

RECEIVED

MAR 20 2013

City of Elk Grove Proposed Sphere of Influence Amendment
Recirculated Draft EIR Document – March 2013
SUMMARY OF REVISIONS TO PREVIOUS
DRAFT EIR

SACRAMENTO LOCAL AGENCY
FORMATION COMMISSION

This is a summary of revisions made to the previously circulated Draft EIR [CEQA Sec. 15088.5(g).] This summary provides a general overview of the location and type of incorporated edits most pertinent to CEQA analysis requirements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary text was revised to be consistent with the changes to impact findings, mitigation measures, and alternative descriptions, as provided below and throughout the Recirculated Draft EIR. In addition, Table ES-1, Executive Summary Matrix, was revised for clarity.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Multiple text edits were made for clarification. Land demand projections in Table 2-4 were updated to reflect the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) Preferred Scenario projections. Applicable Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) CEQA Policies, previously available in multiple locations throughout the Draft EIR, were added to the Project Description. A project objective was added.

- Provide sufficient land to accommodate a jobs-housing ratio for the City of Elk Grove that provides for sufficient residential and employment-generating lands uses to minimize the need for commuting to or from other jurisdictions.

AESTHETICS

Text modification and edits for clarity and consistency were incorporated. Other changes include the following:

A new mitigation measure, Mitigation Measure AES-3, was added to mitigate the project's potential to degrade the visual character of the project site and its surroundings; however, the prior significance determination of significant and unavoidable remain unchanged for the impact.

Impact discussion for Impact AES-4, which analyzes the projects' potential to result in the introduction of substantial new sources of light and glare, was expanded to further describe the process for future annexations that may occur. In addition, Mitigation Measure AES-4 was revised to require a condition on all future City of Elk Grove discretionary projects within the Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) area, subsequent to application to annex the territory, to be designed to avoid spillover and sky glow impacts. As a result of the revised mitigation measure, the prior significance determination of significant and unavoidable was revised to less than significant.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This section has been revised to provide additional description and information about the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classification for lands immediately surrounding the SOIA area. Additional details concerning agricultural land conversion in Sacramento County, crop commodities within SOIA area, and a description of farmland security zones under the Williamson Act Program were added. Other changes include the following:

The impact discussion for AG-1, the potential to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, was expanded to further describe how the project may result in foreseeable annexation and development. In addition, Mitigation Measure AG-1 was expanded to require specific documentation, prohibitions, and enforcement measures; however, the prior significance determination of significant and unavoidable remain unchanged for the impact.

The impact discussion for AG-2, the potential to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, was revised to focus on the impact criteria and reasonably foreseeable impacts. The prior significance determination of significant and unavoidable remain unchanged for the impact.

The impact discussion for AG-2, the potential to result in changes to the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use, was expanded to include analysis of the five factors LAFCo must consider when determining whether a proposal will have no significant adverse effect on the physical and economic integrity of other agricultural lands. In addition, Mitigation Measure AG-3 was revised to specifically reference the City of Elk Grove's Municipal Code requirements and require title report notifications. The prior significance determination of less than significant was revised to significant and unavoidable.

AIR QUALITY

This section has been revised to reflect changes to the regional setting, including the adoption of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy for 2035. The methodology section was expanded to clarify and provide additional details. The impact sections were substantially revised to separate previously grouped impact discussions; therefore additional impact numbers were added to cover previously grouped impact discussions. Changes include the following:

The impact numbering was revised to reflect the addition of the project's potential to violate air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation from operational impacts as a separate impact from construction activities, as described below. In addition, the numbering was revised to reflect the separation of the project's potential to cause or significantly contribute to a carbon monoxide hotspot from other impact analyses.

Impact AIR-1, the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, was substantially revised based on comments from the local air district, and changes to the regulatory setting. Mitigation Measures for AIR-1 were similarly revised, resulting in one mitigation measure instead of the previously circulated two mitigation measures. The prior significance determination of less than significant was revised to significant and unavoidable.

Impact AIR-2, the potential to violate air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, was substantially revised to separate and clarify between construction-related impacts and operational-related impacts, as well as more accurately reflect the reasonably foreseeable impacts that may result from implementation of the project. Mitigation Measure AIR-2 was similarly revised. A description of how Mitigation Measure AIR-2 would affect the potential impact was added. The prior significance determination of less than significant remains unchanged.

Prior analysis included in the September 2011 Draft EIR for the project's potential to violate air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation from operational impacts was expanded to provide additional details and descriptions of potentially foreseeable impacts, as well as clarify the methodology of assessment. A finding of significant and unavoidable was provided.

The project's potential to create a localized carbon monoxide hotspot was separated from other impact analyses, and provided as Impact AIR-5. Mitigation Measure AIR-5 was revised to require proof of consultation with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

The mitigation measure to reduce the project's potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations was revised. The prior significance determination of less than significant remains unchanged.

Mitigation Measures AIR-6 and AIR-7 were revised.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section has been substantially revised throughout including, but not limited to, regulatory settings, environmental settings, methodology discussion, impact assessment discussions, and mitigation measures. In addition, the following changes were incorporated:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1c was added to mitigate impacts on foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, other raptors (including burrowing owl), and greater sandhill cranes. Impact BIO-1, the project's potential to result in substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on special-status wildlife species, was revised from less than significant after mitigation to significant and unavoidable.

Impact BIO-6, the project's potential to conflict with local adopted habitat conservation plans was revised from potentially significant to no impact, and less than significant after mitigation to no impact. Additional discussion concerning the status and potential implementation of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan was included in the impact discussion.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section has been revised to reflect revised mitigation measures. Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4 were revised to specify notification requirements and provide a broader applicability of the measure requirements. The previously circulated significance determinations remain unchanged.

GEOLOGIC RESOURCES

Minor edits in the regulatory and environmental setting, as well as within the impact assessment discussions, were implemented for formatting, consistency and grammar. There are no changes to the previously circulated significance determinations. The following changes were incorporated:

Mitigation Measure GEO-1 was revised to remove the requirement to implement the Uniform Building Code, as it is not applicable and would be redundant to implementation of existing state building requirements.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Minor edits in the regulatory and environmental setting, as well as within the impact assessment discussions, were implemented for formatting, consistency and grammar. There are no changes to the previously circulated significance determinations. In addition, the following changes were incorporated:

Table 3.7-3 was revised from showing the 2005 emissions inventory for unincorporated Sacramento County to the 2005 inventory for the City of Elk Grove

Additional detail concerning the City of Elk Grove's greenhouse gas emissions inventory was added to the environmental setting.

The regulatory setting was updated to reflect the current status of the AB 32 Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy for 2035, the Sacramento County Climate Action Plan, and the SB375 regional targets.

The methodology section was expanded to provide a detailed description of the emissions analysis methodology.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1 was revised require the detailed emissions inventory parameters to be submitted to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. In addition, requirement to demonstrate future consistency with AB32, S-03-05, and SB 375 were replaced by a menu of specific performance standards.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Minor edits in the regulatory setting were incorporated to reflect the current regulatory environment. A methodology section was added to describe the analysis methodology. In addition, the following changes were incorporated:

Impact HAZ-1, the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, was revised to incorporate analysis of implementation and incorporation of applicable federal and state laws and regulations. The level of

significance prior to mitigation was revised to less than significant, and Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 was removed.

Impact HAZ-2, the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment, was edited for consistency with Impact HAZ-1 and to reflect compliance with federal, state, and local laws related to hazardous substances. In addition, the significance before mitigation was revised to less than significant and reference to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 was removed.

The impact discussion for Impact HAZ-3, the potential to hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, was substantially expanded to include more detailed discussion of requirements to comply with federal, state, and local regulations, as well as Public Resources Code Sections 21151.4, 21151.8, and 21151.2 requirements. The significance before mitigation and after mitigation was changed to less than significant.

Impact HAZ-4 impact discussion was modified for consistency with Impact HAZ-1. The reference to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 was replaced with Mitigation Measure HAZ-4.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

This section was revised to include additional environmental setting details, including the location of potential 'solution area' of the North Delta project, estimated water demand from existing agricultural crops within the SOIA area, and a description of the Morris Creek System. Furthermore, additional description of the Water Forum and Sacramento County Water Agency's 2010 Urban Water management Plan were incorporated. The regulatory section was amended to include a detailed discussion of the requirements for an adequate water supply under CEQA per *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova* (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 412. Applicable portions of the Sacramento LAFCo's Policies, Standards, and Procedures were included in the section, as well as an expanded description of the Water Forum Agreement and the successor efforts. . In addition, the following changes were incorporated:

The methodology section was expanded.

Impact HAZ-1, the potential to lead to a violation of a water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, impact analysis was revised to reflect the implementation of regulatory requirements. The level of significance before mitigation was revised less than significant and Mitigation Measure HYD-1 was removed.

The analysis for Impact HAZ-2, the potential to lead to a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or a substantial interference with groundwater recharge, was substantially expanded and revised to incorporate a more detailed discussion to address the required analysis components from the Vineyard case, as referenced above. Mitigation Measure HYD-2 was replaced with a requirement to implement Mitigation Measure USS; however, the significance determination for this impact remains unchanged.

Mitigation Measure HYD-3, which addresses the project's potential to lead to an increase of impervious surface coverage, which may result in increased stormwater runoff volumes and peak flows, was expanded to incorporate specific analysis and plan components, and documentation of consultation with the California Department of Transportation; however, the significance determination for this impact remains unchanged.

The impact analysis for Impact HYD-4, the potential result in the placement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that may have the potential to divert flood flows or to be subjected to flood hazard, was expanded to describe potential coastal flooding and erosion under climate change scenarios, as well as the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program requirements. Mitigation Measures HYD-4a and HYD-4b were modified to require proof of consultation with the California Department of Transportation and specific performance criteria. The significance determination for this impact remains unchanged.

LAND USE

Minor edits in the environmental setting were incorporated to for consistency and additional description of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. Applicable portions of the Sacramento LAFCo's Policies, Standards, and Procedures were added to the section. The regulatory section was updated to reflect the current status of the County of Sacramento General Plan and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy for 2035. Furthermore, the methodology description was expanded to include additional methodology details. In addition, the following changes were incorporated:

Impact LU-2, the potential to conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations was revised to remove reference to Appendix D. Multiple text edits were incorporated throughout the impact discussion for internal consistency. In addition, a discussion of the Sacramento Area Council of Government's Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy for 2035 was added to the impact analysis. Reference to Mitigation Measure AG-1 was replaced by reference to all mitigation measures contained in the Recirculated Draft EIR. In addition, the significance determination after incorporation of mitigation was changed from significant and unavoidable to less than significant.

The impact analysis for Impact LU-2, the potential to conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, was substantially expanded to include additional details of, and analysis related to, the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and Cosumnes River Preserve. Mitigation Measure LU-3 was replaced by requirement to implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1a. The significance after mitigation was revised from less than significant to significant and unavoidable.

The impact analysis for Impact LU-3, the potential to lead to the conversion of open space resources, as defined by Sacramento LAFCo, to urban uses, was expanded to include a description of the process for the City to prepare a land use plan; however, the impact determination and mitigation measure did not change.

MINERAL RESOURCES

The methodology was expanded to include additional methodology details.

NOISE

Minor edits for clarity and consistency are incorporated into the environmental and regulatory setting for this section. In addition, the methodology was expanded to include additional methodology details.

The impact analysis for Impact NOI-1, the potential to increase existing traffic noise levels at noise-sensitive land uses, was expanded to include a description of the annexation process for future development, City of Elk Grove noise requirements, and the applicability of the City's General Plan policies and regulations; however, the significance determination did not change.

The impact analysis for Impact NOI-2, the potential to expose future sensitive receptors to elevated noise levels from both transportation and non-transportation noise sources, was expanded to include descriptions of the City of Elk Grove Municipal Code Sections 6.32.090 and 6.32.090; however, the significance determination did not change.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Minor edits in the regulatory setting were incorporated to reflect the current regulatory environment, including a discussion of the Sacramento Area Council of Government's Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy for 2035, and updated population projections. The methodology was expanded to include additional methodology details.

The impact analysis for Impact POP-1, the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, was revised to include a discussion of the City and County's share of future Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for affordable housing and focus the impact discussion to physical environmental impacts associated with a substantial increase in population. Mitigation Measure POP-1 was retitled to POP-1a, and a new mitigation, Mitigation Measure POP-1b, was added to address revision and updating of the City of Elk Grove General Plan. The significance determination after mitigation was revised from significant and unavoidable to less than significant.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Minor edits in the regulatory setting were incorporated to reflect the current regulatory environment, including a discussion of the California Green Building Standards. The methodology was expanded to include additional methodology details.

Impact PSU-1, the potential to result in a need for new or expanded fire facilities or adverse impacts on fire protection, was revised and expanded to more accurately reflect the proposed project's reasonably foreseeable impacts. The significance determination before mitigation was revised from potentially significant to less than significant, and Mitigation Measures PSU-1a and PSU-1b were removed.

Impact PSU-2, the potential to result in a need for new or expanded police facilities or adverse impacts on police protection, was revised and expanded to more accurately reflect the proposed project's reasonably foreseeable impacts. The significance determination before mitigation was revised from potentially significant to less than significant, and Mitigation Measure PSU-2 was removed.

Impact PSU-3, the potential to result in a need for new or expanded school facilities or adverse impacts on education, was revised and expanded to more accurately reflect the proposed project's reasonably foreseeable impacts; however, the significance determination was not changed.

Minor edits to Impacts PSU-3, PSU-4, PSU-5 and PSU-6 were incorporated to include reference to other sections within the Recirculated Draft EIR; however, the significance determinations remain unchanged.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Minor edits in the environmental setting were incorporated for clarification and internal consistency. Revisions to the regulatory section were made to reflect the current regulatory environment. The methodology was expanded to include additional methodology details. Additionally, minor additions and revisions were incorporated into Impacts TRANS-1 through TRANS-5 for clarification; however, impact determinations and mitigation measures remain unchanged.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The environmental and regulatory settings were updated to reflect current conditions, water use projections, and water supply scenarios, and wastewater treatment facilities and conditions. In addition, the current irrigation water demand was incorporated into the section. A description of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and Sacramento County Water Agency's joint water recycling program was added to the section, as well as a description of publicly owned treatment works. Applicable portions of the Sacramento LAFCo's Policies, Standards, and Procedures were added to the section. The methodology was expanded to include additional methodology details.

Impact USS-1, the potential to result in the generation of a demand for increased water services over that which is currently produced in the area or result in a need for additional water supplies or facilities, was revised to include specific details about the potential water demands within the SOIA area, and analysis of existing water supplies. The significance determination prior to mitigation was revised from potentially significant impact to potentially significant cumulative impact. The requirement to implement Mitigation Measure HYD-2 was removed. Mitigation Measure USS-1 was revised to require demonstration of availability of water supply, signatory to the Water Forum Successor Effort, consistency between the geographic extent of the SOIA area and the amount of water supplied, and that existing water customers would not be adversely affected. The significance determination after mitigation was revised from less than significant to significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

Impact USS-2, the potential to require or result in the construction of new wastewater collection and treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, was amended to include the process for future annexations. The significance determination was changed from less than significant to significant and unavoidable.

Impact USS-4, the potential to be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity and would comply with applicable regulations, was amended with estimated rates of waste generation.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Table 4-1, Cumulative Projects List, was updated to incorporate the current cumulative projects under consideration. The cumulative impacts analysis was updated and amended to reflect the analyses contained within the individual impact sections.

ALTERNATIVES

The significant and unavoidable impacts discussion was updated for internal consistency. The Enhanced Regional Alternative was modified to include the area east of Highway 99 within the County's Urban Service Boundary. Minor edits, clarifications, and amendments were incorporated throughout the Alternatives section.

OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

The significant and unavoidable impacts discussion was updated for internal consistency. The Growth Inducing analysis was expanded and modified for clarity.

APPENDICES

A new appendix, consisting of the written comments received during the previously circulated Draft EIR public comment period, was included in the document as Appendix B. In addition, previously circulated Appendix D was removed. The remaining appendices numeration was adjusted accordingly.