
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with the City of Elk Grove General Plan Update Project (Project, proposed Project). CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “project” refers to the whole of an action which has the potential to result in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]). With respect to the proposed Project, the City of Elk Grove has determined that the proposed General Plan Update is a project under the definition of CEQA.

The City, acting as the lead agency, has caused this EIR to be prepared to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project. As described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a), an EIR is a public informational document that assesses potential environmental effects of the proposed project and identifies mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. Public agencies are charged with the duty to consider and minimize environmental impacts of proposed land use plans and development where feasible, and are obligated to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

This section summarizes the purpose of the EIR, describes the environmental review procedures required by State law, discusses the intended uses of the EIR, and describes the EIR’s scope and organization, lead agency contact person, and impact terminology.

1.2 TYPE OF DOCUMENT

The General Plan Update EIR was prepared as a program EIR, pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. A program EIR examines potential environmental impacts on a geographical area in which the lead agency will evaluate a series of subsequent projects. This type of EIR focuses on the changes in the environment that would result from implementation of the overall project, including land uses, transportation systems, and other infrastructure required to serve the project. The General Plan Update EIR will provide program-level environmental review of these subsequent activities. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c), the City will review subsequent activities to determine whether the activity is within the scope of the Project covered by the program EIR or whether a project-specific environmental document must be prepared. If the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, that no new significant effects would occur and no new mitigation measures would be required, the City may determine that the Project was adequately evaluated in the program EIR and that no new environmental document is required.

1.3 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

The purpose of an EIR is neither to recommend approval nor denial of a project. An EIR is an informational document used in the planning and decision-making process by the lead agency and responsible and trustee agencies. An EIR describes the significant environmental impacts of a project, potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant impacts that are identified, and potentially feasible alternatives that can avoid significant environmental effects or reduce them to less than significant. CEQA requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental effects when deciding whether to approve a project. The General Plan is a long-term policy guide for the development of the City, but does not propose

1.0 INTRODUCTION

specific development that can be analyzed at a project-specific level. Therefore, the City prepared a program EIR for the General Plan Update. A program EIR provides a more general analysis of the General Plan that focuses on the *overall* effects of the proposed General Plan. Because the General Plan is a policy-level document, the City is not committed to development at any particular densities or intensities and there is no assurance that development will occur under the proposed Project, even though the General Plan designates areas for a particular land use and specifies minimum and maximum intensities. CEQA recognizes that the impacts of policy-level decisions cannot be predicted or examined with the same exactitude and detail required for a construction project, and where the proposed project is a large-scale, planning-level decision, an EIR may contain only generalized mitigation criteria and policy-level alternatives, and defer future study of the formulation of details regarding later, site-specific projects (*Koster v. County of San Joaquin* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 29 at pp. 37, 41).

Tiering refers to the concept of a multilevel approach to preparing environmental documents set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152. Subsequent project-level environmental analysis can be streamlined to limit the scope of site-specific approvals following the preparation of an EIR for a general plan. This streamlining provision applies to site-specific approvals for projects that are consistent with the general plan. This program EIR will, in practice, help determine the need for and streamline the scope of subsequent environmental review for projects addressed in the general plan EIR. Furthermore, a program EIR can be incorporated by reference in subsequent project-specific documents to address cumulative impacts and growth-inducing impacts. In this way, subsequent documents may focus on new or site-specific impacts (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d]).

This EIR includes quantified estimates of potential impacts on transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and other topics, based on reasonable assumptions regarding the amount, type, and character of land use changes described in the General Plan. In addition, this EIR references General Plan policies and programs that will serve to avoid or reduce the impacts of future projects accommodated under the General Plan. Thus, the impact analysis in this program EIR will serve to streamline and expedite environmental review of later projects that are consistent with the policies and programs of the General Plan and adopt the relevant mitigation measures in the General Plan EIR. Because the General Plan does not contain details of any specific project, the project-specific effects cannot be analyzed without speculation as to the ultimate use that could be proposed on a particular site. The proposed General Plan designations provide the parameters of uses that would be allowed, but a multitude of different business types or residential uses could be developed at varying intensities or densities at any particular location, so the project-level detail is not available to support meaningful environmental evaluation of project-level impacts at specific sites.

This program EIR also addresses the potential environmental effects associated with implementing the City's Climate Action Plan. The emissions reduction measures in the Climate Action Plan implement policies outlined in the General Plan; therefore, this analysis of the environmental impacts of adopting the General Plan also addresses implementation of the Climate Action Plan, including beneficial impacts related to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and energy conservation.

To maximize the value of the General Plan EIR to future projects that are consistent with the General Plan's objectives, the City has strategically integrated the General Plan and the environmental review. The General Plan Update process, including the development of policies that will reduce environmental effects, was used to refine the City's policies and programs to serve as uniformly applied standards and to limit the scope of analysis for projects consistent with the General Plan.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

Responsible agencies are State and local public agencies, other than the lead agency, that have some authority to carry out or approve the project or a portion of the project for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR.

Trustee agencies under CEQA are designated public agencies with legal jurisdiction over natural resources that are held in trust for the people of California and that would be affected by a project.

Because the proposed Project is a General Plan, there are no agencies other than the City of Elk Grove that have approval or permitting authority for the Plan's adoption. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan (i.e., approval of specific projects) could involve many responsible agencies depending upon the specifics of later projects. The following are some of the agencies that could be required to act as responsible agencies for subsequent projects under the General Plan:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- State Lands Commission
- State Water Resources Control Board
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Sacramento County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)
- Elk Grove Unified School District (EGUSD)

1.4 EIR SCOPE AND ORGANIZATION

Sections 15120 through 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines identify the content requirements for Draft and Final EIRs. An EIR must include a description of the environmental setting, an environmental impact analysis, mitigation measures, alternatives, significant unavoidable environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts.

SCOPE

The City determined the scope for this EIR based on the Notice of Preparation (NOP), comments in response to the NOP, agency consultation, and review of the proposed General Plan. The NOP identified that one issue area would result in no impact, and this issue is scoped out of the EIR:

Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow

Based on the Project's location (inland, away from any water bodies) and topography (relatively flat), there would be no impact related to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. This impact will not be discussed further.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized in the following manner:

Section ES – Executive Summary

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed Project and includes a summary table of the Project's significant environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures.

Section 1.0 – Introduction

Section 1.0 provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process.

Section 2.0 – Project Description

Section 2.0 describes the proposed Project in detail, including intended objectives, background information, and physical and technical characteristics.

Section 3.0 – Demographics

Section 3.0 describes the existing population, employment, and housing levels in the City and Sacramento County and evaluates population, employment, and housing changes caused by the proposed Project that could have the potential to cause physical environmental effects.

Section 4.0 – Land Use

Section 4.0 addresses the land use and planning implications of the Project and discusses potential inconsistencies with land use plans.

Section 5.0 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Section 5.0 contains an analysis of environmental topic areas as identified below. Each subsection contains a description of the existing setting of the Project area, identifies standards of significance, identifies Project-related impacts, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less than significant.

The following major environmental topics are addressed in this section:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Public Services and Recreation
- Public Utilities
- Transportation

Section 6.0 – Other CEQA Considerations

This section contains discussions and analysis of various topical issues mandated by CEQA. These include significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the Project is implemented, growth-inducing impacts, and energy conservation. As required by CEQA Section 15130, an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. The cumulative impacts of the Project are addressed in the technical sections of this Draft EIR and summarized in this section.

Section 7.0 – Project Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project and avoid and/or lessen its environmental effects. This alternatives analysis provides a comparative analysis between the Project and the selected alternatives, which include the following:

Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes the implementation of the existing General Plan (2003), instead of the proposed General Plan Update. Under this alternative, the existing General Plan land uses would remain in place and development within the City would occur as originally anticipated, with its emphasis on carefully managed growth and buildout of the SEPA community plan area.

Alternative 2 – Additional Climate Action Plan Measures

Under this alternative, the City of Elk Grove would adopt additional measures in the Climate Action Plan (CAP) that would further exceed established GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2030, and allow the City to meet the State's targets for 2050. The Administrative Draft EIR concludes that GHG emissions are a less than significant impact for 2020 and 2030, but a significant and unavoidable impact for 2050 due to uncertainty regarding availability of measures to reach 2050 emissions reduction targets. Additional measures may include, but are not limited to, CALGreen Tier 1/NetZero by 2020, additional transportation sector measures, a direct offset program, and other emissions reduction options discussed as part of the project but not included in the proposed CAP.

Alternative 3 – Reduced Study Areas

This alternative reduces the extent of the Study Areas to those areas within the existing Sacramento County Urban Services Boundary (USB) as well as the area included in the Kammerer/99 Sphere of Influence Amendment that was filed by a private developer for the area south of Kammerer Road and west of State Route 99. This would result in a reduction in the size of the West and South Study Areas. The East and North Study Areas would remain the same as the proposed Project.

Alternative 4 – Increased Development Intensity Alternative

This alternative increases the allowable residential density and non-residential development intensity for selected key sites around the City. In addition, for this alternative the land use designations for several additional sites would be changed from Low Density Residential (LDR) to High Density Residential (HDR).

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Alternative 5 – Increased Employment Alternative

This alternative changes the land use designations for certain areas of the City in order to allow for more office development, thereby generating a greater number of jobs in Elk Grove.

Section 8.0 – Report Preparation

This section lists all authors and agencies that assisted in the preparation of the report by name, title, and company or agency affiliation.

Appendices

This section includes all notices and other procedural documents pertinent to the EIR, as well as technical material prepared to support the analysis.

1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review and certification process for the EIR will involve the following procedural steps:

NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared an NOP of an EIR for the Project on June 23, 2017. This notice was circulated to the public, local, State, and federal agencies, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the Project. After initial review of the Project, the City determined that an EIR should be prepared and therefore no initial study was prepared and is not required, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(a). The NOP is presented in **Appendix A**. The City held an EIR scoping meeting on July 11, 2017, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.9 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15083.

DRAFT EIR PUBLIC NOTICE/PUBLIC REVIEW

This Draft EIR contains a description of the Project, description of the environmental setting, identification of Project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives. Upon completion of the Draft EIR, the City filed the Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code Section 21161). Concurrent with the NOC, the City provided public Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR for public review to invite comment from the public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The review period for this Draft EIR is 60 days, from July 27 through September 26, 2018. Public comment on the Draft EIR will be accepted both in written form and orally at public hearings. Although no public hearings to accept comments on the EIR are required by CEQA, the City will hold a public comment meeting during the 60-day review period prior to EIR certification. Notice of the time and location of the hearing will be published prior to the hearing. All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Christopher Jordan, AICP
City of Elk Grove
8401 Laguna Palms Way
Elk Grove, CA 95758

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

Following the public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared. The Final EIR will respond to written comments received during the public review period and to oral comments made at public hearings regarding the Project.

CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR/PROJECT CONSIDERATION

The Elk Grove Planning Commission will review and consider the Final EIR. If the Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR is “adequate and complete,” the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council whether to certify the EIR, and the City Council will make a final decision as to what action to take. The Planning Commission and City Council will each hold a hearing on the Project as part of consideration of its requested entitlements. A decision to approve the Project would be accompanied by written findings in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and, if applicable, a Statement of Overriding Considerations in accordance with Section 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as described below, would also be adopted for the mitigation measures contained in the EIR to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. This MMRP would be designed to ensure that these measures are carried out by assigning responsibility for implementation and monitoring as well as a schedule for implementation.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

CEQA Section 21081.6(a) requires lead agencies to adopt an MMRP to describe measures that have been adopted or made a condition of Project approval to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The specific “reporting or monitoring” program required by CEQA is not required to be included in the EIR; however, it will be presented to the City Council for adoption. Throughout the EIR, mitigation measures are clearly identified and presented in language that will facilitate establishment of an MMRP. Any mitigation measures adopted by the City as conditions for approval of the Project will be included in the MMRP to facilitate compliance tracking.

1.6 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The City received comment letters on the NOP for the Project (see **Table 1.0-1**). A copy of each letter is provided in **Appendix B** of this Draft EIR. **Table 1.0-1** summarizes the comments contained in each letter from agencies and interested parties.

TABLE 1.0-1
LIST OF NOP COMMENT LETTERS

| Agency/Individual | Date | Comment | Location Addressed in EIR |
|---|---------|--|--|
| Elk Grove Unified School District (EGUSD) | 7-24-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity sites 2 and 3 will have significant regional and cumulative impacts to the District’s existing facilities based on the recommended alternatives and capacity is not available at Irene B. West school with the new land use plan. Anticipated future students for the regional middle and high school capacity has already been allocated in the existing land use plans. | Section 5.11, Public Services and Recreation |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

| Agency/Individual | Date | Comment | Location Addressed in EIR |
|--|---------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If infill land use changes are made, it will trigger the need for an additional middle/high school site. • Until development plans are presented for sites 2 and 3, it seems prudent to plan for the maximum number of dwelling units and additional students from those planning areas, which could trigger need for both an additional elementary and regional middle/high school if developed as projected. • As development occurs, EGUSD planning staff will work with City staff and developers to identify school sites. | |
| United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) | 7-24-17 | <p>UAIC recommends updates in the General Plan to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 and Senate Bill 18. • Update addressing the City’s Tribal Consultation Policy. • City’s Historic Preservation ordinances for Native American and historic cultural resources. | Section 5.5, Cultural Resources |
| Triangle Community Group | 7-22-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate nighttime light and glare for Triangle area. • Mitigate for air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise pollution related to transit traffic; traffic circles at all intersections. • Excavated channels that support native plant and wildlife species. • Endangered Swainson’s hawk in the Triangle area. • Cultural resources. • Evaluate any potential changes in residential density in the Triangle area. • Higher housing densities bring increased need for more police and fire protection. How much and when will increased police and fire services be provided regardless of the zoning? • Concern for reduction in sources for groundwater recharge. • References California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act impacts on the Triangle area. • Surface drainage continues to be a problem; higher-density housing has potential to increase flows beyond current infrastructure capabilities. • Intersection congestion expected at Bradshaw/Elk Grove Boulevard; Elk Grove Boulevard/Grant Line Road; and Bradshaw Road/Grant Line Road. | <p>Section 5.1, Aesthetics, Light, and Glare</p> <p>Section 5.3, Air Quality</p> <p>Section 5.4, Biological Resources</p> <p>Section 5.5, Cultural Resources</p> <p>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality</p> <p>Section 5.10, Noise</p> <p>Section 5.11, Public Services and Recreation</p> <p>Section 5.13, Transportation</p> |
| Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) | 7-21-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the Project’s consistency with existing plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) ○ California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Climate Change Scoping Plan ○ Elk Grove’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) ○ Elk Grove’s Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan | <p>Section 5.3, Air Quality</p> <p>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>Section 5.13, Transportation</p> |

| Agency/Individual | Date | Comment | Location Addressed in EIR |
|--------------------------------|---------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sacramento Tree Foundation’s Regional Greenprint Initiative ○ Capital SouthEast Connector Project Design Guidelines ● Evaluate the effectiveness of the existing CAP. ● Expand the City’s existing tree policies and evaluate tree canopy as a climate adaptation measure. ● Evaluate exposure reduction measures to reduce sensitive receptor exposures to air pollution near major roadways and railways. ● Disclose potential cancer risk to receptors near major roadways. ● Vehicle miles traveled (VMT). ● Consider additional multimodal performance indicators such as transit capacity or quality of service as part of roadway efficiency analysis. ● Transit-oriented development. | |
| Lynn Wheat | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop traffic model for entire area covered by the EIR and assume worst case. ● Acknowledge the qualitative or perceived impacts from a quality of life perspective. ● Quantify projected peak vehicle travel times along major arterials. ● Assess traffic levels on major arterials at less than full roadway buildout scenarios—phased or interim approach. ● Include updated air quality modeling that considers full buildout of the entire region. ● Health risk assessment for air quality. ● Take proactive approach to risk assessment due to Elk Grove 24-million-gallon aboveground propane storage tanks. ● Evacuation plans. ● Potential risk sites. ● Consider risk sites susceptible to terrorism. ● Risks from transportation of hazardous materials, including by rail. | <p>Section 5.3, Air Quality</p> <p>Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p> <p>Section 5.13, Transportation</p> |
| Laguna Creek Watershed Council | 7-24-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Integrate a creek corridor protection policy into the General Plan. ● Adopt subdivision standards that optimize use of low-impact development practices. ● Set aside areas in City parks to maintain features, not only landscape features. ● Implement overlay zones that protect riparian corridors and aquifer recharge areas. ● Integrate climate mitigation and adaptation strategies whenever possible. | <p>Section 5.4, Biological Resources</p> <p>Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality</p> |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

| Agency/Individual | Date | Comment | Location Addressed in EIR |
|--|---------|--|---------------------------|
| Sacramento Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCo) | 7-24-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study areas identified in NOP Figure 3 are outside of the City's SOI. • LAFCo is a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA. • Define the Opportunity Sites and Study Areas in detail to allow permit reviewer to determine land use designations and uses within such areas, land use intensities, and policies that will apply within those designations. • Articulate infill strategy and encouragement of infill and the provision of service to such projects. • SACOG Blueprint and the MTP/SCS consistency. • Include comprehensive annexation policies, thorough agriculture and open space preservation program. • Future role and sequence of LAFCo in any General Plan Update New Growth strategy and LAFCo's role as a responsible agency. • Loss of affordable housing. • Primary and secondary effects of construction/operation on services and utilities. • Capacity to serve new development. • Evaluate whether providers can service infill and new growth areas without affecting existing service levels. • Would City perform any services now being provided by another service provider? Effects on those providers. • Agricultural lands, loss trends. • Williamson Act contracts. • Farmland security zone. • Characteristics of soil. • Prime agricultural land displayed on a map. • Evaluate countywide agricultural land loss, and what portion of the overall inventory and loss that such a project represents. • Open space resources should be depicted on a map. • Evaluate countywide open space loss and what portion of the overall inventory and loss that such a project represents. • Environmental justice. • Disadvantaged unincorporated communities. • Include map of analysis of the characteristics of any island, fringe, or legacy unincorporated communities as defined. • Biological resource evaluation should include an evaluation of impacts to the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP). • The City is not a participant in the SSHCP, and coverage within those unincorporated areas that are currently in the USB may cease upon annexation to the City. Additionally, there are portions of the Study Areas that | Throughout EIR |

| Agency/Individual | Date | Comment | Location Addressed in EIR |
|--|---------|--|--|
| | | <p>are outside of the USB and are not scheduled to receive coverage by the SSHCP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodplain areas. • Include evaluation of the City’s existing/future compliance with regulations of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan. • 200-year (0.5 percent) flood. • Consistency evaluation with SACOG Blueprint and MTP/SCS and SSHCP. • Climate change. | |
| Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) | 7-24-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the Blueprint vision depends on cities to implement it. • The Draft Land Use Map and Draft Transportation Network Diagram included in the NOP include potential growth areas and proposed transportation projects that are not included in the 2016 MTP/SCS. | Section 3.0, Demographics Section 4.0, Land Use |
| Michael Monasky | 7-24-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrians aren’t safe due to auto-oriented streets. • No sufficient soccer facilities. • Groundwater table is being severely depleted. • SSHCP. • Ignored global warming threats. • Advanced minimum wage ordinance. • Prepare health impact assessment through County Health Department for heart and lung disease, obesity, diabetes, mental health, anxiety, depression, and air and water pollution. | Section 5.3, Air Quality Section 5.4, Biological Resources Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality Section 5.11, Public Services and Recreation Section 5.12, Public Utilities Section 5.13, Transportation |
| Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) | 7-24-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overhead/underground transmission and distribution line easements. • Utility line routing. • Electrical load needs/requirements. • Energy efficiency. • Climate change. • Cumulative impacts related to the need for increased electrical delivery. | Section 5.12, Public Utilities Section 6.0, Energy Conservation |
| Delta Protection Commission | 7-25-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the Commission’s Land Use and Management Plan and its policies when assessing the Project’s consistency with applicable land use plans and policies. | Section 4.0, Land Use |
| California Department of Transportation | 7-21-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination for work within, over, under, or adjacent to public transportation rights-of-way. • Include traffic study to determine potential project | Section 5.13, Transportation |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

| Agency/Individual | Date | Comment | Location Addressed in EIR |
|---|---------|---|--|
| (Caltrans) | | impacts to State and local facilities; must include State Route 99 and Interstate 5 mainline and interchanges in the Elk Grove Planning Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multimodal (vehicle, bike pedestrian, and transit) transportation opportunities. • Consider if there will be a reduction or increase in VMT. • Include a VMT-based transportation analysis, develop VMT threshold for CEQA analysis. • Analyze potential direct and cumulative State Highway System impacts and mitigate by General Plan and associated documents. • It is recommended the City adopt the I-5 Subregional Corridor Mitigation Program (SCMP). | |
| Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board | 7-18-17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide overview of the Regional Board's jurisdiction and regulations. | Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality |

1.7 IMPACT TERMINOLOGY

This Draft EIR uses the following terminology to describe environmental effects of the proposed Project:

- **Standards of Significance:** A set of criteria used by the lead agency to determine at what level or "threshold" an impact would be considered significant. Significance criteria used in this EIR include the CEQA Guidelines, factual or scientific information, regulatory performance standards of local (e.g., City and County), State, and federal agencies, and City goals, objectives, and policies.
- **Less Than Significant Impact:** A less than significant impact would cause no substantial change in the environment. No mitigation is required.
- **Significant Impact:** A significant impact would cause, or would potentially cause, a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions of the environment. Significant impacts are identified by the evaluation of Project effects using specified standards of significance. Mitigation measures and/or Project alternatives are identified to reduce Project effects on the environment.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** A significant and unavoidable impact would result in a substantial change in the environment that cannot be avoided or mitigated to a less than significant level.