illustrates the natural communities located in the project area. The natural communities occurring within the project area include agricultural/non-native grassland (irrigated pasture, crop, and fallow land ~~totaling 38.9 ha [96.13 acres]~~), seasonal wetlands (0.40 ha [1.0 acre]), vernal pools (0.097 ha [0.24 acre]), Laguna Creek perennial stream (0.25 ha [0.62 acre]), and channelized drainage (1.47 ha [3.63 acres]). ~~All proposed developments/developed land, which includes landscaped, actively maintained land, and ruderal areas is approximately 80.34 ha (198.51 acres).~~

Impact 2.3.1-1 on Page 2.3-17 in Section 2.3.1 Natural Communities is revised as follows:

**Impact 2.3.1-1** Under both Build Alternatives (2A and 3A), the project would result in impacts to vernal pools and/or their supporting watersheds within the project area. The impacts would result in the complete loss of the vernal pools within the project area. Both of the options identified for East Stockton Boulevard would result in impacts to vernal pools. ~~Impacts to the vernal pool habitat identified within the project area are summarized below in Table 2.3-1.~~

Table 2.3-1 on Page 2.3-17 of the Natural Communities section is removed as follows:

**TABLE 2.3-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO VERNAL POOLS**

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Option(s)</b>	<b>Impact Hectares (Acres)</b>
2A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097 (0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097 (0.24)

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

Alternative	Option(s)	Impact Hectares (Acres)
3A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	(0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	(0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	(0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	(0.24)

Mitigation measure MM 2.3.1-1 on Page 2.3-17 in Section 2.3.1 Natural Communities is revised as follows:

### MITIGATION MEASURES

#### MM 2.3.1-1

In order to mitigate for impacts to vernal pool habitat, the project proponent shall mitigate according to USFWS guidelines. ~~Since the area of impact is less than 0.4 ha (1 acre), the compensatory~~ Compensatory mitigation will be conducted according to the USFWS programmatic Section 7 consultation as outlined in *Programmatic Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on Issuance of 404 Permits for Projects with Relatively Small Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans Within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office, California*, or as required by the Service in the Biological Opinion issued for the project, to result in a “no net loss” of vernal pool habitat. The mitigation identified in the *Programmatic Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation* is as follows:

- Preservation component. For every 0.4 hectares (1.0 acre) of habitat directly or indirectly affected, at least two vernal pool credits will be dedicated within a Service-approved ecosystem preservation bank, or, based on Service evaluation of site-specific conservation values, 1.2 hectares (3.0 acres) of vernal pool habitat may be preserved on the project site or on another non-bank site as approved by the Service.
- Creation component. For every 0.4 hectares (1.0 acre) of habitat directly affected, at least one vernal pool creation credit will be dedicated within a Service-approved habitat mitigation bank, or, based on Service evaluation of site-specific conservation values, 0.8 hectares (2.0 acres) of vernal pool habitat will be created and monitored on the project site or on another non-bank site as approved by the Service.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Figure 2.3.1-1 depicting Biological Resources Within Project Area, and Figure 2.3.1-3 depicting Alternative 3A with West Stockton Boulevard Option 1 and West Stockton Boulevard Option 1 Impacts are revised in the northwest quadrant of the project area to reflect a revised alignment of the “connector road,” also known as the “future Lewis Stein Road”, per the comments received from the City of Sacramento. Other changes to these figures, and to Figure 2.3.1-2 depicting Alternative 2A With East Stockton Boulevard Option 1 Impacts, are shown in the attached revised figures.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Insert Revised Figure 2.3.1-1 11x17 color

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Page 2 of figure 2.3.1-1

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Insert Revised Figure 2.3.1-2 11x17 color

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Page 2 of figure 2.3.1-2

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Insert revised figure 2.3.1-3 11x17 color

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Page 2 of figure 2.3.1-3

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

---

Mitigation measure MM 2.3.1-3a on Page 2.3-20 of Section 2.3.1 Natural Communities is revised as follows:

**MM 2.3.1-3a** Construction activities in or near the bed of the creek shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible, in order to minimize the area of damage caused by construction activity associated with the construction of the creek crossing. The following techniques shall be used to help avoid and minimize impacts to Whitehouse Creek during construction:

- 1) The construction area for creek work shall be established prior to the start of construction work in the creek. Only the minimum area required to complete construction shall be utilized and areas outside of the construction zone shall be protected. The creek construction area shall be marked with orange construction fencing to clearly demarcate the limits of the construction area, and to prevent construction equipment and workers from entering sensitive areas outside the construction area.
- 2) Work within the creek bed shall be limited to the dry season (approximately ~~April 15 to October 15~~ May 1 to October 1) to minimize impacts to bank erosion and water quality. Impacts to adjoining portions of Whitehouse Creek shall be minimized by implementing best management practices (BMPs), such as utilizing construction mats within the creek channel and implementing an erosion and sediment control plan that minimizes impacts to water quality within Whitehouse Creek. A biological monitor shall be present during construction activities in and near Whitehouse Creek.

Mitigation measure 2.3.1-3b on Page 2.3-21 in Section 2.3.1 Natural Communities is revised as follows:

**MM 2.3.1-3b** Whitehouse Creek shall be restored to its original topography to mitigate for temporary impacts (i.e. damage resulting from construction activities) and these areas shall be planted with wetland vegetation and subject to a CDFG, USFWS, and ACOE-approved re-vegetation and monitoring plan.

### SECTION 2.3.2 – WETLANDS AND OTHER WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Based on differences in the acreages of wetlands identified in the Draft Wetland Delineation and what was identified during the consultation with the Corps of Engineers, the second paragraph of the Jurisdictional Waters of the United States discussion on Page 2.3-31 in Section 2.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States is modified as follows:

In November 2002 the USACOE requested additional information to complete the assessment of wetlands occurring within the study area. In September and October of 2003, Foothill Associates revisited the site to further assess additional areas of study, and an updated draft wetland delineation was completed June 22, 2004. ~~According to this most recent wetland delineation a total of 0.747 ha (1.86 acres) of Waters of the U.S. are located on the project site.~~

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

The Vernal Pools discussion on Page 2.3-31 of Section 2.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States is revised as follows:

~~A total of 0.24 acres of vernal~~ Vernal pools were ~~mapped~~ identified within the study area. Vernal pools are defined by a hydrologic regime dominated by inundation. Typically, the presence of vernal pools in a given area is a result of depressions within the topography and the presence of a restricting layer in the soil that causes the depression to remain inundated after storm events for periods of varying duration.

The Seasonal Wetlands Discussion on Page 2.3-32 of Section 2.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States is revised as follows:

### **Seasonal Wetlands**

#### DEPRESSIONAL SEASONAL WETLANDS

~~A total of 0.91 acre of depressional~~ Depressional seasonal wetlands ~~was mapped~~ were identified within the study area. Depressional seasonal wetlands are defined by a hydrologic regime that is dominated by saturation, rather than inundation. Depressional seasonal wetlands inundate for short periods of time following a storm event but the primary hydrologic regime is one of saturation.

#### RIVERINE SEASONAL WETLANDS

~~A total of 0.09 acre of riverine~~ Riverine seasonal wetlands ~~was mapped~~ were identified within the study area. Riverine seasonal wetlands are defined by a hydrologic regime dominated by unidirectional flow of water. These features typically occur in topographic folds or swales and represent natural drainages that convey sufficient water to support wetland vegetation.

The Perennial Creek discussion on Page 2.3-32 of Section 2.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States is revised as follows:

### **Perennial Creek**

~~A total of 0.62 acre of perennial~~ Perennial creek was ~~mapped~~ identified within the study area. Perennial creeks maintain water throughout the year, growing large within the wet season and may support various fish species. They have defined beds and banks with a flood plain that supports hydrophytic plants.

Impact 2.3.2-1 on Page 2.3-32 of Section 2.3.3 Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States is revised as follows:

**Impact 2.3.2-1** Project implementation would result in impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. Potential impacts to jurisdictional waters would be the same for both Alternative 2A and 3A. Foothill Associates conducted an initial survey of the project area in May of 2002 and September and October of 2003. A draft wetland delineation completed on June 22, 2004 determined that the project would impact ~~approximately 0.24 acre of vernal pools, and directly impact~~

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

0.03 acre of seasonal wetlands. Laguna Creek would not be impacted by the project.

The CEQA Findings section on Page 2.3-33 of Section 2.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States is revised as follows:

The project would impact ~~approximately 0.24 acre~~ of federally jurisdictional wetlands, which would be considered a **potentially significant impact** without mitigation. Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 2.3.2-1** would ensure that impacted wetlands would be replaced or rehabilitated in accordance with USACOE mitigation guidelines to ensure that “no net loss” of wetlands would occur. Therefore the proposed project would have a **less than significant impact** on wetlands.

### SECTION 2.3.4 – SPECIAL STATUS ANIMAL SPECIES OCCURRENCES

Based on differences in the acreages of wetlands identified in the Draft Wetland Delineation and what was identified during the consultation with the Corps of Engineers, Impact 2.3.4-1 on Page 2.3-38 of Section 2.3.4 Special Status Animal Species Occurrences is revised as follows:

**Impact 2.3.4-1** ~~The project would result in impacts to~~ Impacts to the California linderiella habitat identified within the project area. are summarized in the table below. Impacts to vernal pool habitat would be the same for all of the alternatives and options identified. ~~Both of the options identified for East Stockton Boulevard would result in impacts to the larger vernal pool and to the smaller and long, linear vernal pool.~~ Impacts to the vernal pools would likely result in the pools no longer being viable habitat for listed invertebrate species.

Table 2.3.4-1 of Page 2.3-39 of Section 2.3.4 Special Status Animal Species Occurrences is removed as follows:

**TABLE 2.3.4-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO CALIFORNIA LINDERIELLA HABITAT**

Alternative	Option(s)	Impact Hectares (Acres)
2A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097 (0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097 (0.24)
3A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1 W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097 (0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1 W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097 (0.24)

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	(0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	(0.24)

Impact 2.3.4-2 on Page 2.3-40 of Section 2.3.4 Special Status Animal Species Occurrences is revised as follows:

**Impact 2.3.4-2** ~~The project would result in impacts~~ The project would result in impacts to the midvalley fairy shrimp habitat identified within the project area. ~~are summarized in the table Table 2.3.4-1.~~ (Because both midvalley fairy shrimp and California linderiella rely on vernal pools for their habitats, the impacts to the midvalley fairy shrimp and California linderiella would be the same.) Impacts to vernal pool habitat would be the same for all of the alternatives and options identified. ~~Both of the options identified for East Stockton Boulevard would result in impacts to the larger vernal pool and to the smaller and long, linear vernal pool.~~ Impacts to the vernal pools would likely result in the pools no longer being viable habitat for listed invertebrate species.

### SECTION 2.3.5 – THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

Impact 2.3.5-4 on Page 2.3-66 of Section 2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species is revised as follows:

**Impact 2.3.5-4** ~~Impacts~~ The project would result in impacts to the vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat identified within the project area ~~are summarized in Table 2.3.5-3.~~ Impacts to vernal pool habitat would be the same for all the alternatives and options identified. ~~Both of the options identified for East Stockton Boulevard would result in impacts to the larger vernal pool and to the smaller and long, linear vernal pool.~~ Impacts to the vernal pools would likely result in the pools no longer being viable habitat for listed invertebrate species.

Table 2.3.5-3 of Page 2.3-66 of Section 2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species is removed as follows:

~~**TABLE 2.3.5-3  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO VERNAL POOL FAIRY SHRIMP HABITAT**~~

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Option(s)</b>	<b>Impact Hectares (Acres)</b>
2A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097 (0.24)

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

---

	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097 (0.24)
3A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1 W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097 (0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1 W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097 (0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2 W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097 (0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2 W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097 (0.24)

Impact 2.3.5-5 on Page 2.3-67 of Section 2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species is revised as follows:

**Impact 2.3.5-5** ~~Impacts~~ The project would result in impacts to the vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat identified within the project area ~~are summarized in Table 2.3.5-4.~~ Impacts to vernal pool habitat would be the same for all the alternatives and options identified. ~~Both of the options identified for East Stockton Boulevard would result in impacts to the larger vernal pool and to the smaller and long, linear vernal pool.~~ Impacts to the vernal pools would likely result in the pools no longer being viable habitat for listed invertebrate species.

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

Table 2.3.5-4 of Page 2.3-67 of Section 2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species is removed as follows:

**TABLE 2.3.5-4**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO VERNAL POOL TADPOLE SHRIMP HABITAT**

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Option(s)</b>	<b>Impact Hectares (Acres)</b>
2A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097 (0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097 (0.24)
3A	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	(0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	(0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 1	(0.24)
	E. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	0.097
	W. Stockton Blvd. Option 2	(0.24)

### SECTION 3.0 – CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Table 3.0-1 on Page 3.0-2 of the Cumulative Impacts section is amended to include the following changes to land use designation per comments received on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA.

**TABLE 3.0-1**  
**LAND USES AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS**

<b>Quadrants</b>	<b>Current Land Uses</b>	<b>Current Zoning</b>	<b>Approved or Planned Plans or Developments</b>
Southeast (City of Elk	This area consists of churches, residences,	General Commercial (GC),	Sheldon Pacific, a large residential subdivision, is <del>currently is under</del>

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

Quadrants	Current Land Uses	Current Zoning	Approved or Planned Plans or Developments
Grove)	two commercial businesses, two dog grooming businesses associated with single-family residential homes, undeveloped parcels, and a Caltrans Park and Ride Lot.	Agricultural-Residential (AR-5), <u>Shopping Center (SC)</u>	<del>construction</del> <u>has recently completed construction</u> in the Southeast quadrant.
Northeast (City of Elk Grove)	This area consists of newly developed residential properties, undeveloped grassy fields, and farm buildings.	Laguna Community Floodplain Special Planning Area	This area is designated as the approved Calvine Special Planning Area. The Community Services District (CSD) is planning a park in this quadrant as part of the mitigation for rapid housing developments and residential growth in the area. The park will be approximately 10 acres. The CSD is currently working with engineers to design access to and from the park that would meet the City's needs and be compatible with the Sheldon Road Interchange improvement project.
Northwest (City of Sacramento)	This area consists of a cemetery, vacant properties, single-family residences, commercial businesses, and a golf driving range facility.	Rural Estates (RE-1/4) and General Commercial (C-2-R)	<del>No development is currently planned in this quadrant.</del> Vacant parcels are located north of existing businesses on West Stockton Boulevard, and vacant parcels, and abandoned homes are located on Sheldon Road. <u>Two residential developments are proposed for construction on the vacant parcels in this quadrant.</u>
Southwest (City of Elk Grove)	This area consists of a supermarket, fast food restaurants, gas station, residential properties, and undeveloped land.	Shopping Center Land Use Zone (SC)	Park Meadow Apartments is a 152-unit apartment complex that was recently approved. Also, Park Meadows residential subdivision is under construction.

The Noise discussion on Page 3.0-4 of the Cumulative Impacts section is amended to include the following changes to noise per comments received on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA:

## 4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA

---

### MITIGATION MEASURES

Current noise levels in the project area are above threshold levels and implementation of mitigation measure MM 2.2.6-1 would contribute to a reduction of future noise levels after the project is implemented, and in many cases would reduce noise levels after project implementation to below existing levels under existing no project conditions. Although MM 2.2.6-1 would reduce future noise levels, the predominance of noise from traffic is generated from traffic on SR 99. Because the noise levels at several sensitive receptor locations in the project area would remain above the NAC after mitigation due to traffic from SR 99, impacts from noise would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation. No feasible or reasonable mitigation measures have been identified to reduce noise impacts from this project. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to cumulative noise increases in the area.

#### *CEQA Finding*

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 2.2.6-1 would contribute to a reduction of noise after the project is implemented, and in many cases would reduce future noise levels to below levels under no project conditions. No feasible abatement measures have been identified that would effectively reduce the projected noise impacts. Therefore increases to noise are a significant and unavoidable impact. However, the predominance of noise from traffic on SR 99 results in noise levels in the area remaining high after mitigation. Because the noise levels at several sensitive receptor locations in the project area would remain above the NAC after mitigation, impacts from noise would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

### SECTION 4.0 – COMMENTS AND COORDINATION, EXHIBIT A

Exhibit A of the Recirculated Draft EIR/EA is amended to include the following transcript of public comments received during the April 25, 2002 public meeting:

#### **Dean Harcourt**

Hi, my name is Dean Harcourt. I am a member of the Elk Grove Church of Christ, which is on Sheldon Road. The membership of the church is concerned about the adequacy of the EIR. As was mentioned, there are 3 options on the table, so to respond to the EIR in terms of how it might affect the church and the ability of us to worship at that location, is a little difficult with so many options.

The other thing that is a little troublesome to us is that the document permits construction on Sundays from 8 o'clock in the morning 'til 5 o'clock in the evening and we're concerned about our ability to worship in the middle of a construction zone.

The other thing about the document is it does provide these several options and in the process lacks some specificity with regard to the project itself, but it provides no specificity with regard to the affects of the project on our property. We don't know how we are going to enter our property, for example. We don't know what kind of entrance is going to be provided, exiting are going to be provided to our site. We don't know how to get in the front door, in other words. So

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

we are concerned about those elements and we would request that those items be specifically addressed in the Final EIR document.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you and let me go further on how the process goes from here. Staff takes all the remarks that come up and they prepare written responses, which come back when the EIR comes back. We don't actually make decisions on it tonight, but they do take almost a verbatim transcript of what you're saying and then prepare a response to those issues for when we come back.

### **Dean Harcourt**

Thank you and we have provided written comments, and we hope that we'll be getting answers to those questions, too. Thank you.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Appreciate it. Frank Young?

### **Frank Young**

My name is Frank Young, and the reason I'm here is a friend of the family of Mrs. Lew's, whose property is affected by this Draft EIR. We have prepared a letter, which you should have in your folders right now, asking some of the questions that Mrs. Lew had. We also have some additional questions. If you take a look at Alternative 2, there is a little stub road which comes off of . . .

### **Chairman Winuk**

Mr. Young, would you be willing to wait just a minute while we reboot our computer, just so we could have the map up? We were hoping to avoid that until after this item, but I figure we might make reference to it. So I apologize for interrupting you, but maybe we could take just a minute to do that.

### **Frank Young**

No problem. I've done it professionally, I'll tell you right now.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Well, it's just so much easier for us to hear these when we've seen the map, too. And Mr. Young, we were so rude to interrupt you. You are starting fresh on time, too.

### **Frank Young**

Oh, good, thank you. You have the comments in front of you that refer to the optional design that takes it down Bow Street. If you use the other standalone options, Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, that cuts Mrs. Lew's property right in half. So the Bow Street alternative is the one we are supporting. That also is designated as a superior alternative, and then the Draft EIR links it with

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

Alternative 2. 1, 2, or 3 don't affect us alone, the only thing that affect us is that optional alternative, which is the one we are interested in. We also have some other questions. If you take a look at Alternative 2, you'll see that there's a little stub road there. Now let me get myself oriented. Which way is north?

### **Chairman Winuk**

Right, the right side is north.

### **Frank Young**

Okay. Now Alternative 2 has a little stub road right there. If you'll take a look also at the Optional Alternative design, you'll see that there's a little turn-around. This is not the alternative that goes from here and links those 3 properties there and is mentioned. I wonder why that little stub road comes off of Sheldon right there. And then, if somebody could turn it to the Optional design without me touching the computer, I'd appreciate it. That little stub road doesn't show in the Optional design, but there is a little turn-around here appears that has been put there. And I wondered does anybody intend to connect that little stub road that was on Optional design 2 with this little turn-around? I would also point out that the design here, matter of fact, all of the designs show a right-of-way that goes through in front of Mrs. Lew's property. I just want you to know that the west portion of Mrs. Lew's property that's where her septic system and leech lines are. So I hope that those don't encroach on her property enough to affect her septic tank. Also, when it goes in here, I think the Noise Alternative said that they couldn't decrease the noise here cause there'd have to be some breaks in the sound wall. Because Mrs. Lew's front gate or driveway is right about here and therefore there would have to be a break in the sound wall. But I'd like to have that reviewed to see if they couldn't put a sound wall in, because the sound is awesome over there. And that's about all that I have other than that's stated in this letter. I'd just like to say the above mentioned design alternative, if this option is not selected, then she will have noise on 3 sides of her property of her home, instead of 2 sides. Plus the noise will be closer. The traffic will almost encircle what's left of my property. We also mention that we would like this alignment here on Bow Street to not have a 90-degree turn here, because speeders will come down here, the frontage road. And if they miss that corner there, they'll be running into her house. So if it's possible this could be a little bit gentler curve there. People wouldn't hopefully run into her house. That's all that I have. Thank you very much.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you very much, sir. Mrs. Lew did you want to come up?

### **Mrs. Lew**

No. Mr. Young helped me express myself very properly. That's how I feel. That I wonder, I appreciate the optional form. It's the best form for my property. As I think that it's good for my neighbor on the back. They have a lot of chicken houses on the back. I'd bet that she'd like that way, too. So don't turn in to run into my. I only have 2 acres. It's not too much to cut. So if you can keep that 2 acre-one piece I'd really, I'd appreciate it.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you very much. Carl Stein?

### **Carl Stein**

My name is Carl Stein. I'm a property owner and a member of some families that own some property on the west side of Sheldon Road. We'd like to support the Alternate 3. The reason being, we feel that the traffic flow would be best suited for access from 99 south to Sheldon Road. This would conform with current and modern alignments of off ramps currently being constructed in Sacramento at this time. The improved off ramp access to Sheldon is crucial for current and future businesses on that street. The current heavy flow from south 99 would be best served with Alternate 3 to alleviate the stacking, noise, air pollution, and allow for better West Stockton alignment. The City of Sacramento has not been involved in this current planning process and has, it was mentioned earlier, this started many years ago and nothing has really taken place. It's up to this commission to see what would best serve the City of Elk Grove, even though we have one corner which is the City of Sacramento, it makes it a kind of an awkward arrangement but we've gotta work with it cause this is the City of Elk Grove we're really dealing with and not the City of Sacramento. I think earlier it was mentioned how the funding was going to be handled and, of course, we are all concerned being property owners. And finding out if Mello Roos is involved in this or not, or if it's funded entirely by State and Federal monies. The current single lane access is causing, of course, the backup that we're all aware of, but also causing people to take many chances by driving off the pavement. And I hope something can be done on the interim since this is such a long term project for '06 or '08 possibly for it's completion. So the additionally side lane would be very useful imperative. We've talked about the timing and the planning for the construction. Again, we support Alternate 3. And I appreciate your time, thank you.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you very much. Mr. Zimbelman?

### **Mr. Zimbelman**

Good evening. I appreciate this opportunity just to bring some items to your attention that are not a part of the design thing as such as far as the impact on the people in the area. But some who can't speak for themselves and those are the ones in the little San Joaquin Cemetery. I am a trustee for the Elk Grove Cemetery District, and all of the designs will have an impact on the little cemetery. If we could get back to Option 2 or 3? I hate to touch this. The optional one, I don't think . . .

### **Chairman Winuk**

That's always a wise move here.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

### **Mr. Zimbelman**

Somebody must know what to do here. Either 1, 2, or 3, either of the others. The little cemetery that we talked about is in that little triangle, right there, and what we are concerned with is access. If we're coming off the freeway, this is the current access in this way. The cemetery is right here. We will need the opportunity to get our equipment in there. This cemetery is going to be reopened for funerals, for burials. Well, for burials and therefore there will be funerals. And so there would have to be parking available. The third option, this is Alternate 3, and this is probably the one we like least, because what it provides is a tunnel under this road to get to the cemetery. Pretty hard to get a backhoe or maintenance equipment, things like that into the cemetery. So what we want to do tonight is just to make you aware that this is a serious problem. We talked to Caltrans earlier and they do want to cut a little corner off right there to help on the ramp on the others. That we could probably work with. We had talked to them about that earlier. But the third Alternative, although I know some of the local people would prefer it, this would be very difficult to get in here. There has to be parking. There has to be access for people to visit and parking for funerals, equipment, this kind of thing. The on ramps whatever way they go, this is a historical cemetery and you can't touch it. So we just want you to be aware of that. One further thing, we're not even sure that the cemetery is in the City of Elk Grove. My understanding is that it is still part of the County. So you may have to deal with 3 jurisdictions, either Sacramento County, Sacramento City, or the City of Elk Grove. I'm not sure, isn't this the borderline for the City? And this line's north of that. I don't think it was incorporated into the City. So all of these things might pertain. We'd like to draw to your attention and as this plan develops those are things to consider. Thank you very much.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you very much. Jonathan Meredith?

### **Jonathan Meredith**

Good evening, my name is Jonathan Meredith and I'm a property owner in the Montage Development just to the southeast of the intersection. It's shown on your plans as vacant and there's lots of houses in there now. Unfortunately, I haven't had time to fully read the report, because I only found out about it today, but I am concerned about noise from the rerouting of East Stockton Boulevard, which will be moving closer to our houses. So given that it's marked as vacant presumably it wasn't measured for noise levels and that sort of thing. And I wanted to register some concerns that something will be done about it. If it was going to be loud that there would be increased noise from quite busy Stockton moving closer to us. And that's about that.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Mr. Angell, what was the last day for written comment?

### **Patrick Angell**

29th

### **Chairman Winuk**

It goes to the 29th. What's today?

### **Richard Galvin**

25th

### **Chairman Winuk**

Well, I think you have about 4 days. You can send via e-mail to Patrick. Your comments tonight will also be included. But if you go through it and see something else, feel free to drop an e-mail to City Staff if you have something else as well.

### **Jonathan Meredith**

Okay. Well thank you for your time.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Vicky Lasilia? Laseela?

### **Vicky Lassila**

Hi, I'm Vicky Lassila. I'm Norwegian. I'm a property owner south of Sheldon and west of 99. And the potential on ramp is going to be going on what is an old frontage road that is currently not in use, and now we're going to have an on ramp there, so I am very concerned with acceleration noise. And right now there is no proposed sound wall to deflect that noise. There is north of Sheldon on both east and west side. East Stockton and west Stockton there is a proposal for a sound wall, so I am concerned that south of Sheldon there is not. I also like Option 3 best; because of under Option 3 you can shorten the on ramp from Sheldon to southbound 99. And that's all I have to say right now.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you very much. Kathy Route?

### **Kathy Route**

My name is Kathy Route and I live southeast of 99 on the south side. And my concerns are pretty much the same as the Church of Christ. We have had no communication really. In fact, when they put in the East Stockton Boulevard Alternative, we found out from the people that were creating it. So we had no idea. We had heard that there would be some kind of an access road. So weren't informed at all. So my concern is being informed, too. Definite environmental impact in a lot of different ways. And I just wanted to express the same concerns as the Church of Christ did.

## **4.0 ERRATA/EDITS TO THE RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR/EA**

---

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you very much.

### **Kathy Route**

Thank you.

### **Chairman Winuk**

I don't have any other slips. Is there anyone else who would like to comment on this item? Mr. Hoag? Once wasn't enough this week, huh?

### **Mr. Hoag**

Once wasn't enough. The second lady that was up here prior that was for that certain alternate deal where they shorten the on ramp to the freeway? I would be in favor of that, too because I talked to Caltrans today because of other issues on other things that are coming up, that it would be good to have an off ramp off the freeway right onto Stockton Boulevard; West Stockton Boulevard up by Laguna Boulevard; alleviating a lot of traffic. Because everyone that is going to have to quit using Sheldon because of all this construction will be using Laguna Boulevard. And then they're proposing more development and so on, and so such as that Laguna Boulevard is going to be really crammed with cars. So if you shorten it, then you're apt to have an easier way to have an off ramp right to West Stockton Boulevard. So you bypass going onto Laguna Boulevard, going down Laguna Boulevard. They'd be coming back to the shopping center or going into the homes where she lives or going back down towards Sheldon and maybe out some other way. Anyway, part of my thing is what is coming up but that deal of, if you have a. You can't really have another off ramp if you got a on ramp crowding the whole thing. You'll be crowded getting off, going on and getting off. So the shorter the better on this deal. That's all.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Thank you very much.

### **Mr. Hoag**

Oh and Caltrans, she said they're going to put an engineer on what we've talked about, and review that and see if it's feasible. And if it's something that they want to do. Cause they realize that there's traffic problems already, so this would alleviate a lot of it. Okay, so it might take a couple of months, but she said they'll send a report or they'll tell me what they figure out. Okay, thanks.

### **Chairman Winuk**

Okay, thank you. Other comment? See none. We'll close public comments, and as we mentioned before, this item will be coming back with a listing of all written and comments received tonight, and staff's response to those. The next time will be scheduled for approval of the EIR as the project goes forward. Anything else Staff wants to add?