Chapter 18
Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts

18.1 Cumulative Impacts

The State CEQA Guidelines define a *cumulative impact* as one in which two or more individual impacts which, when considered together, are significant or which compound or increase other significant environmental impacts. The incremental impact of a project may be considerable when viewed in the context of other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355).

18.1.1 CEQA Requirements

Cumulative impacts must consider the combined impact of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. When assessing a cumulative impact, an EIR must identify whether the project makes a *cumulatively considerable* contribution to the cumulative impact. A project's contribution may be cumulatively considerable even if the project's individual impact is considered less than significant. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) requires that discussion of cumulative impacts reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence. The State CEQA Guidelines state that the cumulative impacts discussion does not need to provide as much detail as is provided in the analysis of project-only impacts and should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b), cumulative impacts may be discussed in the form of either:

- a list of past, present, or reasonably foreseeable probable future projects producing related cumulative impacts; or
- a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior adopted or certified environmental document.

This draft program EIR uses a combination of these two methods, using projections contained in the adopted general plans and related planning documents, and in prior environmental documents that have been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to cumulative impacts, as well as known major reasonably foreseeable other projects.

18.1.2 Cumulative Impact Assessment

The State CEQA Guidelines encourage agencies to use a program EIR in circumstances involving implementation of a series of related projects. A program EIR is an environmental document that provides a framework for future environmental analyses. The use of a program-level EIR allows the JPA to characterize the Capital SouthEast Connector as the *project* being analyzed and to consider the broad, regional impacts of a program of actions.

The cumulative significant effects to which the project would potentially contribute are: aesthetics (planned conversion of rural to urbanized areas); air quality (criteria and GHG emissions); biological resources (listed species and habitat loss); water quality (impaired water bodies); noise

(operational noise impacts); and traffic (increased congestion). CEQA requires that the cumulative impact analysis consider whether project impacts would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact. The following discussion presents the basis for conclusions on cumulative impacts.

18.1.2.1 Aesthetics

The cumulative setting for aesthetics includes any proposed projects within the same viewshed of the project corridor, as identified in the local planning documents See Figure 11-1 for general and community plan designations of future land uses within the study area. Other planned or reasonably foreseeable roadway improvement projects in the immediate area include the US 50/Silva Valley Parkway Interchange Project and the widening of Grant Line Road in the Sheldon area. In addition, the Rancho Cordova General Plan contains future land use planning areas for 16 locations in the county, five of which border the project corridor along Grant Line Road and are planned for future mixed use residential and commercial uses:

- Grant Line South Planning Area,
- Grant Line North Planning Area,
- Suncreek Preserve Planning Area,
- East Planning Area (Grant Line East Visioning Plan), and
- Grant Line West Planning Area (Sunrise Douglas Community Plan).

The project in combination with planned and reasonably foreseeable projects could result in substantial changes to the aesthetic character and visual quality of the study area. The project would increase the dominance of transportation facilities within the predominately rural character of the study area. Other planned and reasonably foreseeable projects would introduce suburban and urban land uses that would reduce the intactness and unity of the agricultural and rural aesthetic, resulting in a cumulative impact on visual quality.

Cumulative impacts could be reduced through design measures incorporated into future development to be sensitive to the rural and agricultural aesthetic. Table 3-3 lists various general plan policies that would have the effect of reducing cumulative visual change, such as the creation of open space areas and view corridors to preserve key visual elements. The Elk Grove General Plan EIR concluded that buildout of the general plan would result in significant and unavoidable visual impacts even with implementation of the general plan policies that would reduce the impacts. The cumulative impact of the proposed project and Elk Grove General Plan buildout would therefore be significant and unavoidable. The project's contribution to the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact from physical construction of the roadway improvements and its support of increasing urbanization of the rural area would be considerable.

18.1.2.2 Air Quality

As discussed in Chapter 4, "Air Quality," the project is consistent with the regional air quality attainment plans. Project construction would exceed SMAQMD significance thresholds, but mitigation is available to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. The amount of construction disturbance would be limited 15 acres per day, and the project would follow SMAQMD basic emissions control practices; therefore, the project is not considered to have a significant cumulative construction impact on PM10 or PM2.5.

NO_x Emissions

Within the SMAQMD, operational NO_x emissions in 2025 are expected to exceed the district's threshold of significance under the proposed project with all project options. Due to continuing improvements in engine technology, emissions in 2035 will be slightly lower, but still exceed the NO_X threshold for the proposed project with the Deer Creek Causeway Options 1and 2 (refer to Table 4-14). Within the EDCAPCD, emissions will not exceed the district's significant thresholds under future conditions for any project options (refer to Table 4-15). There is no feasible mitigation to reduce NO_X emissions in the SMAQMD to less-than-significant. Therefore, the project will have a significant cumulative impact on NO_X emissions.

VMT

The Synchro traffic simulation model used to evaluate the effects of the project and options on changes in congestion and associated VMT and fuel consumption in the project alignment area indicates that the change in regional fuel consumption would be less than 0.06 percent for any of the project options along the proposed project alignment. The results of the Synchro analysis, which provides a more complete analysis of the effects of congestion on network operation, indicates that the project and options may result in a smaller increase in VMT and associated emissions. While the results of the Synchro model and analysis presented in Tables 4-14 and 4-15 cannot be directly compared due to limitations inherent in the Synchro modeling analysis, it does provide a more complete snapshot of the congestion-relief benefits of the project and its effect on fuel consumption and air quality emissions, and it is likely that the actual effects of the project to VMT fall between the Synchro results and those presented in Tables 4-14 and 4-15 of Chapter 4, "Air Quality and Climate Change".

CO Emissions

CO emissions are well below the CAAQS and are not anticipated to result in hotspots. The project is therefore not considered to have a significant cumulative impact on CO concentrations or result in elevated health risks.

Health Risk

As discussed in Chapter 4, cumulative health risks are on an assessment of DPM concentrations generated by the proposed project as well as those already present in the existing ambient environment over a given time period. Table 4-17 indicates that cancer risk associated with the proposed project and Deer Creek Causeway Options would result in cancer risks in excess of the SMAQMD's screening criterion of 281 cases in one million on US 50 and SR 99 under 2035 conditions, while the proposed project would exceed the SMAQMD's criterion under existing plus project conditions on US and SR 99. Likewise, cancer risk associated with the proposed project and

the Deer Creek Causeway Options would exceed the SMAQMD's criterion on Sunrise Boulevard between Zinfandel Road and US 50 under 2035 conditions, while the proposed project would exceed the SMAQMD's criterion under existing plus project conditions on Sunrise Boulevard between Zinfandel Road and US 50. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5 will likely reduce potential cancer risks to sensitive receptors adjacent to impacted roadways, but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project will have a significant cumulative impact.

GHG Emissions

The project is anticipated to have a cumulative considerable contribution to global climate change and GHG emissions. Construction-related CO_2, methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O) emissions produced as a result of onsite construction equipment and employee vehicle commutes are shown in Table 18-1. These emissions will be produced at different levels throughout the construction phase; their frequency and occurrence can be reduced through innovations in plans and specifications and by implementing better traffic management during construction phases. In addition, with innovations such as longer pavement lives, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials, the GHG emissions produced during construction can be mitigated to some degree by longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation events. In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 in Chapter 4 and Mitigation Measure AQ-7 below will further reduce construction-related GHG emissions from diesel-powered equipment.

Table 18-1. Total Construction-Related CO_2e Emissions Generated by the Project (metric tons)[a]

	Diesel Equipment			Gasoline Vehicles		Total
Design Option	CO_2	CH_4	N_20	CO_2	Other	CO_2e
Proposed Project with Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	9,921	0.57	0.25	3,941	207	14,160
Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway Option 1	9,921	0.57	0.25	4,180	220	14,412
Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway Option 2	9,921	0.57	0.25	4,189	220	14,421
Proposed Project with Sheldon High Access Roadway	9,921	0.57	0.25	3,939	207	14,158
Proposed Project with Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path	10,058	0.57	0.26	7,142	376	17,668
Proposed Project with Kammerer Bypass	9,921	0.57	0.25	4,022	212	14,245

Note: Emissions based on daily mitigated emissions presented in Tables 4-12 and 4-13 in Chapter 4.

[a] Emissions presented are for the entire 10-year construction period in both the SMAQMD and EDCAPCD.

GHG contaminant emissions tend to accumulate in the atmosphere because of their relatively long lifespan. As a result, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission; GHG contaminant emissions are more appropriately evaluated on a regional, state, or even national scale than on an individual project level. Transportation is a major source of GHG emissions, and the quantity of GHG emissions from automobiles and trucks is directly correlated with VMT and vehicle speeds. Table 18-2 presents the total CO_2 emissions that would be generated as a result of implementation of the project, relative to the no project scenario.

Table 18-2. Total Operation-Related CO_2 Emissions Relative to the No Build Alternative (metric tons per year)[a]

Design Option	Total CO_2[b]
2008 Proposed Project with Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	15,630
2008 Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway 1	22,552
2025 Proposed Project with Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	33,758
2025 Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway 1	44,074
2025 Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway 2	40,256
2025 Proposed Project with Sheldon High Access Roadway	32,627
2035 Proposed Project with Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	36,730
2035 Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway 1	48,604
2035 Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway 2	43,726
2035 Proposed Project with Sheldon High Access Roadway	36,944

[a] Emissions are in relation to the No Project Alternative (i.e., Project Option Emissions – No Building Emissions).

[b] Represents sum of emissions generated in the SMAQMD and EDCAPCD (Tables 4-14 and 4-15 in Chapter 4).

As shown in Table 18-2, all design options would generate CO_2 emissions in excess of all thresholds adopted by state and federal agencies (Table 4-7 in Chapter 4). To put the design options in perspective, 2035 GHG emissions were compared to the most recent global, national, state, and local GHG inventories because estimated emissions in 2035 are higher than in 2025 (Table 18-3). Construction emissions, which will be produced during project construction activities but not operation, were amortized assuming a 50-year roadway lifetime and included in the emissions totals.

As previously indicated, the Synchro traffic simulation model analysis indicates that the change in regional fuel consumption would be less than 0.06 percent for any of the project options along the proposed project alignment. While the results of the Synchro model and analysis presented in Table 18-2 cannot be directly compared due to limitations inherent in the Synchro modeling analysis, it does provide a more complete snapshot of the congestion-relief benefits of the project and its affect on fuel consumption and air quality emissions, and it is likely that the actual effects of the project to VMT lie in the middle of the Synchro results and those presented in Table 18-2.

Table 18-3. Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Sacramento County, California, United States, and Global Context (metric tons)

Proposed Project and Options	2005 Sacramento County	2006 ARB Statewide	2008 EPA National	2004 IPCC Global
Emissions Inventory	13,938,537	483,900,000	6,956,800,000	49,000,000,000
Percent of Emissions Inventory				
2035 Proposed Project with Sheldon Reduced Access Roadway	0.26555%	0.00765%	0.00053%	0.00008%
2035 Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway 1	0.35077%	0.01010%	0.00070%	0.00010%
2035 Proposed Project with Deer Creek Causeway 2	0.31578%	0.00910%	0.00063%	0.00009%
2035 Proposed Project with Sheldon High Access Roadway	0.26708%	0.00769%	0.00054%	0.00008%

Sources: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2007; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2010b; California Air Resources Board 2009; ICF Jones & Stokes 2009.

[a] Operational emissions associated Kammerer Road Bypass Option and the Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path could not be quantified because of traffic data for these options were unavailable, and therefore they are not included in this comparison.

[b] Construction emissions have been amortized over a 50-year time period.

Although GHG emissions from the design options may be small relative to total county, state, national, and global emissions, scientific consensus concludes that given the seriousness of climate change, small contributions of GHGs may be cumulatively considerable. All design options would generate a net increase in GHG emissions relative to the no-project Alternative. These emissions exceed all published significance criteria (Table 4-7 in Chapter 4). Although Mitigation Measures AQ-6 in Chapter 4 and Mitigation Measures AQ-7 and AQ-8 below will help reduce GHG emissions generated by the design options, there is no way to reliably estimate the emission reductions that will occur as a result of implementing these measures. The possibility therefore exists that the design options will contribute to global GHG emissions and global climate change.

The two most recent GHG legislation applicable to the proposed project are AB 32 and SB 375. AB 32 is designed to reduce California's GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the 2020. The AB 32 Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California will use to reduce GHG emissions. The scoping plan has a range of GHG reduction actions which include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system, and an AB 32 program implementation regulation to fund the program. SB 375 requires regional MPOs throughout California to develop a sustainable communities strategy that addresses how their regions will reach emission reductions targets established by the ARB for autos and light trucks. SACOG is the designated MPO within the project area and is currently in the process of revising its MTP 2035 to comply with SB 375. The proposed air quality element contains several policies related to GHG emissions with which the project will have to comply. These include (but are not limited to) provisions for bicycle and pedestrian access, incentives for the use of transportation alternatives, anti-idling strategies, and vehicle trip reduction.

Implementation of the project will increase GHG emissions relative to the baseline. This increase in emissions may obstruct implementation of AB 32 and SB 375. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. The project's contribution to global GHG emissions and global climate change is therefore considered cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure AQ-7: Implement SMAQMD Best Management Practices for Reducing Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The JPA or local agency will implement through construction contract terms and specifications, all applicable SMAQMD best management practices for reducing construction-related GHG emissions. Practices include the following:

- Improve fuel efficiency from construction equipment:
    - Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to no more than 3 minutes (a 5-minute limit is required by the state airborne toxics control measure—13 CCR 2449[d][3], 2485). Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
    - Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition before it is operated.
    - Train equipment operators in proper use of equipment, including limiting idling time, minimizing warm-up time, performing routine maintenance, and optimizing equipment use.
    - Avoid using equipment that is larger than the job requires.
    - Use equipment with new technologies (e.g., repowered engines, electric drivetrains).
- Perform on-site material hauling with trucks equipped with on-road engines (if the air districts or ARB determine them to emit less than the off-road engines).
- Use alternative fuels for generators at construction sites, rather than gasoline or diesel (e.g., propane or solar), or use electrical power.
- Use an ARB-approved low-carbon fuel for construction equipment. (NO_x emissions from the use of low-carbon fuel must be reviewed and increases mitigated.)
- Encourage and provide carpools, shuttle vans, and transit passes for construction worker commutes.
- Reduce electricity use in the construction office by using compact fluorescent bulbs, powering off computers every day, and using the most efficient heating and cooling units available.
- Recycle or salvage non-hazardous construction and demolition debris (goal of at least 75% by weight) to avoid landfill disposal.

Mitigation Measure AQ-8: Conduct a Carbon Sequestration Feasibility Study and Cost-Benefit Analysis for Tree Planting as Greenhouse Gas Mitigation to Mitigate Greenhouse Gas Emissions to Net Zero

The JPA or local agency, in consultation with the SMAQMD and EDCAPCD, will conduct a carbon sequestration feasibility study and cost-benefit analysis for the proposed project. The objective of the study and analysis is to mitigate GHG emissions to net zero, if practicable. A preliminary feasibility study for carbon offsets from tree planting in northern California was conducted for the Connector (ICF International 2011). This analysis indicated that the theoretical carbon offset potential ranges from 0.4 metric ton of carbon per acre per year (C/ac/year) to 2.0 metric tons C/ac/yr. Of the tree types broadly found in this region, the Douglas fir and hemlock-Sitka-spruce offer the largest sequestration potential. If future carbon sequestration studies conclude tree planting is appropriate mitigation from both cost and GHG reduction standpoints, the JPA or local agency will plant selected evergreen species such as Douglas fir and hemlock/Sitka-spruce to sequester project-generated GHG emissions to net zero, if practicable The feasibility study would identify the location and timing of plantings, and other key aspects of the offset potential, including water resources, costs, future climate change impacts, and forest management practices and monitoring needs.

18.1.2.3 Biological Resources

As indicated in Chapter 11, "Land Use," SACOG has identified several areas in the Sacramento metropolitan area where significant growth is expected to occur by 2035. Along the project corridor, Rancho Cordova and the Vineyard Community are identified as having the highest potential for population, housing, and employment growth. Table 11-2 in Chapter 11 identifies characteristics of planned development in the project corridor. Planned projects would support a variety of land uses, including commercial, residential, office, mixed use, parks, and educational.

The same sensitive biological resources identified in the project area occur in these areas of proposed development. Considering the past and reasonably foreseeable projects in the region, the proposed project would contribute to significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on biological resources in the region, particularly vernal pool species. Vernal pool habitat in the project area and vicinity occur in the Mather Recovery Unit of Southeastern Sacramento Valley Vernal Region, which is a recovery area identified in the USFWS's 2005 *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon*. Full buildout of the proposed project and other reasonably foreseeable projects could affect recovery of federally listed vernal pool species in this area. However, if the SSHCP is approved by the USFWS, the cumulative impacts of the proposed project (a project covered by the SSHCP) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

18.1.2.4 Energy

Operational activities associated with the proposed project are anticipated to result in an overall increase in energy consumption. However, it is not anticipated that this energy consumption would result in wasteful, inefficient, or excessive use of direct energy because implementation of the project would lead to improvements in congestion and roadway network efficiency. Because congestion and network inefficiency can be associated with the wasteful and inefficient use of energy (i.e., increased congestion and network inefficiency would "waste" energy because of more cars idling and traffic taking longer to travel through the roadway network), improvements to congestion and roadway network efficiency associated with the project are anticipated to result in

more efficient use of energy resources. The project is not considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to energy-related impacts.

18.1.2.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

Hydrology and water quality conditions can be altered by large roadway projects, such as by increasing the potential for localized flooding and resulting in short-term (during construction) and long-term (post-construction) water quality impacts. As indicated in Chapter 10, "Hydrology and Water Quality," several water bodies within project area could be affected within the 800-foot corridor of the project area. Many of these water bodies are listed as several as impaired according to Section 303(d) of the CWA, have water quality objectives that cannot be violated, and beneficial uses that cannot be compromised, according to the CWA.

The proposed project would likely have hydrology and water quality impacts. The primary hydrological impacts will likely be a greater potential for localized flooding from increases in storm runoff and construction in the floodplain. The primary water quality impacts will likely be associated with the construction of stream crossings (i.e., bridges, culverts), work adjacent to streambanks, and elevated roadways on existing floodplains, such as the Cosumnes River/Deer Creek floodplain.

Ultimately, however, if mitigation measures described in Chapter 10 are implemented, such as implementing water quality regulations into the design of the project, complying with dewatering provisions, implementing measures to maintain water quality after construction, conducting project-level drainage studies, designing and installing infiltration systems, avoiding restriction of flood flows, obtaining agency approval of construction with 100-year floodplains, and designing projects to pass flows in the event of levee or dam failure, the impacts will be less than significant. The project is not considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts on hydrology and water quality.

18.1.2.6 Noise

Significant cumulative noise impacts are considered to occur when the cumulative noise generated by one or more individual projects exceeds an established noise standard. For example, if the land use compatibility noise standard for residential uses is 60 Ldn and traffic noise at a residential area along a roadway exceeds 60 Ldn, that residential area is considered to be exposed to a significant cumulative noise impact because noise exceeds an established standard and the traffic generating the noise is the result of one or more individual development projects in the area.

Under the requirements of CEQA a determination must be made as to whether a project's incremental contribution to a significant cumulative impact is cumulatively considerable. Significant cumulative noise impacts are considered to occur along the proposed project alignment and the alternative alignments where traffic noise exceeds 60 Ldn at residential uses. Because noise from construction activity is highly localized and temporary, the contribution of construction noise to these significant cumulative impacts is not considered to be cumulatively considerable.

As indicated in Table 12-4 in Chapter 12, "Noise", implementation of the proposed project is expected to increase cumulative traffic noise levels in 2035 by as much as 2 dB depending on location. The project's contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts in the area is therefore considered to be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would reduce project-related increases in noise. However because it may not be feasible in all cases to

reduce project-related increases to a less-than-considerable level, the project's contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts is considered to be unavoidable.

18.1.2.7 Traffic and Transportation

The transportation analysis of the proposed project under "cumulative" conditions is based on development assumptions for 2045, which are outlined in Table 16-12 in Chapter 16, and reflects buildout of all residential uses in the traffic analysis study area and growth in jobs that results in about the same number of jobs per household in the traffic analysis study area as current levels.

The assumed roadway system serving the traffic analysis study area under cumulative (2045) No Project conditions generally reflects the maximum number of lanes allowed under local general plans. Most of the roadway segments that make up the project alignment have six lanes. The Elk Grove General Plan calls for eight lanes on Kammerer Road from Lent Ranch to SR 99 and on Grant Line Road from SR 99 to Bradshaw Road. The Sacramento County and El Dorado County General Plans call for White Rock Road to have four lanes between Scott Road (E) and Latrobe Road.

SACOG's travel demand model (SACMET) was used to forecast travel demand and provide key performance measures, based on the 2045 development and transportation system assumptions outlined above. Table 17-9 in Chapter 17 summarizes the projected 2045 daily traffic volumes on segments along each of the alternative alignments and shows the projected change in 2045 daily traffic volumes compared to the 2045 No Project condition. Table 17-10 summarizes some key transportation criteria for each of the alignment alternatives. The information in these tables was used to determine the general performance and impacts of the alignment alternatives, which are discussed below.

The assumed access along the proposed project in 2045 differs from the proposed project in 2035 as follows:

- An additional access point at Centennial Drive, which is expected to be extended to Grant Line Road after 2035.
- Additional interchanges (because of high traffic volumes by 2045) at Centennial Drive/Grant Line Road and at a roadway connection to White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road.

Based on the general analysis of cumulative (2045) conditions, the impacts of the proposed project can be described as follows:

- The proposed project would cause increases in traffic volumes on 1) all of the segments along its alignment, and 2) most major roadways that provide access to the proposed project near were they intersect it. Because of higher levels of assumed development levels, the 2045 No Project traffic volumes would be higher on most major roadways in 2045 than 2035, and the increase in traffic volumes due to the proposed project would be somewhat greater under cumulative (2045) than the increases due to the proposed project in 2035.
- The proposed project would decrease traffic on many non-project roadway segments in the traffic analysis study area. However, the proposed project would cause traffic increases on most of its cross streets near where they intersect the Connector, which would likely result in significant LOS impacts on some non-project roadways, similar to the impacts of the proposed project identified under Baseline conditions.

- Measures could be indentified to mitigate the LOS impacts on non-project roadway segments, but they would involve improvements beyond those planned by local jurisdictions, including some improvements that may not meet the policies of local jurisdictions because of concerns about adverse impacts on bicyclists and pedestrians. Improvements on non-project roadways would need to be implemented by local jurisdictions. Because local jurisdictions may choose not to implement them and the JPA can not ensure their implementation, this impact is considered unavoidable considerable contribution.
- The proposed project would decrease traffic on most of the freeway segments in the traffic analysis study area and would likely not cause any LOS impacts on the freeway mainline or at any ramp junctions. This contribution to freeway traffic is considered less than considerable.
- The proposed project would decrease total vehicle hours of delay in the traffic analysis study area by about 11% because it would decrease traffic on a number of arterial/collector roadway segments in the traffic analysis study area and on portions of US 50, SR 99 and I-5.
- The transit policies adopted by the JPA as part of the project would provide capital funding, beyond what would be available under the baseline and thereby facilitate a modest increase in bus service over baseline levels. Therefore, the proposed project would provide a benefit to transit services compared to the baseline Alternative. This impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable.
- Outside the Sheldon area, the proposed project would reduce the number of existing access points along its alignment by 1) eliminating many (but not all) existing driveways and connections to smaller local roadways, and 2) limiting the number of new access points along the project alignment to planned arterial roadways and some new major collector roadways. This would reduce accident rates in comparison to the baseline.
- In the Sheldon area, with the Sheldon High Access Roadway Option, access to all driveways and local roadways in the Sheldon area would be maintained, but nearly all would be limited to right turns. The accident/crash rates along Grant Line Road through the Sheldon area under the Sheldon High Access Roadway Option would be the same as the baseline, and therefore would not provide any benefit to safety compared to the baseline. The proposed project with the Sheldon Access Roadway or Deer Creek Causeway Options would be less than half the accident rate for the baseline. Therefore, these options would substantially improve safety in the Sheldon area.

Overall, the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts related to traffic and transportation.

18.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts

The State CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR assess the growth-inducing impacts of a project, particularly the potential for a project to:

> foster economic or population growth or the construction of new housing, either directly or indirectly in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth.

A project can have direct or indirect growth inducement potential. A project would be considered to directly induce growth if it included construction of new housing. A project would be considered to

induce indirect growth if it generated a substantial number of new jobs in the region, leading to the need for more housing, services, and associated growth. A major roadway improvement project could result in indirect growth by requiring a large construction effort generating new short- or long-term jobs.

A project may also be considered growth-inducing if it removes an obstacle to growth, such as providing public services or utilities to an area where these services are not available, or opening up a new area to development through the construction of new transportation facilities in areas where access is not currently provided. Growth inducement has the potential to result in a significant impact if the growth is not consistent with or accommodated by the land use plans and policies for the area affected because induced growth would exceed planned facilities and services and construction of needed housing and services could result in indirect physical effects on the environment. In addition, simply because growth would be consistent with land use plans does not mean a project removing obstacles is not growth inducing (*City of Antioch v. City Council* [1986] 187 Cal. App. 3d 1325).

An established transportation network exists in Sacramento and El Dorado Counties that provides local and regional access. Major highways in the general project area include I-5, SR 99, and US 50, in addition to numerous arterial, collector, and neighborhood streets. Circulation within the general project area would be enhanced by the road widening, new road connections, and other improvements called for in the city and county general plans, which would provide access to planned development. Access to the project area is already provided along most of the project alignment by existing roadways. The proposed project would not create new access to areas that are not currently accessible to cars and other vehicles. In addition, the overall design concept for the proposed project is to limit access to the facility that would otherwise be allowed under the city and county general plans. These access limitations would reduce the growth-inducing effects of expanding the roadway capacity by ensuring that no access will be provided as a result of the project into areas where the proposed roadway improvements will extend into now-inaccessible areas, such as in the Deer Creek Causeway Options. However, the result of the project will be to reduce congestion and provide better transportation conditions and easier access to areas currently served by the existing roadways. To the extent that the project will increase roadway capacity, it will remove obstacles to growth. Further, this will increase growth pressure on areas near the Connector's interchanges that are not currently planned for development. For these reasons, the project is considered to have a significant and unavoidable growth inducing impact (Chapter 13, "Population and Housing", concludes that the project would have a significant unavoidable impact related to inducement of substantial population growth under "Impact POP-1").