

## 5 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter provides a summary of significant environmental impacts; significant and unavoidable impacts; significant irreversible environmental changes; growth-inducing effects; and cumulative impacts.

### 5.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Section 15226.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a discussion of any significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented.

Chapter 3 of this Recirculated Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of significant and potentially significant environmental impacts related to approval of the SOIA and future development; identifies feasible mitigation measures, where available, that could avoid or reduce these significant and potentially significant impacts; and presents a determination whether these mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Following is a listing of significant and unavoidable impacts associated with implementation of the SOIA identified in this Recirculated Draft EIR. Cumulative impacts associated with the SOIA, including significant impacts, are summarized in Section 5.3.

#### Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources

- ▶ **Impact 3.2-1:** Direct loss of agricultural land, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland under Williamson Act Contract
- ▶ **Impact 3.2-2:** Indirect loss of adjacent agricultural land, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance or Lands Under Williamson Act Contract

#### Section 3.4, Biological Resources

- ▶ **Impact 3.4-2:** Special-status raptors and other nesting raptors

#### Section 3.6, Energy

- ▶ **Impact 3.6-1:** Energy Efficiency
- ▶ **Impact 3.6-2:** New or Expanded Electrical and Natural Gas Utilities

#### Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality

- ▶ **Impact 3.10-2:** Depletion of groundwater supplies

#### Section 3.11, Land Use, Population, Housing, Employment, Environmental Justice, and Unincorporated Disadvantaged Communities

- ▶ **Impact 3.11-4:** Consistency with the SACOG 2036 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- ▶ **Impact 3.11-5:** Conversion of open space

- ▶ **Impact 3.11-6:** Induce population growth

### **Section 3.13, Public Services and Recreation**

- ▶ **Impact 3.13-1:** Increased demand on fire protection and emergency medical services
- ▶ **Impact 3.13-2:** Increased demand for law enforcement services

### **Section 3.14, Transportation**

- ▶ **Impact 3.14-1:** Conflict with an applicable transportation plan, ordinance, policy, or congestion management program

### **Section 3.15, Utilities and Service Systems**

- ▶ **Impact 3.15-1:** Increased demand for water supplies and water system facilities
- ▶ **Impact 3.15-2:** Increased demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities

## **5.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES**

CEQA requires that significant irreversible environmental changes caused by a plan be addressed in an EIR. Specifically, the EIR must consider whether “uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2[c]). Nonrenewable resources, as used in this discussion, refer to the physical features of the natural environment: land, air, and waterways.

If the SOIA Area is developed consistent with the assumptions embodied in the conceptual land use scenario, this would result in commitment of land to this mix of urban uses instead of the agricultural uses that exist today.

Future development of the SOIA Area would use both renewable and nonrenewable natural resources during both construction and operational phases – both within the SOIA Area and also to construct any required off-site improvements. Future development would likely use nonrenewable fossil fuels during construction and operation. Other nonrenewable and slowly-renewable resources consumed as a result of development of the SOIA Area would include, but not necessarily be limited to, lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemical construction materials, steel, copper, and water. Future development would consume energy for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, building heating and cooling, lighting, appliances, electronics, office equipment, and commercial machinery. Energy could also be consumed during each vehicle trip associated with these proposed uses. It is important to note that actual energy usage could vary substantially, depending upon factors such as the type of uses that would occupy the buildings, actual miles driven by future residents and employees, and the degree to which energy conservation measures are incorporated into the design of the various facilities.

Irreversible changes would likely occur as a result of future excavation, grading, and construction activities associated with implementation of the conceptual land use scenario of the proposed project. If there is future development, this would also generate additional transportation demand, construction, energy demand, and other activities that would increase emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants, as well as generation of noise. Different air pollutants and different greenhouse gas emissions remain in the atmosphere for different amounts of time, ranging from a few years to thousands of years.

If there is development in the future within the SOIA Area, this could result in irreversible damage from environmental accidents, such as an accidental spill or explosion of a hazardous material. During construction of projects, equipment on the site would use various types of fuel. Operation of projects could include the use of hazardous materials, which could increase the risk of an accidental spill or release.

During construction, equipment would be using various types of fuel and material classified as hazardous. In the State of California, the storage and use of hazardous substances are strictly regulated and enforced by various local, regional, and state agencies. The enforcement of these existing regulations would preclude credible significant impacts related to environmental accidents.

Detailed assessments for each of the above mentioned topics are provided throughout Chapter 3 of this EIR. Cumulative impacts associated with each of these topics are additionally addressed in detail in this chapter.

### **5.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

This section provides an analysis of cumulative impacts of the SOIA, taken together with other past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related impacts, as required by Section 15130 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines). Other past, present, and future projects that would contribute to environmental impacts of the proposed SOIA are referred to as “related projects.”

The goal of such an exercise is twofold:

1. first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such related projects, when considered together, would be cumulatively significant; and
2. second, to determine whether the SOIA itself would cause a “cumulatively considerable” (and thus significant) incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts. (See CEQA Guidelines Sections 15130[a]-[b], Section 15355[b], Section 15064[h], and Section 15065[c]).

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines: “(t)he discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impacts to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.” The proposed project is considered to have a significant cumulative effect if:

3. The cumulative effects of development without the project are not significant and the project’s additional impact is substantial enough, when added to the cumulative effects, to result in a significant impact; or
4. The cumulative effects of development without the project are already significant and the project contributes measurably to the effect. The term “measurably” is subject to interpretation. The standards used herein to determine measurability are that either the impact must be noticeable to a reasonable person, or must exceed an established threshold of significance.

### 5.3.1 CUMULATIVE CONTEXT

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1) identifies two approaches to preparing the cumulative context for analysis of cumulative impacts. The first is the summary approach (also known as the “plan” approach), which summarizes the relevant projections from an adopted general plan or related planning document evaluating regional or areawide conditions. The second is the list approach, which requires a listing of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related or cumulative impacts.

For this EIR, both the plan and the list approach have been combined and the cumulative context is specific to each environmental impact. For some environmental issues, the cumulative scope should be broad. This is appropriate given the regional context of transportation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions issues. Issues considered in the more localized context (i.e., construction noise, public services) are not addressed in the regional context because cumulative impacts in these topic areas are generally limited to the service area of the service providers.

The broadest cumulative context used in this EIR is the state of California for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts. Although the effects of climate change are experienced globally, as detailed in Section 3.8 of this EIR, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” the assessment of GHG emissions impacts is established by State legislation. Please see Section 3.8 for the cumulative analysis of GHG emissions impacts.

The next broadest cumulative context used in this EIR is the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, which is comprised of Sacramento, Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, the northeast portion of Solano, and western portion of Placer counties. California’s air basins have been created to group together regions that have similar natural factors that affect air quality.

The next broadest cumulative context is past, present, and probable future plans and projects that are described by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). This is a land use change scenario for the Sacramento region that includes anticipated past development and future development through 2036 (SACOG 2016). Currently, the population is more than 2.4 million, and there are 952,214 housing units (DOF 2016). Developed acreage in the region is forecast to increase by 7 percent between 2012, the baseline year for the MTP/SCS, and 2036, the MTP/SCS planning horizon. This 7-percent increase in developed acreage contrasts with an anticipated increase in housing units of 32 percent and an increase in jobs of 49 percent, indicating that new development could accommodate jobs and population on relatively less acreage. SACOG estimates that Elk Grove will grow by a total of 13,910 housing units between the baseline year for the MTP/SCS and 2036. This is a 27-percent increase. The MTP/SCS identifies a 64-percent increase in employment in Elk Grove by 2036 (19,864 new jobs).

The next broadest cumulative context used in this Chapter is Sacramento County’s General Plan, which was updated and adopted on June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2011, and provides a complete and current representation of cumulative conditions for the County. The land use assumptions embodied in the General Plan include not only new development, but also existing development and development currently in entitlement review by the County.

Finally, some cumulative impacts are experienced more locally, and this Recirculated Draft EIR considers buildout of the City of Elk Grove’s General Plan, and future development outside of the City limits, including along with a potential SOIA and possible potential development of approximately 579 acres, including a 100-acre a multi-sport park complex and potentially future commercial and industrial development southeast of Grant Line

Road and northeast of the SOIA Area (East Study Area); and Bilby Ridge, west of Bruceville Road and west of the SOIA Area (West Study Area), which is proposed to include a range of residential densities and commercial and light industrial uses of the proposed project southeast of the existing City limits.

## 5.3.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

### AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Past, present, and future projects throughout the region have, and will continue to convert existing agricultural land to other uses – predominantly urban use. This includes plans and projects in Sacramento County, including the cities of Elk Grove, Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Citrus Heights, and all existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development projects within these jurisdictions. This includes the SEPA north of the SOIA Area, the Lent Ranch Marketplace, and other large regional projects, including the potential casino north of the SOIA Area and the proposed multi-sport park complex project. In addition to these local development projects, there are several urban development projects in Sacramento County and throughout the Central Valley that are contributing to the cumulative loss of agricultural resources, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance and lands under Williamson Act Contract. Continued urbanization of the region in accordance with applicable land use plans, as well as those approved and proposed development projects described previously, would continue to convert agricultural and open space land to urban uses with residential and commercial buildings and associated roadways and other infrastructure. The continued conversion of farmland in the region is a **significant cumulative** impact.

Based on analysis of the Sacramento County Important Farmland map (DOC 2014), an estimated 510 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance could be directly and permanently converted to nonagricultural, urban use. In 2014, an estimated 149,798 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance existed in Sacramento County. A conversion of an estimated 510 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would account for approximately one-third of one percent of this total. The total conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be relatively small in the context of the county's entire agricultural land base and would not likely cause a substantial reduction in the county's total agricultural production. However, the conversion of agricultural land would contribute to the incremental decline of Important Farmland in the county and would result in the irreversible conversion of this agricultural land. In addition, future development in the SOIA Area could impact nearby agricultural uses and result in the conversion of adjacent agricultural lands. The impact is **cumulatively considerable**.

According to the Elk Grove General Plan and EIR, the loss of agricultural productivity on lands designated for urban uses is a significant and unavoidable consequence of future development. Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to the incremental decline of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland in the county, region, and state and contribute to the irreversible conversion of this agricultural land. Individual development projects would be responsible for incorporating any feasible mitigation to avoid or minimize impacts to agricultural resources. However, this would not create new farmland. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The cumulative impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Past and present actions by humans have substantially altered biological resources in the Central Valley region of California including Sacramento County, specifically, compared to historical conditions. Among the most important of these past actions have been conversion of natural vegetation and habitats to agricultural and developed land uses; fill and alteration of aquatic habitats; flood control and water supply projects; and the introduction of nonnative species, which in many cases have competed with, preyed upon, and degraded habitat for native species. More recently, the large-scale conversion of agricultural habitats to urban land uses has resulted in substantial loss of habitat for species such as State-listed Swainson's hawk and greater sandhill crane, and to the State- and federally-listed giant garter snake that have adapted to use agricultural habitats in response to loss of their natural habitats. Past, present, and foreseeable future urbanization in the city of Elk Grove has contributed substantially to the loss of grassland, wetland, and agricultural habitats that are important to many species in the region, including listed species like Swainson's hawk, greater sandhill crane, and giant garter snake.

Climate change and associated sea-level rise may also contribute to human-caused impacts to these species in the future. The Central Valley is generally becoming hotter and drier as a result of climate change and the region has been experiencing more frequent droughts with reduced precipitation and snowpack contributing to the system. With regards to the effects of sea-level rise, it should be noted that the Delta is surrounded by levees and is a highly regulated system, and it is likely that measures would be taken to compensate for rising levels within the Delta. It is difficult to predict with any certainty the degree to which climate change and sea-level rise may affect the local Swainson's hawk and greater sandhill crane population. For Swainson's hawk, climate change is another human-induced factor that could substantially reduce the extent and quality of habitat for this species. The SOIA could have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant cumulative impact on Swainson's hawk. No feasible mitigation would avoid this impact on Swainson's hawk because there is a limited amount of suitable habitat land available and there would be a net loss of habitat regardless of the acreage preserved as compensatory mitigation.

As specified in the CEQA guidelines (Section 15126.2), when evaluating the impacts of a proposed project, the lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions at the time of the NOP or at the time the environmental analysis commenced (in this case, 2016). What specific changes to habitats and shifts in distribution of plants and animals in the region may occur as a result of climate change within the time frame of the development that could eventually occur as a result of the SOIA is too speculative for meaningful evaluation.

These past and present actions have resulted in significant adverse effects on the extent, species composition, and functioning of natural habitats that occur in the region; and on the distribution and abundance of plant and wildlife species associated with these habitats. Large areas of freshwater marsh, riparian, valley oak woodland, grassland, and vernal pool vegetation have been lost or degraded in the region over the past 100 years. The increase in the distribution and abundance of invasive plant species and nonnative plant communities, the large number of plant and wildlife species listed as threatened or endangered or considered sensitive by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the dramatic reductions in the extent of aquatic habitats and natural vegetation in the Central Valley region are evidence of these overall significant adverse effects. These actions have altered habitats, biotic interactions, and physical processes that continue to affect species in the region today. This is a **cumulatively significant** impact.

While the project could result in direct loss of individuals of western pond turtle and song sparrow, approval of the SOIA would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact on these species because habitat for these species in the SOIA Area is marginal.

The SOIA Area is comprised entirely of agricultural land that provides limited habitat values to most species; however, agricultural lands provide important foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, northern harrier, sandhill crane, and loggerhead shrike, and the agricultural ditches and canal provide aquatic dispersal habitat for giant garter snake. The SOIA Area also contains burrow habitat for burrowing owl. Although mitigation measures are proposed to compensate for the loss of habitat from the SOIA Area, fully compensating for the impact by preserving existing habitat in the vicinity is infeasible because there is a limited amount of suitable habitat land available and there would be a net loss of habitat regardless of the acreage preserved as compensatory mitigation. Because there has been a substantial loss of natural and agricultural habitats for these species that has resulted in a notable decline in their regional population numbers, loss of habitat from the region is considered a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, the loss of 1,156 acres of agricultural habitat from the SOIA Area could have a **cumulatively considerable contribution** to this significant cumulative impact. Impacts on the sensitive biological resources resulting from future development of the SOIA Area requires implementation of mitigation measures 3.4-1, 3.4-2a, 3.4-2b, 3.4-2c, 3.4-3, 3.4-4, 3.4-5, 3.4-6, 3.4-7, and 3.4-8a, 3.4-8b, 3.4-9, 3.4-0a, and 3.4-10b. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources resulting from future development of the SOIA Area. But, there is no additional feasible mitigation available that would avoid this impact. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

## ENERGY

### Energy Use

Increased demand for electrical and natural gas supplies and infrastructure is a byproduct of all future land uses and development throughout the Sacramento region. Energy is consumed for heating, cooling, and electricity in homes and businesses; for public infrastructure and service operations; and for agriculture, industry, and commercial uses. Each service provider is responsible for ensuring adequate provision of these utilities within their jurisdictional boundaries and would be responsible for upgrading their existing electrical and natural gas distribution systems or constructing new distribution systems to meet the demands of individual projects.

As noted in Section 3.6 of this EIR, "Energy," transportation is, by far, the largest energy consuming sector in California, accounting for approximately 39 percent of all energy use in the state (U.S. Energy Information Administration 2015). Since transportation accounts for more energy consumption than heating, cooling, and powering of buildings, powering industry, or any other use, the overall efficiency of energy use in the region will depend importantly on the ability of local lead agencies to plan in a way that reduces travel demand. SACOG's 2016 MTP/SCS demonstrates an increase in energy efficiency through 2035 in relation to transportation energy use – household generated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita is forecast to decrease by more than 8 percent; SACOG also estimates that total VMT will decrease by almost 7 percent during the 2016 MTP/SCS planning period (SACOG 2016, Chapter 5B, page 91).

Energy efficiency will also increase in relation to heating and cooling of buildings. The State of California adopted the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), which establishes mandatory standards for all buildings in California, including for energy efficiency. This Code is updated over time and in each instance, the energy efficiency standards are increased. The next update takes effect on January 1, 2017.

The City of Elk Grove 2030 General Plan and Climate Action Plan includes energy conservation strategies for land use, transportation, community design, public facilities and infrastructure, which also support the reductions in GHG emissions and increased emissions in criteria pollutants. However, the demand for energy and consumption of energy resources would still increase should the area become developed. Future land use patterns, new construction and building renovations, and commuting patterns would increase demand for energy in the City. This would result in a significant cumulative increase in the demand for energy and the need for construction and/or extension of additional facilities to generate and/or distribute electricity and natural gas to serve the SOIA Area. This is considered a **significant cumulative** impact.

As previously stated, the project does not include direct changes to land use or the City of Elk Grove General Plan goals and policies. In addition, no specific land use entitlements, development proposals, and land development activities are proposed at this time in conjunction with the proposed SOIA. There are no direct impacts to energy as a result of the proposed project. However, the indirect effects of energy consumption and demand should the SOIA Area be annexed to the City and developed could contribute to cumulative impacts. Individual development projects would be required to assess project impacts during the environmental review process to ensure that PG&E has sufficient electrical and natural gas supplies to meet demand. Future development could eventually generate a need for new infrastructure, the construction of which could cause impacts on the environment. Construction and operation of off-site electrical and natural gas facilities are the responsibility of SMUD and PG&E, respectively. SMUD and PG&E would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the cumulative environmental impacts and would be required to implement feasible mitigation to reduce impacts found to be significant. However, cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. The SOIA could have an indirect **cumulatively considerable contribution** to this significant cumulative impact. No additional feasible mitigation is available. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

### **Electricity and Natural Gas**

Future development within the SOIA Area would increase demand for electricity and natural gas services and require the development of new utility infrastructure to deliver services to future development. Electrical and natural gas service in the City of Elk Grove is provided by SMUD and PG&E, respectively.

Projects in the SMUD and PG&E service areas would vary in size and have different amounts of development. However, they would be expected to increase the demand for electricity and natural gas supplies and related infrastructure. Individual development projects would be required to assess project impacts during the environmental review process to ensure that PG&E has sufficient electrical and natural gas supplies to meet demand. Future development could eventually generate a need for new infrastructure, the construction of which could cause impacts on the environment. Construction and operation of off-site electrical and natural gas facilities are the responsibility of SMUD and PG&E, respectively. SMUD and PG&E would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the cumulative environmental impacts and would be required to implement feasible mitigation to reduce impacts found to be significant. However, cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. Thus, impacts would be **cumulatively significant**.



Future development in the SOIA Area could contribute to the cumulatively significant or potentially significant cumulative impacts associated with the increased demand for electrical and natural gas supplies. Therefore, future development within the SOIA Area could result in a **cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative impact** related to the increased demand for electrical and natural gas supplies and facilities. No additional feasible mitigation is available. This is considered a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The health and safety impacts associated with a proposed project usually occur on a project-by-project basis, rather than cumulatively. Development associated with the project and future development within the area could result in increased hazard related impacts. As previously described, development would involve the storage, use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials (such as asphalt, fuel, lubricants, and solvents) to varying degrees during demolition, construction, and operation. Facilities that would use hazardous materials on site after the project and any off-site improvements are constructed would be required to obtain permits and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards designed to avoid hazardous waste releases. The storage, use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials are extensively regulated by various federal, State, and local agencies, and therefore construction companies and businesses (during the operational phase) that would handle any hazardous substances would be required by law to implement and comply with these existing hazardous-materials regulations.

Past, present, and future related project sites likely contain existing hazards materials (e.g., piles of debris, underground or aboveground storage tanks, septic systems, stained soils [indicating potential contamination], lead-based paints, asbestos-containing materials, or PCBs). However, if hazardous materials are encountered on site during construction of the related projects, the associated impacts would be localized to those projects and would not be additive to other hazardous materials-related impacts in the SOIA Area.

Federal, State, and local regulations would determine appropriate land uses and would assist in reducing the impacts. Because future development would be required to undergo environmental review and include mitigation measures to abate the site-specific hazards, any potential cumulative impacts associated with the project would be expected to be decreased. There is **no significant cumulative** impact.

## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### Groundwater

The SOIA Area is located within Groundwater Basin 5-21.65 Sacramento Valley, South American subbasin (identified locally as the Central Basin). This subbasin encompasses the area bounded on the north by the American River, on the south by the Cosumnes and Mokelumne rivers, on the west by the Sacramento River, and on the east by the Sierra Nevada mountain range. Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority monitoring data shows that groundwater elevations generally declined by approximately 20 to 30 feet consistently until about 1980. Water levels recovered by about 10 feet from 1980 through 1983, and remained stable until the beginning of the 1987–1992 drought, where until 1995, water levels declined by about 15 feet. Most water levels recovered between 1995 and 2003 generally to levels higher than prior to the 1987–1992 drought. The difference in total annual average change in storage over the 2005 to 2015 timeframe is calculated to be approximately 4,000 acre-feet per year (afy). Over the 10-year period, the basin continues to recover at its deepest points and management is now focused on working with outside agencies to keep water from leaving the basin, and improving basin

conditions where and when possible, in accordance with the Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan (Central Sacramento County GMP) (Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority 2016).

Groundwater storage in the recharge area underlying Elk Grove and surrounding areas is continuing to increase as a result of recharge from the construction of large conjunctive use and surface water infrastructure facilities, increased use of recycled water, and water conservation. The increase in storage in this portion of the subbasin has filled the long-term cone of depression and has eroded the ridge of higher groundwater separating it from the Cosumnes Subbasin (Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority 2016). New development within the subbasin will increase the need for groundwater. It is unknown what effect additional groundwater pumping, if required, would have on the Central Basin. This is considered a **significant cumulative** impact.

As described in Section 3.10, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” future development included in the conceptual land use scenario would increase demands for water supply and thus groundwater uses. Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) would need to conduct future water supply assessments to determine if existing water supplies would meet the demand of future development. It is currently not known if SCWA’s existing water supplies would be adequate to meet the water demands of future development but SCWA has indicated that it is likely additional surface water and groundwater supplies will be procured to meet the water supply demands of the SOIA Area (SCWA 2017). It is unknown what effect additional groundwater pumping, if required, would have on the Central Basin. As described in Mitigation Measure 3.10-2, prior to approval of any application to annex territory within the SOIA Area, the City of Elk Grove shall prepare a Plan for Services which shall demonstrate that SCWA water supplies are adequate to serve existing and planned development under normal, single dry, and multiple dry years as required by law. The Plan for Services required by Mitigation Measure 3.10-2 (also known as Mitigation Measure 3.15-1) shall demonstrate that the SCWA is a signatory to the Water Forum Agreement, that groundwater management would occur consistent with the Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan, and that groundwater will be provided in a manner that ensures no overdraft will occur. However, given the uncertainty of future potential land uses, LAFCo finds that it is not now possible to determine the effectiveness of mitigation with certainty. LAFCo would condition future annexation on compliance with Mitigation Measure 3.10-2. Cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Future development in the SOIA Area and related projects could contribute to the cumulatively significant or potentially significant cumulative impacts associated with the future groundwater uses that would be needed to serve future development and other development within the SCWA service area. The SOIA could have an indirect **cumulatively considerable contribution** to this significant cumulative impact. No additional feasible mitigation is available. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

### **Erosion, Siltation, Polluted Runoff, Flooding and Flood Hazards**

Development in Elk Grove and Sacramento County would result in increased impervious surfaces, excavation and grading activities, and construction of buildings, homes, and other structures which could affect hydrology and water quality in the cumulative study area. However, compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permitting requirements, Clean Water Act permitting requirements, and applicable local regulations such as flood control ordinances and grading permits would ensure that there would be **no significant cumulative impact**.

## LAND USE AND PLANNING / POPULATION / HOUSING

### Land Use

The cumulative setting for land use impacts is Sacramento County, including the cities of Elk Grove, Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Citrus Heights, and all existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development projects within these jurisdictions. This includes the SEPA north of the SOIA Area, the Lent Ranch Marketplace, and other large regional projects, including the potential casino north of the SOIA Area; ~~and~~ the proposed multi-sport park complex project and additional future development anticipated in the East Study Area; and Bilby Ridge and additional future development anticipated in the West Study Area. Land use inconsistencies are not physical effects in and of themselves and combinations of policy inconsistencies would not rise to the level of a physical effect. There would be **no cumulative impact** related to land use. Cumulative effects of the physical changes related to the project are discussed in the other topics in this section.

### Population, Housing, and Employment

Like land use policy inconsistency, population growth is not considered a significant cumulative effect because it is not a physical environmental impact. However, the direct and indirect effects, such as housing and infrastructure needs that are related to population growth, can lead to physical environmental effects.

At a regional level, the population of the six-county SACOG region is expected to increase to 3,078,772 by 2036. The number of housing units is expected increase to 1,188,347 and the numbers of jobs are expected increase to 1,327,265 during the same time period (SACOG 2015). Those counties and their incorporated cities implement general plans, along with specific plans that are outside the development assumptions from local general plans, that could potentially accommodate substantially greater population and employment growth compared to regional forecasts and planning efforts. Increased population and employment in the region could generate the need for additional housing and infrastructure, which could lead to conversion of undeveloped land and associated adverse physical environmental impacts of the sort that are considered in this topic-specific sections of this EIR. Considering the indirect effects from past, present, and future development under the cumulative plans, this is a **significant cumulative** impact.

As discussed in Section 3.11, “Land Use, Population, Housing, Employment, Environmental Justice, and Unincorporated Disadvantaged Communities,” there are no land uses changes proposed as part of this SOIA application. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce population growth through development of new housing and employment opportunities or extension of infrastructure. **No direct cumulative** impact would occur.

Future development could indirectly facilitate population growth through development of 4,000 to 5,000 dwelling units and creation of 18,000 to 20,000 jobs. The SOIA Area is located outside of the City of Elk Grove’s Planning Area; therefore, the population that could be accommodated within the SOIA Area was not considered as part of the adopted Elk Grove General Plan. In addition, the 2016 MTP/SCS designates the SOIA Area as “Blueprint Vacant Urban Designated Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period (SACOG 2016).” The increase in population and housing attributed to future development is not accounted for in these planning documents.

The SOIA Area is not included in SACOG's future employment projection; therefore, the number of jobs potentially generated by future development would represent a substantial number of jobs not accounted for in SACOG's employment projections for the City. The proposed SOIA would indirectly result in a **cumulatively considerable** contribution to a significant cumulative impact. The purpose of the proposed project itself is to provide for future annexation of the SOIA Area and subsequent development of housing and employment opportunities. There is no feasible mitigation to reduce this impact to a less-than-cumulatively considerable level. The impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION**

Future development in service provider's boundaries, including within the SOIA Area, would increase the demand for public services. In terms of cumulative impacts, the appropriate service providers are responsible for ensuring adequate provision of public services within their jurisdictional boundaries.

Although a cumulative shortage of public services and facilities would not in and of itself represent a significant environmental impact under CEQA because these are not physical impacts on the environment, such a shortage could lead to the need to develop additional public-services facilities, which could in turn lead to significant construction- and operation-related environmental impacts. It is assumed that future development and/or development of the additional public-services facilities required to serve them would be preceded by the required environmental review. However, conducting the required CEQA review of the related projects would not necessarily guarantee that significant environmental effects associated with construction of new fire, police, school facilities, and other public services would not occur. Hence, the development of new fire, police, and other public services could result in **potentially significant cumulative** impacts.

### **Fire Protection Services**

The Cosumnes Community Services District (CCSD) Fire Department provides fire protection, fire prevention, and emergency medical services to a 157-square-mile area encompassing the city of Elk Grove, the city of Galt, and areas of unincorporated southern Sacramento County. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.13-1 would ensure that the City demonstrate fire protection facilities would meet the service demand of any future development.

Individual development projects within the CCSD Fire Department service area would incorporate California Fire Code and City or County standards into project designs and provide funding for additional fire protection services and facilities. Any construction or expansion of CCSD Fire Department facilities would require additional analysis in subsequent CEQA documents, prepared at the time such improvements are proposed. CCSD Fire Department would conduct a CEQA analysis to analyze specific impacts and identify any required mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant or significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of mitigation measures would be the responsibility of the CCSD Fire Department, and such measures would be implemented in accordance with the certified CEQA documents. However, impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, a **significant cumulative** impact would occur, and the proposed SOIA could result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to impacts related to increased fire protection services and facilities. No additional feasible mitigation measures exist for these cumulative impacts. Thus, impacts would be **significant and unavoidable**.

## Law Enforcement Services

The SOIA Area is currently served by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department (SCSD), which provides specialized law enforcement services to the County and local police protection to both the incorporated and unincorporated areas. The Elk Grove Police Department (EGPD) also provides certain law enforcement services to the SOIA Area through a mutual aid agreement and would be the main provider if future annexation requests were approved. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 would ensure that the City demonstrate police protection facilities would meet the service demand of any future development.

Development within the unincorporated areas of the county, or within Elk Grove, would increase the demand for SCSD and EGPD law enforcement services and facilities. Individual development projects would be required to assess impacts related to law enforcement services during the environmental review process to ensure that the SCSD and EGPD have sufficient facilities and equipment to meet demand and provide funding for additional police protection facilities through payment of development impact fees. As appropriate, future facility construction would be subject to project-level environmental analysis and mitigation. However, impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, a **significant cumulative** impact would occur, and the proposed SOIA would result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to impacts related to increased law enforcement services and facilities. No additional feasible mitigation measures exist for these cumulative impacts. Thus, impacts would be cumulatively **significant and unavoidable**.

## Schools

The Elk Grove Unified School District (EGUSD) provides K–12 education to the City of Elk Grove and the SOIA Area. Development within the EGUSD service area could increase the demand for school facilities. City General Plan Policy PF-16 requires developments to incorporate new schools in their overall designs, which would render any impacts to school facilities created by the increase in residential population resulting from potential future development less than significant by assuring that adequate school facilities are provided for current and future residents. The City supports state legislative efforts to secure additional state funding for school construction and ensure maintenance of local district priorities for funds in the State school bond program (City General Plan Policy PF-18). In addition, City General Plan Policy PF-21 requires new development to fund its fair share portion of its impacts to all public facilities as provided for in State law. Pursuant to SB 50, new development would be required to pay all applicable State-mandated school impact fees to EGUSD. However, new development within the EGUSD would be required to pay state-mandated school impact fees that may be used to finance new schools and equipment, and to reconstruct existing facilities to maintain adequate housing for EGUSD's students as described in Mitigation Measure 3.13-3. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. However, depending on how school facilities are located and designed relative to possible future residential development within the SOIA Area and other areas within the School District service area, there could be indirect impacts related to transportation, such as air pollutant emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation noise. This is a **potentially significant cumulative impact**.

It is possible that future residential development within the SOIA Area would generate demand for school facilities that are not met within the SOIA Area or are not for some period of time within the SOIA Area as it builds out. Off-site impacts associated with possible school facility development are not knowable at this time and

are conservatively assumed for the purposes of this Recirculated Draft EIR to be cumulatively considerable. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

## **Parks and Recreation**

The CCSD provides parks and recreation facilities for residents of the city of Elk Grove, as well as portions of Sacramento County. CCSD serves an area of roughly 157 square miles, including the city limits of the City of Elk Grove, plus unincorporated areas of Sacramento County.

New development, including future development within the SOIA Area, would generate demand for new and existing recreational facilities in Elk Grove and the unincorporated county. Payment of the development impact fees would provide financing for public facilities, including parks and recreational facilities, which are required to serve new development. Individual development projects would be required to assess impacts related to parks and recreational facilities during the environmental review process to ensure sufficient facilities to meet demand. As appropriate, future facility construction would be subject to project-level CEQA analysis and mitigation. However, impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation. A **significant cumulative** impact would occur, and the proposed SOIA would result in a **cumulatively considerable** incremental contribution to impacts related to increased parks and recreation facilities. No feasible mitigation measures exist for these cumulative impacts. Thus, impacts would be **cumulatively significant and unavoidable**.

## **TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

The purpose of the cumulative (2035) transportation impact analysis is to determine whether implementation of the proposed project in addition to planned cumulative growth will adversely affect the planned transportation system. The MTP for 2036 identifies roadway and transit improvements that are proposed to accommodate future travel demand and includes the western segment of the proposed Capital SouthEast Connector project.

The SOIA Area is located just south of the western segment of the proposed Capital SouthEast Connector project, which is a 35-mile roadway that will link communities in El Dorado County and Sacramento County and the cities of Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and Elk Grove. It will connect between U.S. 50 in El Dorado Hills and I-5 at Hood-Franklin Road southwest of Elk Grove. Many of the roadway improvements are located along potential alignments of the SouthEast Connector project, including improvements on Grant Line Road, Kammerer Road, and Hood-Franklin Road. There are planned roadway improvements under SouthEast Connector in the SOIA Area that include widening Kammerer Road to six lanes from SR 99 to Bruceville Road, and extension of Kammerer Road (four lanes) from Bruceville Road to I-5 with UPRR overcrossing.

### ***Roadway and Freeway Segment Operations***

Table 5-1 and Table 5-2 summarize study roadway and freeway segment operations under cumulative and cumulative plus conditions, respectively, and include the following information for each study roadway segment:

- ▶ Daily roadway capacity
- ▶ Daily traffic volume (two-way total)
- ▶ Volume-to-capacity ratio
- ▶ LOS

As shown in Table 5-1, the cumulative no project conditions may not meet the minimal acceptable operation level for the City or County. The County defines the minimum acceptable operation level for its roadways and intersections to be LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for urban areas. The urban areas are those areas within the Urban Service Boundary as shown in Figure 1 of the Land Use Element of the Sacramento County General Plan (Sacramento County 2016). The areas outside the Urban Service Boundary are considered rural. Also, Policy CI-13 indicates that the City shall require that all roadways and intersections in Elk Grove operate at a minimum Level of Service “D” at all times. This would be a **significant cumulative** impact.

Table 5-2 shows whether the studied roadways are within the urban/City boundary or in rural areas (as identified in the County’s Land Use Element). Table 5-2 also shows existing no project and cumulative no project LOS for the studied roadway segments and provides comparison between cumulative no project conditions and existing no project conditions. As shown, four roadway segments and five freeway segments already operate with LOS E or F under existing conditions. These roadway and free segments are labeled “Yes” under Impact column for existing conditions in Table 5-2. The cumulative no project condition would have indirect impacts related to traffic congestion on additional four roadway segments and four freeway segments. These roadway and free segments are labeled “Yes” under Impact column for cumulative no project conditions in Table 5-2.

However, as shown in Table 5-2, the cumulative no project condition would only cause deterioration in daily level of service from LOS E to LOS F or an increase of more than 0.05 in volume over capacity ratios on the following roadway and freeway segments:

- ▶ Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive
- ▶ Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to SR 99
- ▶ Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Parkway
- ▶ SR 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard
- ▶ SR 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road
- ▶ SR 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to north of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road

<b>Table 5-1. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Cumulative No Project Conditions</b>				
Roadway Segment	Daily Capacity <sup>1</sup>	Daily Volume <sup>2</sup>	V/C Ratio	LOS
Elk Grove Boulevard from I-5 to Harbour Point Drive	54,000	25,500	0.47	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	54,000	26,300	0.49	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	54,000	35,331	0.65	B
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	54,000	59,720	1.11	<b>F</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to SR 99	54,000	75,609	1.40	<b>F</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from SR 99 to East Stockton Boulevard	36,000	33,016	0.92	<b>E</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from East Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	36,000	31,793	0.88	D
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	18,000	32,093	1.78	<b>F</b>
Grant Line Road from Promenade Parkway to East Stockton Boulevard	<del>18,000</del> 54,000	28,589	<del>1.59</del> 0.5	<del>F</del> A
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	<del>18,000</del> 36,000	35,381	<del>1.97</del> 1.0	<del>FF</del>
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	18,000	25,430	1.41	<b>F</b>
Bilby Road from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	18,000	8,400	0.47	A
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Parkway	20,000	29,179	1.46	<b>F</b>
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to SR 99	18,000	1,100	0.06	A
Dillard Road from SR 99 to Wilton Road	17,000	4,700	0.28	A
Lambert Road from I-5 to Bruceville Road	17,000	900	0.05	A
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Parkway	36,000	14,916	0.41	A
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Parkway	36,000	22,400	0.62	B
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	18,000	3,700	0.21	A
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	17,000	2,100	0.12	A
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	17,000	1,500	0.09	A
I-5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	80,000	65,890	0.82	D
I-5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	72,067	0.90	<b>E</b>
I-5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	80,000	88,912	1.11	<b>F</b>
I-5 from Laguna Boulevard to north of Laguna Boulevard	120,000	103,341	0.86	D
SR 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	80,000	94,355	1.18	<b>F</b>
SR 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	80,000	85,778	1.07	<b>F</b>
SR 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	80,000	87,003	1.09	<b>F</b>
SR 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	80,000	88,580	1.11	<b>F</b>
SR 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	89,361	1.12	<b>F</b>
SR 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	80,000	145,671	1.82	<b>F</b>
SR 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to north of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	80,000	186,067	2.33	<b>F</b>
Notes:				
<sup>1</sup> The capacity of each roadway is based on the number of lanes and the facility type.				
<sup>2</sup> The baseline condition represents conditions in fall 2014, which for most of the studied roadways segments were obtained from the City of Elk Grove Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes. The segment volumes not available in the City's 2014 ADT were obtained from the 2011 study for the proposed project.				
Bold text indicates unacceptable LOS.				
Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014.				



Table 5-2. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Comparison between Cumulative No Project and Existing No Project Conditions						
Roadway Segment	Urban/City or Rural	LOS			Impact?	
		Existing No Project	Cum. No Project	VOC Ratio Increase	Existing	Cum. No Project
Elk Grove Boulevard from Interstate 5 to Harbour Point Drive	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	B	B	0.04		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	Urban/City	D	<b>F</b>	0.20		<b>Yes</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to State Route 99	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.20	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	C	<b>E</b>	0.14		Yes
Elk Grove Boulevard from E Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	Urban/City	C	D	0.14		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	Urban/City	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	0.23	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Grant Line Road from Promenade Pkwy to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>FA</b>	<b>FA</b>	<del>0.50</del> <u>0.20</u>	<del>Yes</del> <u>No</u>	<del>Yes</del> <u>No</u>
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	Urban/City	<b>FB</b>	<b>FF</b>	<del>0.50</del> <u>0.40</u>	<del>Yes</del> <u>No</u>	Yes
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	D	<b>F</b>	0.50		Yes
Bilby Road from franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	A	A	0.25		
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Pkwy	Urban/City	A	<b>F</b>	0.65		<b>Yes</b>
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99	Rural	A	A	1.35		
Dillard Road from State Route 99 to Wilton Road	Rural	A	A	0.09		
Lambert Road from Interstate 5 to Bruceville Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Urban/City	A	A	0.27		
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Rural	B	B	0.07		
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	Rural	A	A	0.90		
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	A	A	1.38		
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Interstate 5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	Rural	B	D	0.00		
Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Rural	C	<b>E</b>	0.12		Yes
Interstate 5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	0.10	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Interstate 5 from Laguna Boulevard to North of Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	C	D	0.04		
State Route 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	Rural	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	Rural	D	<b>F</b>	0.02		Yes
State Route 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	D	<b>F</b>	0.02		Yes
State Route 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	Rural	D	<b>F</b>	0.05		Yes
State Route 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	0.27	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
State Route 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.27	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
State Route 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to North of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.27	Yes	<b>Yes</b>

Notes: VOC Ration = volume-to-capacity ration  
**Bold** text indicates significant increase in VOC ratio. For roadways already operating at an unacceptable LOS, a project is considered to have a significant effect if it increases the volume-to-capacity ratio by more than 0.05. (Sacramento County 2004)  
 Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014, Sacramento County 2016

Table 5-3 summarizes study roadway and freeway segment operations under cumulative plus project conditions.

<b>Table 5-3. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Cumulative Plus Project Conditions</b>				
Roadway Segment	Daily Capacity <sup>1</sup>	Daily Volume <sup>2</sup>	V/C Ratio	LOS
Elk Grove Boulevard from Interstate 5 to Harbour Point Drive	54,000	26,923	0.50	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	54,000	27,723	0.51	A
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	54,000	37,643	0.70	B
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	54,000	70,192	1.30	<b>F</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to State Route 99	54,000	86,481	1.60	<b>F</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard	36,000	38,385	1.07	<b>F</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from E Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	36,000	37,062	1.03	<b>F</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	18,000	36,528	2.03	<b>F</b>
Grant Line Road from Promenade Pkwy to E Stockton Boulevard	18,000	39,651	2.20	<b>F</b>
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	18,000	46,542	2.59	<b>F</b>
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	18,000	36,892	2.05	<b>F</b>
Bilby Road from franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	18,000	12,818	0.71	C
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Pkwy	20,000	43,273	2.16	<b>F</b>
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99	18,000	25,479	1.42	<b>F</b>
Dillard Road from State Route 99 to Wilton Road	17,000	6,185	0.36	A
Lambert Road from Interstate 5 to Bruceville Road	17,000	4,261	0.25	A
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	36,000	24,750	0.69	B
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	36,000	24,712	0.69	B
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	18,000	19,981	1.11	<b>F</b>
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	17,000	25,531	1.50	<b>F</b>
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	17,000	4,860	0.29	A
Interstate 5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	80,000	65,940	0.82	D
Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	80,802	1.01	<b>F</b>
Interstate 5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	80,000	96,731	1.21	<b>F</b>
Interstate 5 from Laguna Boulevard to North of Laguna Boulevard	120,000	107,682	0.90	D
State Route 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	80,000	96,018	1.20	<b>F</b>
State Route 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	80,000	87,440	1.09	<b>F</b>
State Route 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	80,000	88,666	1.11	<b>F</b>
State Route 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	80,000	92,956	1.16	<b>F</b>
State Route 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	80,000	111,246	1.39	<b>F</b>
State Route 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	80,000	166,556	2.08	<b>F</b>
State Route 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to North of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	80,000	207,952	2.60	<b>F</b>
Notes:				
<sup>1</sup> The capacity of each roadway is based on the number of lanes and the facility type.				
<sup>2</sup> The baseline condition represents conditions in fall 2014, which for most of the studied roadways segments were obtained from the City of Elk Grove Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes. The segment volumes not available in the City's 2014 ADT were obtained from the 2011 study for the proposed project.				
<b>Bold</b> text indicates unacceptable LOS.				
Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014.				

As shown in Table 5-3, if there is development of the SOIA Area in the future, this may have indirect impacts on County of Sacramento and City of Elk Grove facilities under cumulative plus project conditions.

Table 5-4 shows whether the studied roadways are within the urban/City boundary or in rural areas (as identified in the County's Land Use Element). Table 5-4 also shows cumulative no project LOS and with project LOS for the studied roadway segments and provides comparison between cumulative no project conditions and existing no project conditions. As shown, eight roadway segments and nine freeway segments already operate with LOS E or F under cumulative no project conditions. These roadway and free segments are labeled "Yes" under Impact column for cumulative no project conditions in Table 5-3. The cumulative plus project condition would have indirect impacts related to traffic congestion on additional three roadway segments. These roadway and free segments are labeled "Yes" under Impact column for cumulative plus project conditions in Table 5-3.

However, as shown in Table 5-4, the cumulative no project condition would only cause increase in traffic volume would cause deterioration in daily level of service from LOS E to LOS F or an increase of more than 0.05 in volume over capacity ratios on the following roadway and freeway segments:

- ▶ Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard
- ▶ Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99
- ▶ Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road
- ▶ Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road
- ▶ Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard

Congestion Management Plan (CMP) also requires establishment of LOS standards to measure congestion at specific monitoring locations on the freeway and arterial systems. Policy CI-5-Action 4 indicates that the City shall participate in the preparation and implementation of a CMP consistent with legal requirements which gives priority to air quality goals, alternatives to automobile travel, and the development of demand reduction measures over additional road capacity. Policy CI-17 requires the City to regulate truck travel as appropriate for the transport of goods, consistent with circulation, air quality, congestion management, and land use goals.

Also, the MTP/SCS road investments emphasize access to infill development areas, congestion relief, support for bus and rail transit, and improved bicycle and pedestrian access. Local road investments increase capacity for local passenger travel, creating a benefit to goods movement on highways. The Capitol SouthEast Connector in the MTP/SCS is an expansion of existing segments of Kammerer Road, Bruceville Road, Grant Line Road and White Rock Road in the SOI Area.

However, the above impacts on the studied roadway and freeway segments would occur because adequate roadways and adequate capacity is not planned on I-5 or SR 99 to accommodate cumulative traffic volumes with buildout of the proposed SOIA Area have not yet been identified to support the conceptual land use changes that would occur under implementation of the proposed project. Under these circumstances, many of the study roadways would operate at levels worse than the stated significance criteria. This is a **cumulatively considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact.

Section 3.14, "Transportation," includes mitigation measures to reduce impacts on transportation. Impacts on local roadways outside of the City's jurisdiction would require consultation with other agencies (e.g., Sacramento County, the Capital SouthEast Connector JPA, and Caltrans), and the City cannot assure that mitigation for improvements outside its jurisdiction would be implemented. Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

<b>Table 5-4. Roadway Segment Level of Service – Comparison between Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions</b>						
Roadway Segment	Urban/City or Rural	LOS			Impact	
		Cum. No Project	Cum. Plus Project	VOC Ratio Increase	Cum. No Project	Cum. Plus Project
Elk Grove Boulevard from Interstate 5 to Harbour Point Drive	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Harbour Point Drive to Franklin Boulevard	Urban/City	A	A	0.03		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	B	B	0.04		
Elk Grove Boulevard from Bruceville Road to Laguna Springs Drive	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.19	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to State Route 99	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.20	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from State Route 99 to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	0.15	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from E Stockton Boulevard to Elk Grove Florin Road	Urban/City	D	<b>F</b>	0.15		<b>Yes</b>
Elk Grove Boulevard from Elk Grove Florin Road to Waterman Road	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.25	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Grant Line Road from Promenade Pkwy to E Stockton Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.61	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Grant Line Road from E Stockton Boulevard to Waterman Road	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.62	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Grant Line Road from Waterman Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.64	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Bilby Road from franklin Boulevard to Bruceville Road	Urban/City	A	C	0.25		
Kammerer Road from Bruceville Road to Promenade Pkwy	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.70	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Eschinger Road from Bruceville Road to State Route 99	Rural	A	<b>F</b>	1.35		<b>Yes</b>
Dillard Road from State Route 99 to Wilton Road	Rural	A	A	0.09		
Lambert Road from Interstate 5 to Bruceville Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Franklin Boulevard from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Urban/City	A	B	0.27		
Bruceville Road from Elk Grove Boulevard to Whitelock Pkwy	Rural	B	B	0.06		
Bruceville Road from Whitelock Parkway to Kammerer Road	Rural	A	<b>F</b>	0.90		<b>Yes</b>
Bruceville Road from Kammerer Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	A	<b>F</b>	1.38		<b>Yes</b>
Bruceville Road from Eschinger Road to Lambert Road	Rural	A	A	0.20		
Interstate 5 from Twin Cities Road to Hood Franklin Road	Rural	D	D	0.00		
Interstate 5 from Hood Franklin Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Rural	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	0.11	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Interstate 5 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.10	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
Interstate 5 from Laguna Boulevard to North of Laguna Boulevard	Urban/City	D	D	0.04		
State Route 99 from Mingo Road to Arno Road	Rural	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Arno Road to Dillard Road	Rural	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Dillard Road to Eschinger Road	Rural	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.02	Yes	Yes
State Route 99 from Eschinger Road to Grant Line Road	Rural	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.05	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
State Route 99 from Grant Line Road to Elk Grove Boulevard	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.27	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
State Route 99 from Elk Grove Boulevard to Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.26	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
State Route 99 from Laguna Boulevard/Bond Road to North of Laguna Boulevard/ Bond Road	Urban/City	<b>F</b>	<b>F</b>	0.27	Yes	<b>Yes</b>

Notes: VOC Ration = volume-to-capacity ration  
**Bold** text indicates significant increase in VOC ratio. For roadways already operating at an unacceptable LOS, a project is considered to have a significant effect if it increases the volume-to-capacity ratio by more than 0.05. (Sacramento County 2004)  
 Source: Fehr & Peers 2011; Elk Grove 2014, Sacramento County 2016

## UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

In terms of cumulative impacts, the appropriate service providers are responsible for ensuring adequate provision of public utilities within their service boundaries. Utilities and service systems would be provided to future development by the Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA), the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) (formerly known as County Sanitation District-1), Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD), SMUD, and PG&E. The related projects discussed in this section include future development that would occur within each provider's service area

### Water Supply and Water Systems

The SOIA Area is adjacent to the southwestern boundary of SCWA's Zone 40; therefore, it is most likely that water service would be provided by SCWA. SCWA's nearest water transmission mains are along Bilby Road at West Stockton Boulevard and at the Grant Line Road/State Route 99 interchange. The Poppy Ridge WTP is located near the intersection of Bruceville Road and Poppy Ridge Road (see Exhibit 3.15-1 in Section 3.15, "Utilities and Service Systems"). Zone 40 provides water supply through a conjunctive-use water supply system consisting of surface water, groundwater, and recycled water. The Zone 41 UWMP addresses water supply and demand issues, water supply reliability, water conservation, water shortage contingencies, and recycled-water usage for the areas within Sacramento County where Zone 41 provides retail water services, including Zone 40. As shown in Table 3.15-2 in Section 3.15, SCWA would have surface water and groundwater supplies that exceed demands within Zone 40 from 2010 to 2035 in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years. The SOIA Area is not within SCWA's Zone 40 service area and water supply demands to the SOIA Area were not accounted for in the Zone 41 UWMP or Zone 40 WSMP.

Planned SCWA water system improvements could serve future development in the service area. The Zone 40 WSIP shows the future Whitelock WTP, planned as a Phase 2 facility in The Zone 40 WSMP, and additional water conveyance pipelines are proposed along Whitelock Parkway (SCWA 2006). These water system improvements were identified in the 2005 Zone 40 WSMP EIR, and the environmental impacts of the construction and operation were analyzed at a programmatic level. SCWA would conduct project-level CEQA or NEPA analysis, if necessary, to analyze specific cumulative impacts and identify any required mitigation measures for construction and operation of new off-site facilities.

As shown in Section 3.15, "Utilities and Service Systems," SCWA would have water supplies that exceed demands in all water years. Future development within the SCWA service area could require SCWA water. If capacity is not available, SCWA may need to expand or construct water systems facilities. SCWA would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the environmental impacts of constructing or expanding facilities and would be required to implement mitigation for any impacts found to be significant. However, impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Thus, future development within the service area could lead to a **significant cumulative** impact.

As shown on Table 3.15-3, the estimated water supply demand based on build-out of the conceptual land use scenario has been conservatively estimated as 3,233 afy. SCWA would have water supplies that exceed demands in all water years. ~~Surplus water supplies could potentially meet water supply demands of future development.~~ SCWA has indicated that it is likely additional surface water and groundwater supplies will be procured to meet the water supply demands of the SOIA Area. Off-site water supply facilities necessary to serve future

development have not been identified at this time. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.15-1 would reduce significant impacts associated with increased for water supplies and demand for off-site water facilities because the City of Elk Grove would demonstrate adequate water supplies and water system facilities would be available for the amount of development identified in the annexation territory.

However, future development in the SOIA Area could contribute to the cumulatively significant or impacts associated with the future construction of water facilities that would be needed to serve development within the SCWA service area. Impacts resulting from off-site water infrastructure improvements could include, but are not limited to, short-term impacts on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction, potential impacts on special-status plants and wildlife or sensitive habitats; potential disturbance of known or unknown cultural or paleontological resources; short-term increases in erosion and stormwater runoff; and short-term increases in construction noise levels.

Therefore, the effects of future development within the SOIA Area is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

### **Wastewater Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment Facilities**

Future development within the SASD or SRSCD service areas would receive municipal wastewater service through existing infrastructure or the construction of on-site wastewater transmission facilities and new and/or expansion of existing infrastructure. Planned construction of the SASD infrastructure in the LA Laguna Trunk shed and the SRCSD South Area Interceptor and expansion of the SRWTP would be required to serve future development within their service areas regardless of whether development within the SOIA Area occurs. However, it cannot be determined if the SRWTP and other facilities would have capacity to treat wastewater generated by future development. If SASD or SRCSD are not able to provide wastewater service to new development with existing infrastructure, construction or expansion of existing infrastructure may be required, the construction of which could have environmental impacts. Both SASD and SRCSD would prepare separate CEQA documentation in the future to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with increased demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities and would be required to implement feasible mitigation measures to reduce any impacts found to be significant. However, cumulative impacts could remain significant after implementation of mitigation (i.e., cumulatively significant and unavoidable), or no feasible mitigation may be available to fully reduce cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. Thus, future development within the service area would be a **potentially cumulative considerable** impact.

Future development in the SOIA Area could contribute to the cumulatively significant impacts associated with the future construction of wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities that would be needed to serve development within the SASD and SCRSD service areas. Mitigation Measure 3.15-3 would reduce impacts because the City of Elk Grove would demonstrate adequate on-site and off-site wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities would be available for the amount of development identified in the annexation territory. However, LAFCo would not have control over the City's approval, timing, or implementation of on-site wastewater collection and conveyance facilities. Therefore, future development could result in a **cumulatively considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to the increased demand for SASD and SCRSD wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities. There is no additional feasible mitigation. The impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

## Solid Waste

Residential solid waste in the City of Elk Grove is disposed of at the Kiefer Landfill and commercial solid waste is primarily disposed of at the Kiefer Landfill, the L and D Landfill, and the Yolo County Landfill. These landfills currently provide solid waste disposal services to both municipal and commercial customers in Sacramento and Yolo Counties. Development of new land uses within those counties would increase the amount of solid waste disposal at the Kiefer Landfill, the L and D Landfill, and the Yolo County Landfill. The Kiefer Landfill, the L and D Landfill, and the Yolo County Landfill have a large volume of landfill capacity (254 million cubic yards) available to serve future development within their service areas through 2064. Therefore, **no significant cumulative** impact would occur.

## 5.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

According to Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR should:

[d]iscuss ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects that would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss characteristics of some projects that may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

A project has the potential to induce growth both directly and indirectly. Direct growth inducement would result if a project involved construction of new housing. Indirect growth inducement would result, for instance, if implementing a project resulted in substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial, or governmental enterprises); or a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that indirectly stimulates the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand; and/or removal of an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as improving the capacity of a public utility or service (e.g., construction of a major sewer line with excess capacity through an undeveloped area).

Growth inducement itself is not an environmental effect but may lead to environmental effects. These environmental effects may include increased demand on other services and infrastructure, increased traffic and noise, degradation of air or water quality, degradation or loss of plant or animal habitats, conversion of agricultural and open space land to urban uses, or other adverse impacts.

### 5.4.1 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

There are no land uses changes proposed as part of this SOIA application. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce population growth through development of new housing and employment opportunities or extension of infrastructure.

However, future development could indirectly facilitate population growth by generating a population of approximately 13,000 to 16,250 people in the City of Elk Grove. The SOIA Area is located outside of the City of Elk Grove's Planning Area; therefore, the population that could be accommodated within the SOIA Area was not considered as part of the adopted Elk Grove General Plan. However, the City is currently updating its General Plan and although no draft has been released, preliminary maps show the SOIA Area within the future planning area. It is anticipated that the population, housing, and employment that could be accommodated under the future land use scenario would be addressed in the City's General Plan update.

The proposed project could develop approximately 4,000 to 5,000 dwelling units. In addition to residential development, future development could generate a substantial amount of employment-generating land uses. The conceptual land plan assumes a broad range of commercial, office, and industrial uses that generate 18,000 to 20,000 jobs.

In addition, the future development under the SOIA could require off-site improvements for services, facilities, and utilities. Some of these improvements could benefit development elsewhere within Elk Grove and in other portions of the County. Potential growth-inducing impacts resulting from the extension of circulation facilities and expansion of utility infrastructure are addressed in Sections 3.14, "Transportation," and 3.15, "Utilities and Service Systems," respectively.

Future development in the SOIA Area would require construction workers. Because construction workers typically do not change where they live each time they are assigned to a new construction site, it is not anticipated that there would be any substantial relocation of construction workers to Elk Grove or Sacramento County associated with the SOIA. LAFCo does not anticipate substantial impacts associated with growth inducement associated with the temporary relocation of construction workers.

The additional population associated with the future development within the SOIA Area could spur an increase in demand for goods and services in the surrounding area, which could potentially result in additional development to satisfy this demand. In this respect, the SOIA Area would be growth inducing. It would be speculative to attempt to predict where and when any such new services would be developed, and whether or not existing and future planned industrial and commercial development would satisfy additional demand for goods and services created by the project. Existing vacant light industrial and commercial space may be sufficient to meet additional demand created by implementation of the SOIA that is not accommodated within the SOIA Area.

The SOIA Area is located within unincorporated Sacramento County and the Sacramento County General Plan establishes land use designations and zoning within the SOIA Area. The entire SOIA Area and areas south, east, and west of the SOIA Area are zoned AG-80 (Agricultural, 80-acre minimum). The AG-80 zoning code is used to eliminate the encroachment of land uses incompatible with the long term agricultural use of land, to preserve the maximum amount of the limited supply of agricultural land in order to conserve the County's economic resources that are vital for a healthy agricultural economy, to discourage the premature and unnecessary conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, and to encourage the retention of sufficiently large agricultural lots to assure maintenance of viable agricultural units. In addition, the SOIA Area and land south and west of the SOIA Area are located outside of the County's Urban Service Boundary (USB) and Urban Policy Area (UPA). The USB defines the ultimate boundary of urban development and is intended to be permanent, allowing modification only under special circumstances. Lands outside of the UPA are not intended to receive urban levels of public infrastructure and services to support urban development.



If future development occurs, it would place urban development adjacent to agricultural lands south and west of the SOIA Area. Historically, economic returns from urban development are typically substantially higher than continued use of undeveloped land, and encroaching urban uses typically make attractive the conversion of other undeveloped land to urban uses. Thus, it could be reasoned that implementing the proposed project would be growth inducing by placing pressure on land south and west of the SOIA Area to convert to urban uses. An application has been submitted to Sacramento LAFCo that proposes future development in the Bilby Ridge SOIA, west of the SOIA Area. Conversion of this agricultural land to urban land uses is being proposed, and conversion of agricultural land to urban uses could occur regardless of future development within the SOIA Area. No urban development is currently proposed immediately south of the SOIA Area. Additional agricultural land uses occur near the SOIA Area east of State Route 99. Sacramento County has initiated the South of Grantline Visioning process with property owners of approximately 1,070 acres inside the USB northeast of State Route 99 and the City of Elk Grove's proposed multi-sport park complex. This planning effort is intended to permanently define the relationship of urban uses within the USB with adjacent agriculture and open space outside the USB and will attempt to ensure compatibility of land uses with the proposed multi-sport park complex and other surrounding land uses.

In summary, the SOIA would maintain existing land use designations and zoning and would not result on the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or utilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth and impacts; however, the project may indirectly induce substantial population growth because the increased population and employment opportunities associated with the future development could increase demand for goods and services, thereby fostering population and economic growth in unincorporated Sacramento County and other nearby communities. It is possible that a successful SOIA could place pressure on adjacent areas to seek development entitlements or annexation applications.

However, the SOIA Area would provide sufficient acreage to accommodate population and employment growth. Therefore, the SOIA would likely not induce substantial growth outside of the SOIA Area. Furthermore, any growth outside of the SOIA Area would require its own LAFCo SOI amendment and environmental review outside of the SOIA process.

This page intentionally left blank.