

S.1 Introduction

This section presents a summary of the Capital SouthEast Connector project (project) draft program environmental impact report (EIR), including an overview of the project description and a summary of the impacts and mitigation measures for the proposed project and project options (Table S-1), and for the alternatives to the proposed project (Table S-2).

S.2 Project Background and Overview

In December 2006, the Cities of Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and Folsom, and Sacramento and El Dorado Counties (member agencies), collaborated to form the Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to facilitate the planning, environmental review, engineering design, and development, and construction of the Capital SouthEast Connector Project (also known as the Connector, or proposed project). The proposed project is a 35-mile-long multi-modal transportation facility that will link communities in Sacramento and El Dorado Counties, including Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, and El Dorado Hills. The project limits extend from the Interstate 5 (I-5)/Hood Franklin Road interchange in southwest Sacramento County to approximately 35 miles northeastward, terminating at U.S. Highway 50 (US 50) in the community of El Dorado Hills, near Silva Valley Parkway approximately 3 miles east of the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line.

The Connector is envisioned to link residential areas and employment centers in the project corridor, serving both local and regional travel needs and substantially reducing the excessive traffic volumes that currently overburden existing two-lane roadways, which were never intended to serve as major commuter routes. When completed, the proposed project would be a road of four to six traffic lanes with limited access points that would accommodate a variety of regional transportation needs. The Connector will provide options for a variety of travel modes throughout the project corridor. Additional information on the background of the project is included in Chapter 1.

S.3 Opportunities for Public Input on the Draft EIR

During the 60-day public review of the draft program EIR (from March 14 to May 13, 2011), the JPA will conduct informational meetings to present the results of the draft program EIR analysis and solicit comments during review of the public draft program EIR. The meetings are scheduled for the following locations and times:

- Tuesday, April 12, 2011, from 6p.m. to 8 p.m. at William Brooks Elementary School, 3610 Park Drive, El Dorado Hills
- Wednesday, April 13, 2011, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., at Rancho Cordova City Hall, American River Room, 2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova
- Thursday, April 14, 2011, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., at Elk Grove City Hall, Council Chambers, 8400 Laguna Palms Way, Elk Grove

- Tuesday, April 19, 2011, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., at the Sacramento County Agricultural Extension Auditorium, 4145 Branch Center Road, Sacramento
- Wednesday, April 20, 2011, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., at the Folsom Community Center, 52 Natoma Street, Folsom

Questions about the draft program EIR meetings can be directed to the JPA offices at 916/876-9094.

S.3.1 Purpose of Program EIR

This EIR will serve as a program EIR for the proposed project. Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a “program EIR” as an EIR that may be prepared on “a series of related actions which can be characterized as one large project,” such as phased projects. Use of a program EIR allows a CEQA lead agency (in this case, the JPA) to characterize the overall program of actions as the “project” being approved at the time (in this case, the selection of a maximum 1,000-foot-wide corridor connecting communities between I-5 in Elk Grove and US 50 in El Dorado County). When subsequent activities are proposed, a determination will be made at that time whether additional CEQA documents are necessary if significant impacts occur that were not examined in the program EIR. This concept, referred to as “tiering,” addresses the coverage of general matters in broader EIRs with subsequent negative declarations or site-specific EIRs. These subsequent, project-specific environmental documents will incorporate by reference the general discussions in the previously prepared program EIR, and concentrate solely on the issues specific to the environmental analysis prepared for a project segment. A program EIR can act as the first-tier analysis for subsequent, more detailed project-specific environmental review.

In the case of the proposed project, multiple project-specific sections of the overall Connector corridor will be designed and implemented over time. This program EIR will provide the CEQA lead and responsible agencies with a base reference of facts and analyses that will avoid unnecessary repetition for future project-specific assessments by member agencies on individual project segments, and will allow for a comprehensive approach to the consideration of regional and cumulative impacts. Additional information on CEQA requirements is provided in Chapter 1.

S.4 Project Objectives

There are numerous regional and local deficiencies in the project corridor’s existing roadway facilities, which create a variety of transportation problems, including insufficient transportation options for persons, and goods and freight movement to, from, and within the corridor. The overall objectives of the project are to improve mobility, access, and connections between residential and nonresidential land uses, which have been compromised by increasing congestion, and to assist in preservation of open space and threatened habitats. The project is intended to link employment centers and residential areas in the corridor and contribute to the remedy for current and future deficiencies in transportation capacity, safety, and land use compatibility. The project would serve both regional and local travel needs, and would relieve congestion on heavily used local roadways that currently serve the corridor. The specific objectives of the project are to:

- enhance mobility options within the project corridor and support planned growth;
- aid economic vitality by improving accessibility to existing and planned job centers and commercial areas;

- provide a limited-access, multi-modal facility; and
- preserve open space, wildlife habitat, and productive agricultural uses in the corridor.

These objectives are described in detail in Chapter 2.

S.5 Project Description

S.5.1 Project Components and Locations

The overall design concept for the Connector involves limiting access to the roadway facility—the more limited the access, the more capacity is improved along the segment, and the more unplanned growth is limited. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities also will be included in the design along the alignment; these facilities vary by the type of roadway segment. The proposed project includes improvements to the following segments along the 35-mile-long project corridor:

- a four-lane expressway segment from the I-5/Hood Franklin Road interchange east along an extension of Kammerer Road to the existing Kammerer Road/Bruceville Road intersection, with at-grade signalized intersections (spaced at a minimum of one mile apart) at Franklin Boulevard, Willard Parkway and Bruceville Road. These intersections would be converted to grade-separated interchanges as required by traffic volumes and LOS conditions. An optional alignment for Kammerer Road has been identified, as discussed in Section S.5.5. below under “Optional Project Components”;
- a four-to six-lane thoroughfare segment east of Kammerer Road from its intersection with Bruceville Road and then north on Grant Line Road to its intersection with Bond Road, with at-grade signalized intersections spaced 0.5 mile apart where feasible;
- several options for the alignment from Bond Road to Calvine Road through the Sheldon area have been identified, as discussed in Section S.5.5 below under “Optional Project Components”;
- a four- to six-lane expressway segment on Grant Line Road from its intersection with Calvine Road to White Rock Road, and on White Rock Road from Grant Line Road to the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line, with directional grade-separated interchanges at most major cross streets when warranted by LOS conditions;
- a four- lane thoroughfare segment on White Rock Road from the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line to the US 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange; and
- an in-corridor multi-use path with non-motorized multi-modal facilities, including Class I, II, and III Bike lanes throughout the project corridor, depending on the design.

S.5.2 Transit Services and Facilities

The Connector JPA has adopted transit policies, as part of its Integrated Modes Policy, to provide capital funding for cost-effective transit facilities along the project alignment and provide funding for strategic, cost-effective capital improvements on routes parallel to the project alignment that can demonstrate strong potential for high-use service. As such, the proposed project includes considerations for expanded transit service in the project area. The project design would accommodate intersection signal priority (“queue jumps”), park-and-ride lots, and other transit-

related components, which would be defined and implemented in a phased manner, consistent with development and ridership growth trends.

S.5.3 Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Alternative

As an alternative to constructing an enhanced in-corridor multi-use path included in the proposed project, the JPA could construct a basic multi-use path within the Connector corridor and construct segments of an off-corridor trail in coordination with local park jurisdictions. The Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path would link existing disconnected trail segments in the study area. Segments of a Class I multi-use path off the project corridor would be constructed along Laguna Creek, the Folsom South Canal, and Alder Creek to complete the off-corridor trail. The off-corridor multi-use path alternative is described further in Chapter 2.

S.5.4 Optional Project Components

Several optional project components are under consideration as alternatives to various segments along the proposed corridor. These “options” provide alternative alignments to the proposed project along Kammerer Road south of Elk Grove and along Grant Line Road through the community of Sheldon. The following optional components are evaluated in this program EIR:

- Kammerer Road Bypass Option,
- Deer Creek Causeway Options,
- Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway (RAR) Option, and
- Sheldon High Access Roadway Option.

These optional project components are described in detail in Chapter 2.

S.6 Impacts of the Proposed Project

S.6.1 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

As shown in Table S-1, significant and unavoidable impacts (i.e., impacts that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level) would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project or project options:

- construction of the Deer Creek Causeway on concrete piers and bridges would diminish the predominantly rural, agricultural, and natural visual character of the area, specifically at the overcrossing of Deer Creek and its associated riparian/wetland habitat in the Cosumnes River floodplain;
- operation of the project would contribute to an increase of traffic emissions above the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District’s threshold;
- construction of the project and/or its options could lead to permanent impacts on wetlands and loss or disturbance of special-species wildlife and their habitats;
- construction of the project and/or its options could destroy or damage cultural resources or historic architectural resources;

- the RAR Option would limit access from one side of the Sheldon community to the other side of Grant Line Road;
- construction and operation of the project and/or its options would convert both prime farmland and Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural uses;
- both construction and operation of the project would expose noise-sensitive land uses to noise and vibration;
- the proposed project would result in increased growth and development; and
- the proposed project under any of the Sheldon Options (i.e., the Deer Creek Causeway, RAR, or High Access Road Option) would increase traffic volumes and adversely affect LOS on some non-project roadways and intersections in the traffic analysis study area.

S.7 Benefits of the Project

The State CEQA Guidelines require that the lead agency disclose the adverse environmental impacts of a proposed project, which are summarized in Table S-1 and described in detail in this program EIR. In addition to causing adverse impacts, the proposed project will also improve conditions (“benefits”) in certain issue areas. As described in the project objectives in detail in Chapter 2, the proposed project is intended to address several underlying traffic problems in the region. As such, the proposed project would have the following transportation benefits:

- decreased traffic on several arterial/collector roadway segments in the traffic analysis study area, as well as decreased traffic volumes on portions of US 50, SR 99 and I-5;
- reduced VMT and VHT percentages that would occur on congested roadways in the traffic analysis study area;
- substantially reduced delay and travel times along the project alignment;
- reduced overall delay on the entire roadway system serving the traffic analysis study area;
- reduced travel times between communities along the project alignment, especially along the expressway segment between Grant Line Road at Calvine Road and White Rock Road at the El Dorado County line;
- improved goods movement in the corridor by substantially reducing delay and travel times; and
- increased transit ridership through capital improvements.

These benefits are described in Chapter 16, “Traffic and Transportation.”

S.8 Project Alternatives

CEQA requires an EIR to examine a range of reasonable alternatives to the project. The process of selecting the following alternatives is described in Chapter 17 and Appendix H. The alternatives to the project that are evaluated in the program EIR are described below.

S.8.1 No-Project Alternative

The Connector No-Project Alternative represents existing conditions and what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project was not approved, based on current adopted local and regional plans. The roadway network under the No-Project Alternative represents, for the most part, the transportation system in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG's) adopted 2035 MTP, with widening of the existing roadways in the general project area to four or six lanes, with exceptions, as noted below. Access along the roadways within the general project area under the No-Project Alternative would have only minor limitations on new driveways and no reductions in the substantial number of existing driveways. The No-Project Alternative would have numerous at-grade intersections, with their locations based on adopted and proposed general plans and specific plans. These future roadway improvements would be intended to serve the planned growth in the general project area.

The planned improvements to the roadway network identified in the adopted 2035 MTP would include the following:

- White Rock Road would be widened to 1) six lanes from US 50 west to Latrobe Road, 2) four lanes from Manchester Drive west to the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line, and 3) six lanes from the county line west to Grant Line Road.
- Grant Line Road would be widened to 1) four lanes from White Rock Road south to Bradshaw Road, and 2) six lanes from Bradshaw Road to SR 99.
- Kammerer Road would be 1) widened to six lanes from SR 99 to Bruceville Road, and 2) extended as a four-lane road from Bruceville Road to I-5.

The No-Project Alternative reflects reasonably foreseeable improvements based on the implementation of existing plans. As described in more detail in Chapter 16, "Traffic and Transportation," general plans of the local jurisdictions within the study area reflect the following future roadway network. The No-Project Alternative assumes that the general plans' provisions will result in road improvements that vary from the 2035 MTP as follows:

- The number of lanes on White Rock Road from the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line to Scott Road was reduced from six to four to be consistent with the maximum number of lanes allowed on that segment in the Sacramento County General Plan currently being updated.
- An extension of Hazel Avenue from the future Easton Valley Parkway south to White Rock Road was not assumed because the Project Development Team (PDT) felt that this extension would not occur by 2035.
- The number of lanes on Scott Road between White Rock Road and future Road B was reduced from six (in the MTP) to four, and the number of lanes on Prairie City Road from US 50 to the future Easton Valley Parkway was increased from four (in the MTP) to six to be consistent with the proposed roadway improvements in the City of Folsom's plans for the Sphere of Influence (SOI) south of US 50.
- The proposed Cordova Hills project along Grant Line Road would have connections to Grant Line Road.

The primary difference between the No-Project Alternative and the proposed project is the amount and type of access along the project alignment. The proposed project would reduce the amount of access, especially on segments designated to have an expressway standard (Grant Line Road from

north of Calvine Road to White Rock Road, and White Rock Road from Grant Line Road to the Sacramento County/El Dorado County line). Table 16-12 in Chapter 16, "Traffic and Transportation," provides the list of cross streets along the project alignment and the future no-project traffic control (signal, interchanges, etc.).

S.8.2 Sunrise Boulevard Alternative

This alternative is similar to the proposed project, except that it would utilize existing Sunrise Boulevard for a portion of the alignment. At the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection, this alternative would follow Sunrise Boulevard north as an expressway to just north of SR 16 (Jackson Highway) and then as a thoroughfare north of SR 16 (Jackson Highway) to Douglas Road. North of Douglas Road, the alignment would be east of and parallel to Sunrise Boulevard, requiring an undefined new thoroughfare segment to provide a connection to White Rock Road. The alignment would continue east as a thoroughfare on White Rock Road through Rancho Cordova. East of Grant Line Road, the alignment is the same as the proposed project.

S.8.3 Bradshaw Road Alternative

This alternative is similar to the proposed project, except that it would utilize existing Bradshaw Road for a portion of the alignment and would avoid a lengthy section of Grant Line Road between its intersections with Bradshaw and Douglas Roads. At the Grant Line Road/Bradshaw Road intersection, this alternative would be a thoroughfare along Bradshaw Road north to SR 16 (Jackson Highway), with access limited and consolidated where feasible. A signalized intersection spacing of 0.5 mile may not be feasible in this area because of existing and approved development, and therefore minimal 0.25-mile spacing may be allowed for this stretch. From SR 16 (Jackson Highway), this alternative would continue as a new expressway in a predominantly easterly direction, along the southern boundary of Mather Airport, to the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road intersection. The alignment would then follow Douglas Road east as a thoroughfare to Grant Line Road, where it then follows Grant Line Road as an expressway. East of Grant Line Road, the alignment is the same as the proposed project.

S.8.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives that are analyzed in an EIR. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is defined as that alternative with the least adverse impacts on a project area and its surrounding environment. Because roadway improvements would generally be less extensive than what are proposed under the project or build alternatives, the No-Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. However, when a No-Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires that an EIR also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]).

The Sunrise Boulevard Alternative and Bradshaw Road Alternative both assume the same land use projections and population estimates, and would result in similar types of transportation improvements with similar impacts, although the locations and levels of impact could vary. Each of the alternatives will reduce one or more of the significant impacts of the project. Of the alternatives, the Sunrise Boulevard Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. However, none of the

alternatives would avoid all the significant impacts of the proposed project, and each would have greater impacts in some areas, as shown in Table S-2.

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts of the Alternatives Compared to the Proposed Project

Resource Topic	No-Project Alternative	Sunrise Boulevard Alignment Alternative	Bradshaw Road Alignment Alternative
Aesthetics	<	=	>
Air quality	<	=	=
Biological resources	<	<	>
Cultural resources	<	=	>
Energy	=	=	=
Geology, soils, and paleontological resources	<	=	=
Hazards and hazardous materials	<	=	>
Hydrology and water quality	<	>	>
Land use	<	=	=
Noise	=	=	>
Public services and utilities	<	>	>
Population and housing	=	=	=
Recreation	=	>	<
Traffic and transportation	<	=	=

Notes: < - impacts are less.
 > - impacts are greater.
 = - impacts are approximately the same.

S.8.5 Other Impact Conclusions

S.8.5.1 Cumulative and Growth-Related Impacts

The project would result in the following cumulative impacts (discussed in more detail in Chapter 18, "Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts"):

- degradation in aesthetic character and visual quality;
- increased greenhouse gas emissions;
- conversion of land uses to urban uses and disruption of established communities;
- increase traffic noise;
- increased loss of vernal pool species and habitat; and
- LOS impacts on non-project roadway segments.

S.8.5.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts

Under certain circumstances, improvements in mobility can result in making land more attractive for development. In such cases, transportation projects can contribute to inducement of growth that fosters "economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or

indirectly, in the surrounding environment” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2[d]). This issue is particularly relevant in areas where local plans do not call for urban development, as is the case in several sections of the corridor under consideration.

Although implementation of the proposed project would not involve any changes in land use plans, it could make some areas more attractive for development by improving access to those areas. Recognizing this effect, strategically applied access control and capacity characteristics would preserve the regional functionality of the project and, in part, relieve direct growth pressure on adjacent properties not designated for growth. However, the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable impact regarding inducement of substantial population growth because it could remove an obstacle to growth.

S.8.5.3 Irreversible Environmental Change

The State CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental change resulting from the project (Section 15126[f]). “Significant and irreversible change” is defined as the use of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of a project that require a large commitment of such resources that may make unlikely the future removal or nonuse of the resources. As discussed in Chapter 2, the project would result in acquisition of right-of-way for roadway use. Most converted land would be in the form of long, narrow bands adjacent to roadways (lane improvements or modifications), not large, contiguous parcels. The magnitude of this impact cannot be fully known until a project-level design is developed. However, the impact would represent a significant irreversible change to the environment because open space would be permanently converted.

Additionally, construction of the project will require irretrievable quantities of a variety of limited natural resources including aggregates, petrochemicals, metals, and asphalt products, although implementing the various sustainable design elements of the project could help recycle and reduce the waste generated by project construction.

S.8.5.4 Known Areas of Controversy

The State CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by other agencies and the public (Section 15123[b][2]). Several issues of concern were raised during the NOP comment period and at scoping meetings for the project in February and March, 2010; at public workshops held in the Sheldon and El Dorado Hills areas; and at monthly JPA Board meetings held over the life of the project. These issues include concerns over the Connector causing increased traffic volumes and safety concerns (and air quality and noise) adjacent to existing businesses and residences, the increased width of roadway bisecting existing communities, limiting access and causing right of way takes of homes and businesses fronting the Connector, EDH.

Based on concerns expressed by Elk Grove and Sheldon area residents and business owners about the proposed project’s changes to the planned improvements affecting the community character through Sheldon, the JPA undertook a study of the Sheldon area and the potential effects of different potential designs of a limited access roadway through the area in the summer of 2010. The study involved a design consultant to the JPA opening a “store front” in the Sheldon area for residents and business owners to stop by with comments and questions about the project. The effort also involved interactive “charette-style” workshops in summer 2010 and included recommendations on the

potential design of the roadway through the community. The JPA then worked with the City of Elk Grove and a community working group representing the Sheldon area to further refine the recommendations in December 2010 and incorporate design and performance criteria into the options in the Sheldon area that would be acceptable to the community and meet the project objectives. The JPA also considered alternate route options that would avoid the community impacts associated with expanding Grant Line Road through Sheldon (the Deer Creek Causeway Option 1 and Option 2) and alternatives that would avoid the Sheldon Community (The Sunrise and Bradshaw Alternatives). The options are described in detail in Chapter 2, and the alternatives are described in Chapter 17 of the draft program EIR.

To address concerns raised by the El Dorado Hills groups, the JPA conducted an analysis to provide more information on future travel patterns traveling to and from the easternmost segment of the Connector and to determine how the timing of roadway improvements will impact traffic patterns and volumes in the eastern segment of the project area. The summary of this study is included in Appendix J of this draft program EIR. The JPA also met with El Dorado County and representatives from the El Dorado Hills community to review the results of the traffic study, and clarify that the Connector design is consistent with the County's planned improvements for White Rock Road in El Dorado County.

Other issues raised during the NOP comment period, at public workshops, and at monthly JPA Board meetings have been addressed either through modifications of the proposed project (Chapter 2) or in the specific resource chapters addressing the topic raised (i.e., Chapter 3 through 18) in this program EIR.

Table S-1. Summary of Environmental Effects of the Capital SouthEast Connector Project

Impact	Significance before Mitigation							Significance after Mitigation					
	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway	Mitigation Measure	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway
Aesthetics													
AES-1: Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista	LTS	LTS	LTS	S	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	SU	LTS	LTS
AES-2: Damage to Scenic Resources or Degradation of Existing Visual Character or Quality	LTS	LTS	LTS	S	LTS	LTS	AES-1: Prepare a Construction Lighting Plan AES-2: Conform with Lighting Design Standards	LTS	LTS	LTS	SU	LTS	LTS
AES-3: New Source of Light or Glare	S	LTS	S	S	S	LTS	AES-1: Prepare a Construction Lighting Plan AES-2: Conform with Lighting Design Standards	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
AES-4: Temporary Alteration in the Visual Character	LTS	S	LTS	S	S	S	AES-1: Prepare a Construction Lighting Plan AES-2: Conform with Lighting Design Standards	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Air Quality and Climate Change													
AQ-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of an Applicable Air Quality Management Plan	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	-	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI
AQ-2: Violate any Air Quality Standard or Contribute Substantially to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation	Const: S Op: S	Const: NI Op: NI	Const: S Op: S	Const: S Op: S	Const: S Op: S	Const: S Op: S	AQ-1: Implement SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices to Reduce Fugitive Dust AQ-2: Limit Maximum Daily Disturbed Area to 15 Acres AQ-3: Implement SMAQMD Basic Construction Emission Control Practices to Reduce NO _x AQ-4: Implement SMAQMD Enhanced Construction Emission Control Practices to Reduce NO _x	Const: LTS Op: SU	Const: NI Op: NI	Const: LTS Op: SU	Const: LTS Op: SU	Const: LTS Op: SU	Const: LTS Op: SU
AQ-3: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations	S	NI	S	LTS	LTS	LTS	AQ-5: Implement Additional Exposure Reduction Strategies to Further Minimize Potential Health Risks AQ-6: Conduct a Geological Investigation for Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Implement an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan if Naturally Occurring Asbestos Is Found in the Project Area	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
AQ-4: Create Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Biological Resources													
BIO-1: Potential Loss of Special-Status Plant Species	S	S	S	S	S	S	BIO-1: Conduct an Environmental Awareness Training Program for Construction Crews BIO-2a: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Special-Status Plant Populations BIO-2b: Compensate for Impacts on Special-Status Plant Species	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
BIO-2: Potential Introduction or Spread of Invasive Plant Species	S	S	S	S	S	S	BIO-3: Avoid and Minimize the Introduction and Spread of Invasive Plant Species	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
BIO-3: Potential Disturbance or Conversion of Riparian Woodlands	S	S	NI	S	S	S	BIO-1: Conduct an Environmental Awareness Training Program for Construction Crews BIO-4a: Avoid and Minimize Potential Impacts on Riparian Woodlands BIO-4b: Compensate for the Loss of Riparian Community	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
BIO-4: Potential Loss or Alteration of Waters of the United States and Waters of the State	S	S	S	S	S	S	BIO-1: Conduct an Environmental Awareness Training Program for Construction Crews BIO-5a: Avoid and Minimize Disturbance of Waters of the United States and Waters of the State BIO-5b: Compensate for the Loss of Wetlands and Waters	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU

Notes: NI = no impact.
LTS = less than significant.
S = significant.
SU = significant and unavoidable.
- = not applicable.

Impact	Significance before Mitigation						Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation					
	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway		Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway
BIO-5: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Special-Status Wildlife Species and Their Habitat	S	S	S	S	S	S	BIO-1: Conduct an Environmental Awareness Training Program for Construction Crews BIO-6a: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Special-Status Wildlife Species BIO-6b: Compensate for Impacts on Special-Status Wildlife Species	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
BIO-6: Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	S	S	S	S	S	S	BIO-7: Review Local City and County Policies, Ordinances, and Conservation Plans and Comply with Requirements	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
BIO-7: Removal or Disturbance of Protected Trees	S	S	S	S	S	S	BIO-1: Conduct an Environmental Awareness Training Program for Construction Crews BIO-8a: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Protected Trees BIO-8b Compensate for Impacts on Protected Trees	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Cultural Resources													
CUL-1: Potential for Damage to or Destruction of Cultural Resources during Project Construction	S	S	S	S	S	S	CUL-1: Conduct Site-Specific Cultural Resource Investigations and Implement the Recommendations CUL-2: Stop Work If Archaeological Materials Are Discovered during Construction	SU	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CUL-2: Potential for Damage to or Destruction of Previously Undiscovered Human Remains	S	S	S	S	S	S	CUL-3: Stop Work If Human Remains Are Discovered during Construction	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CUL-3: Damage to Historical Architectural (Built Environment) Resources	S	S	S	S	S	S	CUL-4: Conduct Historic Inventory and Evaluation for Architectural Resources	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
Energy													
EN-1: Increased Consumption of Direct Energy	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
EN-2: Increased Consumption of Indirect Energy	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources													
GEO-1: Potential Structural Damage and Injury Caused by Fault Rupture	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
GEO-2: Potential Structural Damage and Injury from Ground Shaking	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
GEO-3: Potential Structural Damage and Injury from Development on Materials Subject to Liquefaction	S	S	S	S	S	S	GEO-1: Implement Seismic Design Standards into Site-Specific Project Design GEO-2: Conduct Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigations and Implement the Recommendations	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
GEO-4: Potential Structural Damage as a Result of Development on Expansive Soils	S	S	S	S	S	S	GEO-1: Implement Seismic Design Standards into Site-Specific Project Design GEO-2: Conduct Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigations and Implement the Recommendations	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
GEO-5: Potential Accelerated Runoff, Erosion, and Sedimentation from Construction Activities	S	S	S	S	S	S	HYD-1: Obtain an NPDES Construction General Permit and Incorporate its Requirements as Well as Those of Other Water Quality Regulations in Site-Specific Project Designs	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
GEO-6: Potential for Damage to or Destruction of Previously Undiscovered Buried Paleontological Sites	S	S	S	S	S	S	GEO-3: Stop Work if Paleontological Resources are Discovered During Construction and Implement Recommendations of Paleontologist	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Notes: NI = no impact.
LTS = less than significant.
S = significant.
SU = significant and unavoidable.
- = not applicable.

Impact	Significance before Mitigation							Significance after Mitigation					
	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway	Mitigation Measure	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway
Hazards and Hazardous Materials													
HAZ-1: Potential to Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment through the Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HAZ-2: Potential to Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment through Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and Accident Conditions Involving the Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HAZ-3: Potential to Emit Hazardous Emissions or Involve Handling Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within 0.25 Mile of an Existing or Proposed School	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HAZ-4: Potential to Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment	S	S	NI	S	NI	S	HAZ-1: Perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prior to Demolition and Construction Activities and Remediate If Required	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS	NI	LTS
HAZ-5: Potential for Increased Air or Ground Hazards for People Residing or Working in the Project Area	S	S	S	S	S	S	HAZ-2: Ensure Compliance with Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HAZ-6: Impair Implementation of or Physically Interfere with an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan	S	S	S	S	S	S	HAZ-3: Prepare a Traffic Management Plan and Construction Scheduling	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HAZ-7: Expose People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Wildland Fires	NI	LTS	NI	NI	NI	LTS	-	NI	LTS	NI	NI	NI	LTS
Hydrology and Water Quality													
HYD-1: Surface Water Quality Degradation Caused by Construction Activities	S	S	S	S	S	S	HYD-1: Obtain an NPDES Construction General Permit and Incorporate its Requirements as Well as Those of Other Water Quality Regulations in Site-Specific Project Designs	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HYD-2: Water Quality Degradation Caused by Construction Activities below the Water Table	S	LTS	S	S	S	S	HYD-2: Comply with Provisions for Dewatering	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HYD-3: Water Quality Degradation from Urban Runoff Caused by Increased Impervious Surfaces	S	S	S	S	S	S	HYD-3: Implement Measures to Maintain Water Quality After Construction HYD-4: Conduct Project-Level Drainage Studies for Project Design HYD-5: Design and Install Infiltration Systems	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HYD-4: Substantial Increased Runoff Resulting in Flooding	S	S	LTS	S	LTS	S	HYD-4: Conduct Project-Level Drainage Studies for Project Design	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HYD-5: Reduction in Groundwater Recharge Caused by Increased Impervious Surfaces	S	LTS	S	S	S	S	HYD-5: Design and Install Infiltration Systems	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
HYD-6: Discharges of Contaminants to 303(d) Listed Water Bodies	S	S	S	S	S	S	HYD-1: Obtain an NPDES Construction General Permit and Incorporate its Requirements as Well as Those of Other Water Quality Regulations in Site-Specific Project Designs HYD-3: Implement Measures to Maintain Water Quality After Construction	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Notes: NI = no impact.
 LTS = less than significant.
 S = significant.
 SU = significant and unavoidable.
 - = not applicable.

Impact	Significance before Mitigation							Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation					
	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway	Proposed Project		Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway	
HYD-7: Changes to Floodplain from Construction Activities	S	NI	S	S	NI	LTS	HYD-6: Avoid Restriction of Flood Flows and Obtain Agency Approval of Construction with 100-Year Floodplains	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS	
HYD-8: Potential for Inundation by Dam or Levee Failure	S	S	S	S	S	S	HYD-7: Design Projects to Pass Flows in the Event of Levee or Dam Failure	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
Land Use														
LU-1: Physically Divide an Established Community	S	NI	NI	NI	S	LTS	HAZ-3: Prepare a Traffic Management Plan and Construction Scheduling	LTS	NI	NI	NI	SU	LTS	
LU-2: Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plans and Policies	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	-	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
LU-3: Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	-	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
LU-4: Convert Farmland to Nonagricultural Uses	S	S	S	S	S	S	LU-1: The Proponent Agency Will Implement One or More of the Following Measures as Feasible to Reduce Impacts on Significant Farmland	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	
LU-5: Conflict with Existing Zoning for Agricultural Use or a Williamson Act Contract	S	S	S	S	S	S	LU-1: The Proponent Agency Will Implement One or More of the Following Measures as Feasible to Reduce Impacts on Significant Farmland	SU	SU	SU	SU	LTS	SU	
LU-6: Involve Other Changes That Could Result in Conversion of Farmland	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS	LU-1: The Proponent Agency Will Implement One or More of the Following Measures as Feasible to Reduce Impacts on Significant Farmland	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS	
Noise														
NOI-1: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Noise and Vibration from Project Construction	S	S	S	S	S	S	NOI-1: Employ Noise- and Vibration-Reducing Construction Practices	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	
NOI-2: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Increased Noise from Project Operation	S	LTS	S	S	S	S	NOI-2: Develop and Employ Site-Specific Measures to Reduce Traffic Noise	SU	LTS	SU	SU	SU	SU	
Population and Housing														
POP-1: Inducement of Substantial Population Growth	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	
POP-2: Displacement of Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing or People, Necessitating the Construction of Replacement Housing Elsewhere	S	S	S	S	S	S	POP-1: Develop and Implement a Relocation and Compensation Plan	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
Public Services and Utilities														
PS-1: Require or Result in the Construction of New Stormwater Drainage Facilities or Expansion of Existing Facilities, the Construction of Which Could Cause Significant Environmental Effects	S	S	S	S	S	S	PS-1: Implement Low-Impact Development Techniques for Control of Surface Drainage PS-2: Use Drought-Resistant Plants and Irrigation in Project Landscaping PS-3: Construction and Demolition Debris Produced by Implementation of the Proposed Project Will be Recycled and Properly Disposed	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
PS-2: Not Have Sufficient Water Supplies Available to Serve the Project From Existing Entitlements and Resources, or Require New or Expanded Entitlements	LTS	NI	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	PS-2: Use Drought-Resistant Plants and Irrigation in Project Landscaping	LTS	NI	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	

Notes: NI = no impact.
 LTS = less than significant.
 S = significant.
 SU = significant and unavoidable.
 - = not applicable.

Impact	Significance before Mitigation							Significance after Mitigation					
	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway	Mitigation Measure	Proposed Project	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	Kammerer Road Bypass	Deer Creek Causeway	Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	Sheldon High Access Roadway
PS-3: Be Served by a Landfill Without Sufficient Permitted Capacity to Accommodate the Project's Solid Waste Disposal Needs	S	S	S	S	S	S	PS-3: Construction and Demolition Debris Produced by Implementation of the Proposed Project Will be Recycled and Properly Disposed	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Recreation													
REC-1: Increased Use of Existing Neighborhood and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
REC-2: Inclusion of Recreational Facilities or Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities	LTS	LTS	NI	NI	NI	NI	REC-1: Conduct Project-Level Assessment of Impacts on Recreational Resources	LTS	LTS	NI	NI	NI	NI
Traffic and Transportation													
The proposed project would increase traffic volumes but not adversely affect levels of service along the proposed project alignment. (TRF-1, TRF-8, TRF-15, TRF-22)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	S	TRF-4: Widen roadway segments and intersections	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS
The proposed project would increase traffic volumes and adversely affect levels of service on non-project roadway segments and intersections in the TASA (TRF-2, TRF-9, TRF-16, TRF-23)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	S	S	S	Widen roadway segments and intersections (TRF-1, TRF-2, TRF-3, TRF-5)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	SU	SU	SU
The proposed project would not adversely affect traffic levels of service on freeways in the TASA (TRF-3, TRF-10, TRF-17, TRF-24)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS
The proposed project would not adversely affect existing or planned bikeway or pedestrian facilities (TRF-4, TRF-11, TRF-18, TRF-25)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS
The proposed project would not adversely affect existing or planned transit facilities, routes or services (TRF-5, TRF-12, TRF-19, TRF-26)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS
The proposed project would not conflict with General Plan principles for transit-supportive development (TRF-6, TRF-13, TRF-20, TRF-27)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS
The proposed project would not increase hazards due to design features (TRF-7, TRF-14, TRF-21, TRF-28)	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS	-	Not analyzed independently	-	-	LTS	LTS	LTS

Notes: NI = no impact.
 LTS = less than significant.
 S = significant.
 SU = significant and unavoidable.
 - = not applicable.

