



Meeting of the Board of Directors

Location: Rancho Cordova Council Chambers
2729 Prospect Park Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA

Date: Friday, May 21, 2010, 8:30 am – 10:30 am

Roll Call: Directors Budge, Hume, Knight, Nottoli, Starsky

Members of the public may comment on any item on the agenda at the time that it is taken up by the Board. We ask that members of the public complete a request to speak form, submit it to the Clerk of the Board, and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the Board on a single item, the Chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of the discussion.

Public Communications: Any person wishing to address the Board on any item not on the agenda may do so at this time. After ten minutes of testimony, any additional testimony may be heard following the New Business Items.

1. Executive Director's Report

Consent Agenda

2. Minutes of April 23, 2010, Meeting

New Business Items

3. Introduction of Draft FY 2010-11 Budget

a. Attachment – Staff Report

4. Update on Status of Agreement with Participants of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP)

a. Attachment – Staff Report

5. Presentation of Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) Alternatives Screening and Recommendations for Further Analysis

a. Attachment – Staff Report

b. Attachment – Presentation

6. Adjournment

The Board may take action on any matter, however listed on this Agenda, and whether or not listed on this Agenda, to the extent permitted by applicable law. Staff Reports are subject to change without prior notice.

If requested, this agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact the Board Secretary for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting, should telephone or otherwise contact the Board Secretary as soon as possible. The Board Secretary may be reached at 428 J Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, California 95814, or by telephone at (916) 447-7933. The Connector JPA's address is 10640 Mather Blvd., Suite 120, Mather, CA 95655. The Connector JPA's phone number is (916) 876-9094.



Capital SouthEast Connector Board of Directors

Item # 1
Receive and File

May 21, 2010

Issue: An Executive Director's report is filed every month on current JPA activities.

Recommendation: Receive and File

Discussion: The following is a brief status report on some of the more significant issues and activities currently being pursued by the Connector JPA staff.

Administrative

- To provide for summer schedules, staff proposes to consolidate the July and August Board meetings to a single meeting in early August. Details will follow once an available date for Board members and the meeting room has been secured.
- Director Nottoli has advised the Executive Director that due to conflicts with his participation on a regional task force, he will be unavailable for several Board meetings over the summer of 2010. Arrangements have been made for his alternate, Supervisor MacGlashan to serve during his absence.

Project

- Work has started on the Sheldon Limited Access Roadway (LAR) Study with a project start-up meeting and an initial meeting with the Community Working Group. The consultant team has also leased the vacant commercial space at 8973 Grant Line Road, Suite 100, Elk Grove, 95624, to use as its local work office for the months of May, June, and July. Coordination between the consultant team, the City of Elk Grove, and the JPA on the development of a multi-faceted outreach program is also underway as a priority issue. Additional updates on the progress of the contract will be presented as the process advances.
- JPA staff and the consultant team met with representatives of the Federal regulatory agencies during May to discuss the details of their responses to the Notice of Preparation of the Program Environmental Impact Report. Details of the meeting will be provided during today's agenda item #5 on Alternatives Screening.
- Staff anticipates releasing a Request for Proposal for Financial Advisory Services over the next several weeks. The intent of this contract will be to secure the services of expert(s) in the area of transportation economics, funding tools, and user fee based financing services. It is expected that a recommended contract for these services will be before the Board for approval in July.

Fiscal

- A draft budget for FY 10-11 has been developed and will be presented to your Board today as agenda Item #3 – Draft FY 10-11 Budget
- The Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA) has notified JPA staff that due to the decline in Measure A revenues, it will be unable to issue its planned mid-2011 bond for capital projects. The impact of this proposal will be discussed with STA staff and reported to the Board once the impact of this development is fully determined. The Executive Director will be making a project update to the STA Board in July.

Miscellaneous

- The JPA was successful in hosting two events during April as was reported earlier. Both were considered successful in raising the awareness of the Connector project to local and state officials as well as the business community.
- The Executive Director made a presentation to the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on May 11th. The Board was receptive to the integration of the Connector project into the El Dorado County Transportation plan. However, it requested the JPA perform an analysis of future trip distribution using additional existing and future local roadways at the eastern end of the project in the Program Environmental Impact Report with the intent of reducing impacts on the currently planned alignment in El Dorado County.
- Following last month's Board presentation on the Aggregate Mining Truck Management Plan, staff is preparing comments to submit to Sacramento County in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the first application going to hearing. Comments will be consistent with the concerns expressed at the April JPA Board meeting with regard to operational and fiscal impacts on the Connector project by the proposed mining applications.
- The Executive Director will be in Los Angeles next week for a one day forum on Public Infrastructure Financing organized by the Public Infrastructure Advisory Commission.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tom Zlotkowski
Executive Director



Capital SouthEast Connector Board of Directors

Item # 2
Receive and File

May 21, 2010

Action Minutes of the April 23, 2010, Meeting

The Capital SouthEast Connector Authority's Board of Directors met in regular session on April 23, 2010, in the Rancho Cordova Council Chambers, located at 2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova, CA, at 8:30 a.m.

Call to Order: Chairperson Hume called the meeting to order at 8:41 a.m.

Roll Call: Directors Budge, Hume, Knight, and Starsky were present.
Alternate Director Roberta MacGlashan arrived during the discussion of Item 5.

Public Comment: No members of the public requested to comment on items not on the agenda.

Executive Director's Report: Mr. Tom Zlotkowski, the Executive Director of the Authority, summarized the highlights from his Executive Director's Report, including the status of the contract for the Sheldon Limited Access Roadway Study, the status of discussions on the possibility of a Public Private Partnership, the reconciliation prepared by the California Fair Services Authority, and the status of the current Budget, including funding from the Sacramento Transportation Authority. The Executive Director also described two receptions sponsored by the JPA.

Consent Agenda:

The consent agenda included the (1) Minutes of March 26, 2010, Meeting, (2) Ratification of the Sheldon/Wilton Limited Access Roadway Alternative Contract with Design, Community & Environment (DC & E); and (3) a Report on Findings of Accounting Reconciliation by the California Fair Services Authority. A member of the public supported ratification of the Limited Access Roadway Alternative Contract.

It was moved by Director Budge, seconded by Director Knight, and passed by unanimous vote that:

THE CAPITAL SOUTHEAST CONNECTOR AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVES THE CONSENT AGENDA, WHICH INCLUDED THE (1) MINUTES OF MARCH 26, 2010, MEETING, (2) RATIFICATION SHELDON/WILTON LIMITED ACCESS ROADWAY ALTERNATIVE CONTRACT WITH DESIGN, COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT (DC & E); AND (3) A REPORT ON FINDINGS OF ACCOUNTING RECONCILIATION BY THE CALIFORNIA FAIR SERVICES AUTHORITY.

New Business Items:

Agreement with Participants of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP): The Executive Director discussed the comments presented by the Board on the SSHCP during the last meeting, including setting milestones and setting a date for the conclusion of the SSHCP. These requests were incorporated into the agreement before the Board today, to the extent possible. The Executive Director explained that the item before the Board was an agreement to participate in the funding of the HCP.

Director Starsky expressed concern that the JPA should not be entering into the SSHCP because the HCP itself has not been presented to the Board. Director Budge stated that the SSHCP has changed dramatically over the last few months

and is now more valuable to the participants. Counsel for the JPA, Kirk Trost, clarified the status of the negotiations. Director Budge noted that a consultant has been hired to further draft the HCP. Director Starsky stated that the City of Folsom was not pleased with the status of the negotiations and moved to reject the contract. After further discussion among the Board members, Director Starsky withdrew his motion to reject the contract and moved to continue the item for a month to obtain further information. No members of the public offered comments on this item.

It was moved by Director Starsky, seconded by Director Knight, and passed by unanimous vote that:

THE CAPITAL SOUTHEAST CONNECTOR AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS CONTINUED ITEM FIVE TO THE BOARD'S MAY 21, 2010, MEETING.

Progress Report on Alternatives Screening Process for Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR): The Executive Director presented an updated alternatives screening matrix to the Board. This matrix is used to determine the preferred alignment for the project. New technical information is being incorporated into the matrix as it is received by the JPA. The matrix was presented to the Board for preliminary feedback. A member of the public commented on the content of the screening matrix.

Presentation on East Sacramento Region Aggregate Mining Truck Management Study: The Executive Director provided the background on the Truck Management Study and an update on its status. He noted that the Connector is not mentioned in the study and may, therefore, encounter a financial liability. Dean Blank of the Sacramento County Department of Transportation gave a presentation on the Study. Members of the Board asked questions and provided comments. Members of the public offered comments on: the findings in the study and its possible effect on the Connector; an opinion that the study supported a toll road concept; a statement that the Connector is being considered as part of the environmental review of the applications, by Granite, in particular; and a statement regarding participation by Elk Grove.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Hume at 10:18 a.m.

Approved By:

Attest:

Director Hume
Chairperson

Kirk Trost
Secretary



Capital SouthEast Connector Board of Directors

Item # 3
Receive and File

May 21, 2010

Introduction of Draft FY 2010-11 Budget

Issue: To present a proposed budget for the Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority to cover the period of time from July 2010 through June 2011.

Recommendation: Review the draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Connector budget, as presented at this meeting, and provide input to staff as necessary to allow for revisions and adoption prior to July 1, 2010.

Discussion: Section 6.d.4 of the Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority Agreement requires that the Board adopt a budget within 120 days of its first meeting and no later than June 30 of each year thereafter. Additionally, Sacramento County, acting as the Treasurer/Auditor for the Authority, requires that a budget be adopted prior to processing transactions on behalf of the Authority.

The Executive Director prepared a proposed budget for FY 2010-11 that reflects a number of activities and requirements necessary to advance the Connector Project as outlined in the Project Funding/Financing plan approved by the Board in February, 2009.

The revenues anticipated in the proposed FY 2010-11 budget include a combination of Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA) Measure A bond proceeds, Measure A "pay-go" proceeds, member agency contributions, a small amount of interest earnings, and reserves.

The key elements of the proposed budget are set forth below:

Revenue

- The proposed member agency contribution for FY 2010-11 is \$10,000 for each of the five jurisdictions. This is the same contribution as last year. These funds shall be used for expenses that are not reimbursable through Measure A proceeds.
- Measure A bond proceeds shall continue to be used exclusively for project related expenditures in line with current STA revenue estimates.
- Measure A "pay-go" revenues shall continue to be used exclusively for administrative expenses that cannot be claimed using bond proceeds.
- As previously reported, the Federal RSTP funds that remained from the SACOG Phase One work were exhausted during FY 09-10.
- Due to re-structuring of the environmental services contract, revenues originally budgeted for that contract will be re-allocated to the "Other Professional Services" revenue line item.
- Unexpended bond revenues, if any, from FY 09-10 can be re-budgeted for use in FY 10-11 once a new annual contract is approved by the STA. The availability of unexpended bond revenue is contingent on the JPA's participation in the SSHCP.

- It is anticipated that \$27K of local funds will remain by the fiscal year end.

Expenditures

- Salaries and Benefits remain basically unchanged for FY 10-11 except for benefit cost increases as provided by Sacramento County
- Legal services budget will remain unchanged
- Major contract expenditures for FY 2010-11 will be:
 - The environmental services contract, which will continue from FY 2008-09 and will extend on into FY 2010-11. This is a separate budget line item (\$1.14M)
 - The remaining portion of the services contract with Design, Community & Environment (DC&E) to conduct the Limited Access Roadway outreach and concept process design in the Sheldon area (\$75K)
 - Participation in the development and funding of the SSHCP (\$250K)
 - Contract for financial advisory services (\$110)
 - A number of smaller project related and administrative contracts executed by the Executive Director (\$150)
- Allocated cost and support services from the County of Sacramento. (These costs are currently being reviewed for applicability by County and JPA staff)

The proposed budget is in substantial conformance with the JPA plan of finance/funding adopted by the Board in March, 2009. Details of the proposed budget are found on the attached budget spreadsheet. Staff requests that the Board review the attached spreadsheet and provide comments and recommendations to staff in anticipation of adopting a final budget at the June 25, 2010 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Zlotkowski
Executive Director



Capital SouthEast Connector Board of Directors

Item # 4
Update

May 21, 2010

Update on Status of Agreement with Participants of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP)

Issue: To provide an update on the status of the Connector Project's participation in the development and funding of the SSHCP.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Board hear a verbal update on the progress of the JPA's participation in the SSHCP, provide guidance as necessary, and continue the item to the June Board meeting for a final decision on participation.

Discussion: At your April Board meeting, the Board discussed several outstanding issues regarding the JPA's participation in the SSHCP and approval of the MOA for financial participation. Since that Board meeting, staff has engaged in discussions with the plan participants, as well as with staff of the member jurisdictions in an attempt to reach agreement in the area(s) of concern.

Despite staff's best efforts, it must be reported that additional time will be necessary to secure a possible agreement and that this item should be continued to the June Connector Board meeting for a final decision on participation. Staff is prepared to provide the Board with an up-to-date progress report on the status of discussions and to receive comments and/or direction to advance this agreement to a successful conclusion.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tom Zlotkowski
Executive Director



Capital SouthEast Connector Board of Directors

Item # 5

Receive and File

May 21, 2010

Presentation of Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) Alternatives Screening and Recommendations for Further Analysis

Issue: To provide results of alternatives screening for the PEIR review process and identify a preferred alternative for detailed study.

Recommendation: Identify Alternative 2/3 as the Preferred Alternative in the program EIR analysis as a result of the updated alternatives screening process.

Discussion: State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines call for the selection of a "proposed project", or a "preferred alternative" for detailed study and focus in an EIR, and a comparative analysis of alternatives. Since last summer, the JPA staff has been actively analyzing the 4 main alternative corridors and subalternatives related to the alignments crossing through the Sheldon community. As part of this effort, detailed mapping and Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis (commensurate with program-level analysis), traffic modeling, and synthesis of data has taken place. All the information has been included in a comprehensive screening matrix for comparative purposes and to aid in the selection of a preferred alternative.

Following the close of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the PEIR in March, the Capital SouthEast Connector JPA continued the environmental screening process, along with further definition of the alternatives and options identified to date. The updated design information on the alternatives and options were analyzed using a GIS format, which generated updated impact calculations for each alternative and option. This information, along with the results of ongoing operational analyses and engineering and design feasibility studies, was used to update the preliminary screening information matrix last presented to the Board in November 2009. This matrix was refined for presentation and additional discussions with the Project Development Team (PDT) in early May, and is included with the attached memo prepared by ICF International documenting the alternatives screening results.

Summary of Alternatives Screening

In the examination of the alternatives screening, staff and the PDT determined that the following conclusions can be drawn regarding the 4 main alternatives:

- Alternative 2/3 **best** meets the Connector objectives and **avoids or reduces the most impacts** of the project,
- Alternative 4 **least** meets the objectives of the project, **avoids or reduces the fewest impacts**, and generally causes the most impacts (in terms of numbers and extent of acreage) of impacts,

- After Alternative 4, Alternative 1 *least* meets the objectives of the project, *avoids or reduces the fewest impacts*, and generally causes the most impacts (in terms of numbers and extent of acreage) of impacts.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Based on the attached memo, staff recommends that Alternative 2/3 be identified as the “Preferred Alternative” (proposed project) for detailed review in the PEIR, and that Alternatives 1 and 4 be included in the PEIR for comparative purposes. For the subalternatives, the Bypass options generally show good performance for meeting the project objectives. The Bypass alternatives would avoid the impacts along existing residences and businesses on Sheldon road. However, the Bypass options would introduce extensive impacts on floodplains, aquatic resources, and special status species. Information on the Limited Access Roadway subalternative (LAR) is not yet available. These subalternatives will remain in the PEIR until the LAR information is available and a comparison can be made.

Therefore, Alternatives 1 and 4, and the Sheldon Community subalternatives (LAR, Bypass options, Sheldon No-Build), are recommended for further review and comparison once the results of the LAR option are made available.

The JPA staff also met informally with representatives from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the California Department of Transportation at the JPA office on May 11. The purpose of the meeting was to provide more detail to the agencies on the alternatives and explain the federal funding constraints of the Connector, discuss the agencies’ comments provided on the NOP, and present the results of the PDT’s initial screening. The EPA initially indicated in its NOP comment letter that it preferred Alternative 1 or 4, primarily because staff at EPA feels those alternatives would induce the least amount of growth. At the May 11 meeting, the Agencies speculated that Alternatives 1 and 4 would likely have the least impacts on aquatic resources and sensitive species (the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, “LEDPA”), and would have the least impact on growth and indirect impacts. JPA staff will update the screening matrix based on comments received from the federal agencies and will provide updated information as we proceed through the EIR process.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tom Zlotkowski
Executive Director



Date: May 14, 2010

To: Tom Zlotkowski, Executive Director, Capital SouthEast Connector JPA

From: Maggie Townsley

Subject: Alternatives Screening and Selection of a Preferred Alternative for the Capital SouthEast Connector Program EIR

Overview

In February, 2010, the Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority (JPA) published a notice of preparation (NOP) of a program EIR for the proposed Capital SouthEast Connector project (proposed project), located in the counties of Sacramento and El Dorado, and the cities of Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and Folsom, California. The NOP included a range of preliminary alternatives developed from an initial environmental screening process prepared in the fall of 2009 and previous studies, including SACOG's Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Connector Concept Plan (2005) and Environmental Phase 1 Studies final technical report (2006).

Following the close of the NOP for the program EIR in March 2010, the Capital SouthEast Connector JPA re-initiated the environmental screening process in April, along with further definition of the alternatives and options identified to date. The updated design information on the alternatives and options was entered into a Geographic Information System (GIS) format, which was used to generate updated impact calculations for each alternative and option. This information, along with the results of ongoing operational analyses and engineering and design feasibility studies, has been used to update the preliminary screening information matrix presented to the JPA Board in November 2009.

Information used in the screening process was based on preliminary studies and evaluations, including traffic forecast modeling, field studies and mapping, literature and data reviews, and discussions with federal, state, and local agency officials.

Alternatives Screening Requirements

Because a lead agency must identify ways in an EIR to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives in the EIR must focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. However, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially

feasible alternatives that will foster informed decisionmaking and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The lead agency, in this case, the JPA, is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 provides specific direction for the consideration and discussion of alternatives to the proposed project:

- An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” (15126.6[a]).
- An EIR is governed by a "rule of reason", which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making. (15126.6[f])
- Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives. (15126.6[f][1])
- When considering alternative locations to a project, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR. 15126.6(f)(2)(A)]

Approach to Alternatives Screening

The alternative screening analysis will select the preferred alternative to be evaluated in detail in the EIR and identify a reasonable range of alternatives to the preferred alternative. The alternative screening analysis ensures that only the alternatives that meet the provisions of Guidelines Section 15126.6 are evaluated and compared in the EIR.

As described above, this screening methodology uses the "*rule of reason*" approach to alternatives (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). The rule of reason approach has been defined to require that EIRs address a range of feasible alternatives that have the potential to diminish or avoid adverse environmental impacts. The State CEQA Guidelines state:

“The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need

examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 [f])

In defining feasibility of alternatives, the State CEQA Guidelines state:

“Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1))

The use of a screening analysis for the alternatives ensures that the full range of environmental concerns is adequately represented, and that a reasonable range of alternatives is selected for further evaluation in the EIR. The screening criteria are used as a tool for focusing the environmental review process and limiting the amount of detailed analysis (i.e., eliminating potential alternatives that are technically infeasible, do not reduce the environmental impacts, or do not satisfy the basic objectives of the proposed project).

Project Objectives

The overall objectives for the project is 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 would 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. During Phase 1, extensive comments by project sponsors and other stakeholders identified the following four purposes of the proposed project:

Enhance mobility options within the project corridor (and the greater Sacramento region) to serve and support sustainable planned growth and development patterns and principles from the approved General Plans and MTP, while minimizing impacts to the livability of residences and communities along the Project corridor.

The communities in the Project corridor reflect a range of development types, historical attributes, and local activities. The Project should not detract from the quality of life established by these communities and expected by their residents. Several defined communities exist along the corridor, including the small unincorporated community of Franklin, the Sheldon area of Elk Grove, the former military housing community on the Mather Air Force Base site, and the El Dorado Hills area of unincorporated El Dorado County.

- Franklin. The unincorporated community of Franklin is located approximately two miles south of Elk Grove and is centered on Franklin Boulevard. The community consists of several stores, a few rural residences, and a California Historical Landmark cemetery.

- Sheldon. The Sheldon community is a largely “exurban,” rural area within the city of Elk Grove that straddles Grant Line Road, with mostly large-lot residential uses and a small cluster of commercial uses centered near the intersection of Grant Line and Wilton Roads. The historical two-lane configuration of Grant Line and the relative isolation of the area have fostered a sense of community that long-time residents passionately embrace.
- Mather. The site of the former Mather Air Force Base includes approximately 1,300 single family housing units in the central portion of the base. When the base was active, this housing supported a community of approximately 4,000 people, including military personnel and their families. The units were vacated in 1993 when the base closed. The on-base housing area has been redeveloped. The residential subdivision “Independence at Mather” opened in 1999 and has been well-received by the community. The area accommodates new homes, schools, several parks, mature vegetation, and open space on all four sides. Mature vegetation is embedded within the development. Mather Commerce Center, a 250-acre commercial office complex, is located in close proximity to the residential housing site and provides opportunities for employment within a short distance from the homes.
- El Dorado Hills. The community of El Dorado Hills is located in the lower Sierra Nevada foothills in western El Dorado County, about 25 miles east of Sacramento. US-50 is the primary route through the community. The community, which sits immediately inside the El Dorado County line, has developed steadily over the past three decades. In the last few years, it has seen tremendous growth in both facilities and activities available to residents and businesses in the area. Most recently, development has focused south of US-50 on both the two- and four-lane segments of the White Rock Road alignment, with residential development (e.g., Four Seasons, Stonebriar, Cresleigh, A Fuller Sunset, and Valley View), and commercial development (Town Center) directly abutting the roadway.

In addition to the incorporated areas and established communities present in the Project corridor, several single residences and residential communities are located in the project corridor. The main residential communities include:

- **The Sunridge Specific Plan area of Rancho Cordova**, which includes the existing Anatolia development as well as other approved residential projects.
- **The Vineyard Area**, which includes the Vineyard Specific Plan Area and the North Vineyard Station Specific Plan Area
- **Elk Grove residential developments along Bradshaw Road**, which include the following subdivisions:
 - Fieldstone Subdivision
 - Clarke Farms Subdivision
 - Tributary Pointe Subdivision
 - Remington Estates Subdivision
 - Bishop Ranch Subdivision
 - Char-Lyn Acres Subdivision

- Meadowlark Ranch Subdivision
- Bradshaw Ranch Estates Subdivision

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 which fosters “economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.” (State CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15126.2, subdivision[d].) This issue is of particular relevance in areas where local plans do not call for urban development, as is the case in several sections of the alternative corridors under consideration.

While implementation of the 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 proposed project and, in part, relieve direct growth pressure on adjacent properties not designated for growth. Second, the project includes \$15 million in funds to serve as seed money for a larger program to preserve open space and critical wildlife habitat. Strategically programmed, these funds could effectively inhibit development in areas that are not planned for urban growth.

Aid economic vitality by improving accessibility to existing and planned job centers and commercial areas, facilitating goods movement, and enhancing the attractiveness of existing and planned employment and commercial areas.

Rancho Cordova is the largest employment center in the corridor, with about 77,000 jobs in 2007. By 2045, employment in Rancho Cordova is expected to more than double, when its job total will be more than the current employment in the Sacramento Central City. The El Dorado Hills Business Park will also become a major employment center, growing from 9,000 jobs in 2007 to more than 33,000 jobs in 2045. Additionally, Elk Grove is expected to grow as an employment center in the region, with an estimated increase in jobs from 25,000 in 2007 to more than 84,000 jobs in 2045.

The Project is a part of the overall regional transportation system, and its ability to improve access and provide connectivity among these communities and throughout the region complements other new and/or improved roadways identified in MTP 2035 as strategies to serve this focused residential and employment growth. The project would facilitate diversified employment opportunities for residents of the region and provide a larger reservoir of skilled workers to businesses in the corridor by creating a more direct connection between residential areas and employment centers.

Provide a multi-modal facility that limits access to the extent possible to afford efficient transportation options within the corridor that balance transportation needs between local access and shorter trips and regional needs for longer trips; enable flexibility among automobile, transit service, bicycle, and pedestrian uses, while incorporating ITS elements where possible.

The Project is being proposed to achieve the following improvements in transportation operations:

- Reduced total vehicle-hours traveled (VHT) during morning and evening peak commute periods on Corridor roadways, especially time spent in congested conditions;

- Reduced travel times between key origins and destinations (e.g., between the Elk Grove and Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove and El Dorado County, and Rancho Cordova and El Dorado County);
- Evidence of fewer short trips on I-5, SR-99, and US-50, and fewer long trips on local/residential streets; and
- Reduced transit travel times and improved service frequencies in the corridor – evidence of viable options to automobile travel.

To achieve these improvements in transportation operations, the project will need to be designed for higher travel speeds, have a higher capacity, and have less delay at intersections than a typical arterial or thoroughfare facility. The Project will need to be designed primarily to an expressway standard, which will have more limited access than a thoroughfare and will include grade-separated interchanges instead of at-grade intersections at locations where level of service C or better conditions cannot be provided. To achieve the desired transportation operations, the portions of the Project with intersection spacing of less than ½ mile will be minimized.

Preserve open space, wildlife habitat, and productive agricultural uses in the corridor and minimize growth inducement via sound transportation facility improvements and implementation.

Among the key features of the Project is a \$15 million (minimum) allocation to preserve open space, wildlife habitat, and valuable agricultural lands in the project corridor already secured through the current primary funding source. The preservation would be supported by an active, funded program for open space protection in conjunction with the transportation improvements. The program would also strategically target those areas that are most susceptible to growth-inducement pressures associated with enhanced access.

The manner in which this program will be administered is dependent on the adoption of JPA policies and procedures that will accompany the development of the overall administration of the Project. The new funding likely would augment existing programs rather than support new efforts or initiatives, although this has not yet been determined. In this respect, an important function of the program would be to coordinate and support the efforts of the participants to secure outside funding from grants and private donations for their overall efforts. The Project’s open space program could provide a significant source of local matching funds, providing leverage for securing competitive grant funding. Program participants could submit joint multi-purpose applications that would enhance chances for securing grants. The combined transportation/ land use/habitat protection/recreation features of the overall project would provide a greater range of potential grant sources, as well.

In addition to the open space preservation program, the Project will include design features that are intended to relieve potential impacts on sensitive natural resources. This will include access management techniques to minimize direct exposure of natural resources to increased activity. It will also include a commitment to alternative modes of transportation, including enhanced transit services and non-motorized facilities. In addition to preserving open space and habitat, the corridor should continue to accommodate agricultural uses through the consideration of the regional need to transport agricultural products to market and to move agricultural equipment. In general, the project should support the overall

region's growth and sustainability objectives (including economic and environmental) from a rural perspective.

Sustainable "green highways" design principles also will be incorporated into the project design. These may include preservation strategies for wetlands, farmland, and other ecologically sensitive areas affected by the alignment of the corridor; recycling and reuse of construction materials to reduce energy consumption and construction costs; source controls and other best management practices to decrease the rate of discharge caused by any increase in impervious surfaces, and to capture and reduce pollutant loads generated primarily from roadway usage; and innovative design to reduce noise pollution and light pollution.

Preliminary Alternatives included in the Screening

The project limits extend from the Interstate 5 (I-5)/Hood-Franklin Road interchange in southwest Sacramento County east and north approximately 35 miles, terminating at U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) in the vicinity of Silva Valley Parkway approximately 3 miles past the El Dorado County line. A wide range of alternatives for the Connector Project was initially considered to address potential alternatives to the proposed project. These alternatives were included in the NOP and described below.

- No-Project Alternative
- Alternative 1. Sunrise Alignment
- Alternative 2. Grant Line Alignment
- Alternative 3. Grant Line Alignment with Off-Corridor Multi-Use Trail
- Sheldon Community Options for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3
 - Sheldon Local Access Road (LAR) Option for Alternatives 1, 2, 3
 - Sheldon Bypass Options 1 and 2
 - Sheldon No-Build Option
- Alternative 4. Bradshaw Alignment

Additionally, transit-oriented and non-traditional alternatives were considered in the initial set of alternatives. These alternatives, as stand-alone alternatives, were determined insufficient to meet the project objectives. However, transit-oriented and non-traditional forms of transportation alternatives are integrated as components into each of the alternatives.

Given the CEQA requirements identified above, this section covers: (1) a description of a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, including the No-Project Alternative; (2) a screening analysis that summarizes and compares the alternatives' abilities to meet the project objectives and lessen the significant environmental effects; and (3) the selection of alternatives chosen for further evaluation in the EIR. The EIR must contain a No-Project alternative; therefore, the no-project alternatives are not discussed in this screening analysis and are assumed to be screened through for further environmental review in the EIR.

No-Project Alternative

The No-Project Alternative represents the transportation system as envisioned under general plans, with widening of the existing roadways along the Connector alignments to 4 or 6 lanes. Access along the

roadways within the study area under the No-Project Alternative represents “business as usual,” with only minor limitations on new driveways. The No-Project Alternative is also assumed to have numerous at-grade intersections with their locations based on adopted and proposed General Plans and Specific Plans. For the Sheldon Area, the Elk Grove Rural Roadway Standards would apply with improvements made as traffic volume thresholds warrant.

Preliminary Alternatives

Four preliminary alternatives were proposed (in addition to a No-Project) alternative for initial screening and ultimate selection of a preferred alternative. These alternatives contained four elements—roadway, non-motorized trails; transit services and facilities; and open space acquisition—and each had a mix of transit services and facilities both along and off the alignment based on the transit policy. The preliminary alternatives are described below.

Alternative 1. Sunrise Alignment

The Alternative 1 concept utilizes existing Sunrise Boulevard for a portion of the alignment. This alternative, originating at the I-5/Hood-Franklin Road interchange, follows the common Connector alignment to SR99 along Kammerer Road. From the Grant Line/SR99 interchange, the alignment would proceed along Grant Line Road to Calvine Road, continuing as a thoroughfare except in the Sheldon area which has several options that are defined below for the Sheldon Community Options for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. The Connector then continues from Calvine Road to Sunrise Boulevard as an expressway.

From there, the alignment follows Sunrise Boulevard north as an expressway from Grant Line Road to just north of State Route 16 (Jackson Highway) and then a thoroughfare segment north of State Road 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. Alternative 1 continues east as a thoroughfare, utilizing the White Rock Road alignment through Rancho Cordova. East of Grant Line Road, the Connector then follows the common Connector alignment along White Rock Road and the southern boundary of the Folsom sphere of influence to the El Dorado County with an expressway. In El Dorado County, the Connector is proposed to be a thoroughfare segment along White Rock Road to the terminus at U.S. 50. (See Figure 2 and Figure 5)

Alternative 2. Grant Line Alignment

The Alternative 2 alignment follows Kammerer Road, Grant Line Road, and White Rock Road. The non-motorized facilities follow the main alignment. This concept is located primarily on Grant Line Road. Similar to the Alternative 1, the alignment would proceed from I-5 to SR99 along Kammerer Road. From the Grant Line/SR99 interchange, the Connector would remain on Grant Line Road through Elk Grove and Sacramento County to White Rock Road in Rancho Cordova. On Grant Line Road, from Bradshaw Road to Calvine Road, several options are being considered for the Sheldon Community under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. From Calvine Road to White Rock Road, the Connector is proposed to be an expressway. This expressway continues on White Rock Road following the common alignment to the El Dorado County line. In El Dorado County, the Connector is proposed to be a thoroughfare segment along White Rock Road to the terminus at U.S. 50. (See Figure 2 and Figure 5)

Alternative 3. Grant Line Alignment with Off-Corridor Multi-Use Trail

The Alternative 3 alignment is the same as under Alternative 2 except in the design of the non-motorized facilities. The on-corridor bike/pedestrian component under this alternative would be restricted to one side of the roadway and would have limited connections to local streets and few enhancements to

intersection and interchange access. However, this alternative would include an additional multi-use trail component aligned off the Connector route. This multi-use path would be constructed along Laguna Creek, the Folsom South Canal, Folsom Boulevard, Alder Creek, and Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to White Rock Road. The multi-use trail location is consistent with the bicycle master plans of the local jurisdictions, and portions of a trail system is already in existence along Laguna Creek and the Folsom South Canal and would be utilized for this alternative.

Sheldon Community Options for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

Several options are being evaluated for the portion of the Connector alignment through the Sheldon community as part of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. These options include various alignments for a bypass that would take the Connector route off of the Grant Line Road alignment or that would realignment local street and access points.

Sheldon Bypass Options 1 and 2

These options would construct a bypass of Grant Line Road south of the central part of the Sheldon community. Either bypass would be constructed above grade through the Cosumnes River floodplain, just east of Grant Line Road, from Waterman Road to Eagles Nest (Option 1) or Bradshaw Road to Eagles Nest (Option 2). No access would be provided along the bypass through the floodplain, including at Wilton Road. Under this option, bicycle and pedestrians access would not be accommodated along the bypass because of the need to limit project footprint and alignment widths within the floodplain. Instead, bicycle and pedestrians would be accommodated along Grant Line Road. (See Figure 2 and Figure 4) With a Bypass, the segment of Grant Line Road running through the Sheldon area would not be incorporated into the Project but would remain a rural roadway under the jurisdiction of the City of Elk Grove. This road would be managed in accordance with the Rural Road Guidelines adopted by the City, which anticipate adjustments in capacity as warranted by traffic demand.

Sheldon Limited Access Roadway (LAR) Option

This option proposes to construct a rural road segment, with a raised center median along Grant Line Road through the Sheldon Area. This option would eliminate direct driveway access, increasing the capacity of the road while minimizing the right of way impact as much as possible. Controlled spacing of signalized intersections and frontage roads would need to be developed to access businesses and residences at selected locations. An effort will be undertaken to investigate the feasibility of this option and provide sufficient detail for analysis in the EIR.

Sheldon No-Build Option

This option proposes the segment of Grant Line Road running through the Sheldon area would not be incorporated into the Project but would remain a rural roadway under the jurisdiction of the City of Elk Grove. This road would be managed in accordance with the Rural Road Guidelines adopted by the City, which anticipate adjustments in capacity as warranted by traffic demand.

Alternative 4. Bradshaw Alignment

The Alternative 4 concept utilizes existing Bradshaw Road for a segment of the Connector. As with all other alternatives, this concept originates at I-5/Hood-Franklin Road interchange, and the first segment, up to Bradshaw Road, matches that of the previously described Alternatives 1 and 2. At Grant Line Road and Bradshaw Road, the Connector would be aligned to the north along a widened Bradshaw Road up to State Route 16 (Jackson Highway) as a thoroughfare, with access limited and consolidated where feasible. Signalized intersection spacing of ½ mile may not be feasible in this area due to the existing and approved development, therefore minimal ¼ mile spacing may be allowed for this stretch. From Jackson Highway,

a new expressway would be constructed in a predominantly easterly direction, along the southern boundary of Mather Airport, to the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and Douglas Road. The alignment would then follow Douglas Road, as a thoroughfare segment to Grant Line Road where it then follows Grant Line Road as an expressway. East of Grant Line Road, the Connector continues as an expressway and follows the common Connector alignment along White Rock Road to El Dorado County. In El Dorado County the Connector is proposed to be a thoroughfare along White Rock Road to the terminus at U.S. 50. The additional non-motorized trail alignment is the same as in Alternative 3.

Screening Criteria and Results

The screening process involved examining the initial alternatives for fatal flaws against screening criteria, including ability to meet most of the proposed project's defined objectives (described above), including the ability to provide adequate traffic operation improvements, potential for substantially reducing the significant environmental impacts of the project, and overall project cost. These elements provided the basis for the development of alternatives and, subsequently, after additional analyses, the basis for their screening. The results of the process are listed in Table 1. A discussion of the impacts of each alternative and the alternative's ability to meet basic project objectives and operational criteria is provided below, along with a recommendation for selecting a preferred alternative for more detailed evaluation in the Program EIR.

Alternatives Recommended for Further Review in the EIR

State CEQA Guidelines focuses the selection of alternatives that can avoid or reduce the impacts of the proposed project. (i.e., "The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project." (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f])). In addition to the No-Project alternative, which is required to be evaluated in and EIR, the following alternatives are recommended for further review in the EIR.

Alternative 2. Grant Line Alignment

Alternative 2 avoids or lessens the extent of numerous environmental impacts associated with Alternatives 1 and 4, while still meeting some of the basic objectives of the proposed project. Alternative 2 best reduces the VHD and improves traffic and pedestrian safety in the project corridor, minimizing exposure to sensitive areas that are integral to community services because no schools, parks, or other sensitive receptors/land uses are located along the proposed corridor. After the Bypass option, this alternative also bests removes heavy trucks and thru-traffic from local streets by providing a more direct route. Like Alternative 1, this alternative best connects to I-5 and would provide critical access during emergencies; improvements along Grant Line Road and proximity to floodplain provide for improved evacuation route during flood event.

This alternative reduces travel times for goods movement in the corridor compared to No Build and significantly reduces potential for heavy trucks on local streets. This alternative also Reduces travel times from residential areas to large employment and commercial areas in the corridor compared to the No-Build alternative.

The existing Grant Line Road currently bifurcates two reaches of Laguna Creek surrounded by high-density vernal pool landscape. Expansion of the road in this corridor could result in impacts on vernal

pools; however, project designs that include low bridging in these areas present otherwise unavailable opportunities to reconnect the vernal pool habitat on either side of the existing roadway. The total estimated impact on wetlands and seasonal waters for Alternative 2/3 (69) is less than that for Alternative 1 (86 acres) the least compared to the other alternatives but slightly more than that for Alternative 4 (68).

Construction costs associated with Alternative 2 are estimated at \$650 million and would be the least expensive behind Alternative 1 (the estimate does not include right-of-way and acquisition costs).

Alternative 3. Grant Line Alignment with Off-Corridor Multi-Use Trail

The Alternative 3 alignment is the same as under Alternative 2 except in the design of the non-motorized facilities. The on-corridor bike/pedestrian component under this alternative would be restricted to one side of the roadway and would have limited connections to local streets and few enhancements to intersection and interchange access. However, this alternative would include an additional multi-use trail component aligned off the Connector route. This multi-use path would be constructed along Laguna Creek, the Folsom South Canal, Folsom Boulevard, Alder Creek, and Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to White Rock Road. Operational improvements associated with this alternative are generally identical to those described for Alternative 2. This alternative would provide the benefits of Alternative 2 but with greater connectivity in the region for alternative modes of transportation. Impacts associated with this alternative are generally the same as those under Alternative 2, but with some minor additional impacts associated with the off-trail construction.

Costs to construct this alternative would be approximately \$6 million more than Alternative 2 to construct the remaining segments in the off-corridor trail (therefore, total construction costs are estimated to be approximately \$676 million). Right-of-way estimates are not included in the cost estimates.

Additional Alternatives Recommended to be included in Program EIR Evaluation

Based on the alternatives screening, the following alternatives overall did not meet the project objectives as well as Alternatives 2/3, and generally result in new or more extensive impacts than Alternative 2/3. However, these alternatives were identified to reduce or avoid one or more environmental impacts of the environmental impacts identified for Alternative 2/3. A discussion of these alternatives is provided below.

Alternative 4. Bradshaw Alignment

As shown in Table 1, Alternative 4. Bradshaw Alignment provides the least benefit to improving traffic operations (in terms of congested vehicle miles traveled, and vehicle-hours of delay—or the amount of delay that would be encountered while travelling) of the 4 main alternatives, generally would not reduce or avoid many of the impacts caused by the other alternatives and would also result in new or worsened environmental impacts than the other alternatives. However, the screening matrix shows that this alternative could result in slightly less impacts on seasonal wetlands and vernal pools than either Alternative 2/3 or Alternative 1 and it would minimize potential impacts from growth inducement that could occur under Alternative 2/3.

All of the alternatives could result in the impacts on existing access points, including removal of driveways serving residential and commercial uses. Removal of residential or commercial driveways could result in the need to acquire properties, or construct new driveways in alternative locations, potentially outside the project footprint, substantially adding to the project costs and enlarging the area of

disturbance. However, Alternative 4 would impact the most existing driveways (154 as compared to 91 for Alternatives 1 and 2, and 3).

Alternative 4 would provide the least amount of access control on the Connector and have the highest impact on existing, approved and planned driveways and minor roadways. Because of the schools along the Alternative 4 alignment, there would be more potential for conflict with existing sensitive uses with Alternative 4. Alternative 4 would also provide the least opportunity for emergency vehicle access and routes because it would not provide a flood evacuation route.

Alternative 4 would also have substantially more potential for impacts related to drainage crossings (33 crossings), compared to Alternatives 1 (20 crossings) and 2/3 (21 crossings) (without the Sheldon bypass). Alternative 4 crosses or is adjacent to designated critical habitat (CH) for vernal pool tadpole shrimp. The CH designation prohibits any adverse modification to primary constituent elements that define the critical habitat in these designated areas. Impacts must be offset within designated critical habitat. Available mitigation within the designated area is extremely limited.

Alternative 4 has the highest potential for total acres of floodplain encroachment (up to 411 acres on 100-year and 524 acres on 500-year FEMA floodplain and up to 62 acres of DWR floodplain—totaling more than 1,000 acres of potential encroachment). It is the only alternative impacting the 500 yr floodplain.

With estimated construction costs at \$720 million (right-of-way acquisition costs are not included), Alternative 4 is neither the least expensive nor most costly of the build alternatives.

Alternative 1. Sunrise Alignment

Alternative 1 is estimated to result in the least construction costs (right-of-way acquisition and displacement costs are not included) and could avoid some of the environmental impacts associated with Alternative 4. Although Alternative 1 would have the least increase in VMT of all the alternatives, it would generally have the least benefit in reduction in travel times along the most project segments of the alternatives. Alternative 1 could avoid some of the driveway access issues that Alternative 4 causes, but it would still have a significant impact on driveway access in approved or planned development areas. Alternative 1 also would be inconsistent with general plan build out assumptions. However, based on its location alone (and not taking design into account), Alternative 1 has the least potential for growth inducement beyond the anticipated growth shown in local jurisdiction's General Plans.

Alternative 1 (without the Sheldon Bypass) does not avoid or minimize the amount of 100-year FEMA-designated acreage of floodplain impacts that Alternative 2 or 3 would cause, but would also result in the greatest amount of DWR-designated 100-year floodplain (up to 113 acres) due to the crossing on south Sunrise Blvd.

Sheldon Community Options for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

The JPA has developed numerous options for the Sheldon community that could reduce or avoid the impacts of the proposed alignment through the Sheldon area. To allow for direct comparison of the options to the proposed alignment under consideration for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, these alternatives to the Grant Line Road alignment are compared below.

Alternative 2/3: Sheldon Limited Access Roadway (LAR) Option

This option alignment is similar to Alternative 2/3, with the exception of a segment running through the community of Sheldon. Under this option, a rural road segment would be constructed, with a raised center

median along Grant Line Road through the Sheldon Area. This option would eliminate direct driveway access, increasing the capacity of the road while minimizing the right of way impact as much as possible. Controlled spacing of signalized intersections and frontage roads would need to be developed to access businesses and residences at selected locations. This option generally performs less effectively than Alternative 2/3 in traffic operations, but avoids some of the impacts on natural resources (vernal pools, floodplains) in the Sheldon area that the Bypass option would cause. Because additional work is currently underway to further define this alternative, it is recommended that this alternative remain under consideration until additional information is available for review.

Sheldon Bypass Options 1 and 2 for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, with the Sheldon Bypass Options would result in the greatest construction costs of \$900 million (right-of-way acquisition and displacement costs are not included). This alternative's ability to meet the basic project objectives and traffic operations criteria are mixed. This alternative would have the greatest increase in daily VMT (0.38 to 0.35%), as compared to Alternatives 1, 2, and 4 (.17% to .32%). However, because of its restricted access, it would result in the greatest reduction in future congested VMT of the alternatives. This alternative also would provide the fastest travel times along most of the project segments and along the overall Connector alignment. For response times during potential catastrophic events, the connection to I-5 for this alternative would provide critical access during emergencies; the Bypass segment would provide for alternative flood event evacuation route, but it would provide only limited access to the Sheldon area during flooding.

Under this alternative, travel times for goods movement in the corridor is reduced compared to the other alternatives, and the bypass option significantly reduces the potential for heavy trucks on local streets, especially in the Sheldon area.

With the Sheldon Bypass, Alternative 2/3 would have the most potential for biological impacts because the bypass would cross Deer Creek and the Cosumnes River floodplain. Location of the bypass on a new alignment within the watershed would also result in substantially greater potential for direct and indirect effects on other sensitive species, including Swainson's hawk, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, tricolored blackbird, western spadefoot, Bogg's Lake hyssop, and Sanford's arrowhead.

The Cosumnes River is the only remaining undammed river between the eastern Sierra Nevada and the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta. It supports a rich aquatic ecosystem and is considered by resource agencies to be a prime river for restoration. The watershed historically supported fall-run Chinook salmon and restorations efforts are underway in the upper watershed as part of the USFWS's Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. Additionally, the Sacramento/San Joaquin Basin Plan identifies numerous beneficial uses, such as fish habitat and water quality, for upper Deer Creek. Uses within these watersheds, particularly construction of new roadway as would occur with the Bypass option, are likely to be restricted. Also, with the Sheldon Bypass, Alternative 1 would have substantially more acres of impact on FEMA-designated floodplains because of the location of the bypass within the Cosumnes River floodplain.

The Bypass alignment is outside of the county USB and therefore is not consistent with the Sacramento County General Plans. Also, the Bypass would construct a roadway within open space habitat protected under various state and federal regulations for watersheds, habitat, and floodplains.

This alternative would avoid displacement/right-of-way acquisition of approximately 44 driveways impacts identified through the Sheldon/Wilton communities that are associated with Alternatives 1, 2, and

3. Under this alternative, travel times for goods movement in the corridor are reduced compared to the other alternatives, and the bypass option significantly reduces the potential for heavy trucks on local streets, especially in the Sheldon area.

This option/alternative would involve construction of a bypass in the floodplain, and it would result in substantially more impacts on wetlands, vernal pools, and floodplains than any other alternative. This alternative presents some advantages over other alternatives by avoiding right-of-way takes through a built community. It does, however, introduce new significant impacts to biological and flood-protected resources that would be avoided under other alternatives and is the most expensive to build.

Recommendation to Select Preferred Alternative (Proposed Project) and Alternatives for EIR Analysis

Based on the screening matrix, Alternatives 2/3 best meet the overall project objectives while minimizing or avoiding the potential impacts of the project. Therefore it is recommended that Alternatives 2/3 be selected as the preferred alternative for analysis in the Program EIR and Alternatives 1 and 4, along with the subalternatives for the Grant Line Road alignment passing through the Sheldon Community, be analyzed as alternatives to the preferred alternative.

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
GREEN (best performance)			3	7				9	9	2	Scores not weighted.
YELLOW								1	1		
RED (worst performance)			9	1				8	7	13	
I. Improves mobility and provides cost-effective, efficient multimodal travel options											
a. Demonstrates cost-effectiveness by minimizing capital and operating expenses while offering strong performance benefits		Varies from \$310-\$360 million per alignment assuming widening existing road	Construction cost estimated at \$610 million For performance benefits, see criteria 1b-1j.	Construction cost estimated at \$685 million For performance benefits, see criteria 1b-1j.	Construction cost estimated at \$6 million (based on Phase I estimate; does not include grade separations or special intersection treatments.	Construction cost estimated at \$670 million.	Construction cost estimated at \$685 million. For performance benefits, see criteria 1b-1j. Additional cost for redevelopment yet to be determined and therefore not accounted for in the cost estimate.	Construction cost estimated at \$900 million (longest bypass option) For performance benefits, see criteria 1b-1j.	Construction cost estimated at \$840 million (shortest bypass option) For performance benefits, see criteria 1b-1j	Construction cost estimated at \$720 million. For performance benefits, see criteria 1b-1j.	Alternative 2/3 with the bypass has the highest estimated construction cost. However, these estimates do not include the cost of additional property acquisition that may be required under Alternative 1 & 4 to address loss of driveway access to existing residential and commercial driveways.
b. Reduces total VHD during morning and evening peak commute periods on Corridor roadways	Existing VHD (PM Peak 3 hr Period) 6,340	2045 VHD (PM Peak 3 hr Period) 17,614	% Change from 2045 No Build -9.4 %	% Change from 2045 No Build - 11.2 %		Would result in less of a reduction in VHD than Alt 2/3	Would result in less of a reduction in VHD than Alt 2/3 with change dependent on definition of LAR	% Change from 2045 No Build - 9.8 %	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	% Change from 2045 No Build -7.3%	Alternative 4 would have the least benefit to reduction in future (2045) VHD (7.3% reduction), as compared to Alternatives 1 and 2/3 (9.4% to 11.2%). Morning peak hour estimates are similar for all alternatives.
c. Reduces peak period VMT on congested (LOS F) roadways in study area	Existing Congested VMT 575,800	2045 Congested VMT 1,576,700	% Change in Congested VMT from 2045 No Build -7.3%	% Change in Congested VMT from 2045 No Build -5.7%		Less reduction in Congested VMT than Alt 2/3	Less reduction in congested VMT than Alt 2/3 with change dependent on definition of LAR	% Change in Congested VMT from 2045 No Build -12.0%	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	% Change in Congested VMT from 2045 No Build -5.2%	Alternative 4 would have the least benefit to reduction in future congested VMT (5.2% reduction), as compared to Alternatives 1 and 2/3 (5.7% to 12.0%).

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
d. Contributes to the reduction of daily VMT in the region	Existing VMT 55,83,400	VMT 2025 = 75,403,700 2045 = 93,795,500	% Change in VMT from Future No Build 2025 = 0.24% 2045 = 0.17%	% Change in VMT from Future No Build 2025 = 0.29% 2045 = 0.22%		Less increase in VMT than Alt 2/3	Less increase in VMT than Alt 2/3 with change dependent on definition of LAR	% Change in VMT from Future No Build 2025 = 0.38% 2045 = 0.35%	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	% Change in VMT from Future No Build 2025 = 0.32% 2045 = 0.30%	No alternative would reduce VMT. Alternative 1/2/3 with either Bypass option would have the greatest increase in VMT (0.38 to 0.35%), as compared to Alternatives 1 and 2/3 without the bypass and Alternative 4 (.17% to .32%)
e. Reduces travel times between key origins and destinations Travel on quick-est travel path:		Peak hour Travel Time	Peak hour Travel Time (% Change in time from Future No Build)	Peak hour Travel Time (% Change in time from Future No Build)		Peak hour Travel Time (% Change in time from Future No Build)	Peak hour Travel Time (% Change in time from Future No Build)	Peak hour Travel Time (% Change in time from Future No Build)	Peak hour Travel Time (% Change in time from Future No Build)	Peak hour Travel Time (% Change in time from Future No Build)	Grant Line Road would provide the quickest route between the common points along the alternative Connector alignments (that is between Grant Line Rd at Bradshaw Rd and Grant Line at White Rock Rd) and the future "build" versions of Alignments 1 and 4 would be slower than travel along Grant Line Road under the No Build Alternative. Therefore, under Alternative 4, the quickest route for travel between south Elk Grove and El Dorado Hills would be along Grant Line Road, not along Bradshaw Road. Alternative 2/3 with the Sheldon bypass would have the fastest travel time followed by Alternative 2/3 without the Sheldon Bypass. Alternative 4 would have the slowest travel time. Despite a major investment in either Alternative 1 or 4 alignments, travel between the common points would continue to use Grant Line Road.
El Dorado Hills—Rancho Cordova		24.7 min	23.0 (-6.7%)	22.9 (-6.9%)		Less reduction in travel time than Alt 2/3	Less reduction in travel time than Alt 2/3 with change dependent on definition of LAR	23.0 (-6.7%)	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	22.8 (-7.5%)	
So. Elk Grove—El Dorado Hills		53.4 min	49.4 (-7.6%)	47.1(-11.8%)				46.1 (-10.9%)		48.2 (-9.7%)	
Sunridge—El Dorado Hills		20.6 min	19.4 (-16.0%)	18.2 (-21.5%)				18.5 (-20.9%)		18.4 (-21.2%)	
So. Elk Grove—Rancho Cordova		38.8 min	36.7 (-5.4%)	37.0 (-4.5%)				35.8 (-5.5%)		37.3 (-3.7%)	
Travel along Connector Alignment Grant Line Rd at Bradshaw Rd-- Grant Line at White Rock Rd		36 min	41 min	26 min				24 min		39 min	
f. Increases the mode share of transit and non-motorized trips in the study area in	Very limited transit service and non-motorized facilities in	Significant increase in transit service and non-motorized	Number of transit and non-motorized trips will increase	Number of transit and non-motorized trips will increase compared to No		Number of transit and non-motorized trips will increase compared to	Number of transit and non-motorized trips will increase	Number of transit and non-motorized trips will increase	Number of transit and non-motorized trips will increase	Number of transit and non-motorized trips will increase	No appreciable differences between alternatives have been identified

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
a cost-effective and productive manner	Corridor	facilities expected	compared to No Build	Build		No Build	compared to No Build	compared to No Build	compared to No Build	compared to No Build	
g. Provides access control while minimizing impacts to existing driveways and local streets. Such methods include limiting access via directional access control or restricting development outside approved local agency general plans or the MTP2035	Existing Driveways: Alt 1: 91 Alt 2/3: 91 Alt 4: 154 Existing Minor/Major Road Intersections: Alt 1: 34/25 Alt2/3: 35/24 Alt 4: 28/30	Driveways Significant number of new driveways may be allowed on roads with approved or planned development without significant access controls, including: • Bradshaw Rd from Calvine Rd to Florin Rd • Rancho Cordova Pkwy from Rio del Oro to White Rock Rd • Rio del Oro Rd from Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Pkwy Future Minor/Major Road Intersections: Alt 1: 42/42 Alt2/3: 37/37 Alt 4: 38/47	Future No Build Minor/Major Road Intersections: 42/42 Future Build: Will strive to limit number of new driveways and eliminate some existing driveways Would impact new driveway access in planned or approved development areas that do not have significant access controls, including: • Rancho Cordova Pkwy from Rio del Oro to White Rock Rd • Rio del Oro Rd from Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Pkwy Minor/Major	Future No Build Minor/Major Road Intersections: 37/37 Future Build: Will strive to limit number of new driveways and eliminate some existing driveways Minor/Major Road Intersections – 20/24 Interchanges – 13		Future No Build Minor/Major Road Intersections: 37/37 Future Build: Similar to Alt 1/2/3 but would not eliminate existing driveways and minor intersections in Sheldon	Future No Build Minor/Major Road Intersections: 37/37 Future Build: Similar to Alt 1/2/3 but would eliminate more existing driveways and minor intersections in Sheldon	Future No Build Minor/Major Road Intersections – 37/37 Future Build: Will strive to limit number of new driveways and eliminate some existing driveways Bypass avoids impacts on about 44 existing driveways Minor/Major Road Intersections – 13/19 Interchanges – 13	Build Minor/Major Road Intersections – 37/37 Future Build: Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Future No Build Minor/Major Road Intersections – 38/47 Future Build: Will strive to limit number of new driveways and eliminate some existing driveways Would impact new driveway access in planned or approved development areas that do not have significant access controls, including: • Bradshaw Rd from Calvine Rd to Florin Rd Minor/Major Road Intersections – 35/33 Interchanges – 15	All of the alternatives could result in the impacts on existing access points, including removal of driveways serving residential and commercial uses. Removal of residential or commercial driveways could result in the need to acquire properties, or construct new driveways in alternative locations, potentially outside the project footprint, substantially adding to the project costs and enlarging the area of disturbance. Alternative 4 would impact the most existing driveways (154 as compared to 91 for Alternatives 1 and 2/3). The exact number of new driveways that would be impacted cannot be determined because precise plans (tentative maps) are not approved for most areas. However, Alternatives 1 and 4 would have a significant impact on driveway access in approved or planned development areas. Elimination of existing driveways and restricting new driveways in approved development areas will be costly and difficult to implement and thus providing an access controlled will not be feasible in some areas. Alternative 2/3 with the Sheldon Bypass would provide the best

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
			Road Intersections: 39/33 Interchanges: 10								access-controlled Connector facility with the least impact on existing, approved and planned driveways and minor roadways followed by Alternative 2/3 without the Sheldon Bypass. Alternative 4 would provide the worst access control on the Connector and have the highest impact on existing, approved and planned driveways and minor roadways.
h. Improves traffic and pedestrian safety in the project corridor, minimizing exposure to sensitive areas that are integral to community services (schools, parks, hospitals, etc.)		Local road configurations will have numerous intersections with x-walks, sidewalks and front on uses that will likely include parks, schools, etc.	There are two parks and a church within 800 ft. of centerline along Grant Line Rd. and Sunrise Blvd.	No schools adjacent to the alignment. One park and one church within 800 ft. of centerline on Grant Line Rd. Removes heavy trucks and thru traffic from local streets by providing more direct route	Five parks, one school and one church within 100 ft.			No parks or schools adjacent to the alignment. Removes heavy trucks and thru traffic from local streets by providing more direct route	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	There are five schools, six churches, and two parks within 800 ft. of centerline mostly located along Bradshaw Rd.	Because of the five schools along the Alternative 4 alignment, there would be more potential for conflict with existing sensitive uses with Alternative 4. Alternative 2 would have the least potential for conflicts with existing sensitive uses. The comparative potential for conflicts with planned sensitive uses cannot be estimated at this time.
i. Improves response times during catastrophic floods or other public safety emergencies and facilitates rapid response and evacuations in the case of emergencies	Existing alignment and profile is within floodplain.	Local road configurations will reduce response time with additional intersections and signals and slow evacuations	Connection to I-5 would provide critical access during emergencies; improvements along Grant Line Road and proximity to floodplain provide for improved evacuation route during flood event.	Connection to I-5 would provide critical access during emergencies; improvements along Grant Line Road and proximity to floodplain provide for improved evacuation route during flood event.	Not anticipated to affect response times	Effects likely to be similar to Future No Build in the Sheldon Area	Limited access along Grant Line Road in the Sheldon area would provide some improved response time along the corridor during emergencies.	Connection to I-5 would provide critical access during emergencies; Bypass would provide for alternative flood event evacuation route, but provide limited access to Sheldon area during flooding.	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Connection to I-5 would provide critical access during emergencies;	Alternative 2/3 would provide for the quickest response time due to the improved travel time along the corridor.

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
j. Provides a sense of community enhancement through the establishment of unique, functional, and attractive features		Planned local road configs. likely not consistent thru 5 jurisdictions. Aesthetics discontinuous based on jurisdictions preference	JPA to enhance aesthetics thru continuous theme and common features	JPA to enhance aesthetics thru continuous theme and common features	Project would provide beneficial linkages to existing trail systems	Effects likely to be similar to Future No Build	Alternative not defined but intended to ensure community of Sheldon remains intact	JPA to enhance aesthetics thru continuous theme and common features	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	JPA to enhance aesthetics thru continuous theme and common features	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option would enhance existing multi-modal systems, create new linkages, and provide opportunities for habitat restoration, context sensitive design elements, and other sustainable design features to benefit communities
2. Supports economic development											
a. Facilitates goods movement and provides the necessary facilities to remove heavy vehicles from community streets			Reduces travel times for goods movement in Corridor compared to No Build	Reduces travel times for goods movement in Corridor compared to No Build Significantly reduces potential for heavy trucks on local streets.	.	Would result in less of a reduction in travel time than Alt 2/3	Would result in less of a reduction in travel time than Alt 2/3 with change dependent on definition of LAR	Reduces travel times for goods movement in Corridor compared to No Build Significantly reduces potential for heavy trucks on local streets.	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Reduces travel times for goods movement in Corridor compared to No Build	Goods movement in the project area is primarily accomplished via trucking. As noted in I., e. above, based on travel times, the alternative alignments along Grant Line Road provide the highest potential to reduce heavy traffic, although these estimates are not specific to trucks but account for all traffic. Road geometry is also important in selection and use of truck travel routes, and therefore a straighter alignment best accommodates heavy trucks. Therefore, Alternative 2/3, would likely have the greatest potential to reduce travel time for goods movement.
b. Improves accessibility to existing and planned employee and commercial centers			Reduces travel times from residential areas to large employment and commercial areas in Corridor compared to No Build	Reduces travel times from residential areas to large employment and commercial areas in Corridor compared to No Build		Would result in less of a reduction in travel time than Alt 2/3	Would result in less of a reduction in travel time than Alt 2/3 with change dependent on definition of LAR	Reduces travel times from residential areas to large employment and commercial areas in Corridor compared to No Build	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Reduces travel times from residential areas to large employment and commercial areas in Corridor compared to No Build	As noted in I., e. above, based on travel times, the alternative alignments along Grant Line Road provide the highest potential to reduce heavy traffic, although these estimates are not specific to residential traffic but account for all traffic. There are a number of existing and planned employment and

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
											commercial centers in the greater study area that will draw employees and customers from residential areas throughout a wide area. Alternatives 1 and 4 serve some specific commercial centers best (i.e. the Rancho Cordova employment center), but Alternative 2/3 serves the widest range of centers located in all five JPA jurisdictions.
3. Considers the environment											
a. Minimizes impacts on wetlands, species habitat, and other ecologically sensitive areas* *Ranges given for a 400 to 800 foot wide corridor (except 30 feet assumed for off-corridor path option), based on GIS mapping of alignments in May 2010	Numerous vernal pools, seasonal waters, and wetlands throughout the corridor, designated vernal pool recovery units, critical habitat for Sacramento & Slender Orcutt Grass Numerous streams and creeks, including the Cosumnes River and Laguna Creek, Morrison Creek, Elder Creek, and Alder Creek watersheds	Potentially impacts more than 27 acres of vernal pools Potentially impacts more than 74 acres of seasonal waters Potentially impacts more than 32 creek/stream crossings	Potentially impacts 11-24 acres of vernal pools Potentially impacts 17-63 acres of seasonal waters Potentially impacts 20 creek/stream crossings	Potentially impacts 11-27 acres of vernal pools Potentially impacts 21-43 acres of seasonal waters Potentially impacts 21 creek/stream crossings The limited access roadway reduces the potential for growth outside the USB and keeps growth confined to the currently planned growth areas.	Potential Impacts to <.5 acre of vernal pool Potentially impact 3 acres of seasonal waters Would not impact and creek/stream crossings	Effects likely to be similar to Future No Build	Impacts cannot be quantified until option is defined	(Additive to Alts 1,2, 3) Potentially impact <0.5 to <1.3 acres of vernal pools Potentially impacts <3-<8 acres of seasonal waters Potentially impacts 13 stream crossings <i>Note: These acreage estimates assume bypass on fill and will be updated with CAD data on pier locations</i>	(Additive to Alts 1,2, 3) Potentially impacts <0.5 to <1.5 acres of vernal pools Potentially impacts 4-9 acres of seasonal waters Potentially impacts 11 stream crossings <i>Note: These acreage estimates assume bypass on fill and will be updated with CAD data on pier locations</i>	Potentially impacts 10-22 acres of vernal pools Potentially impacts 22-47 acres of seasonal waters Potentially impacts 32 stream crossings Potentially impacts critical habitat	All Alternatives are situated within the S.E. Sacramento Valley VP Recovery Unit. Sufficient area to recover the species must be preserved within in the unit. Alternative 4 crosses or is adjacent to designated critical habitat (CH) for vernal pool tadpole shrimp. The CH designation prohibits any adverse modification to primary constituent elements that define the critical habitat in these designated areas. Impacts must be offset within designated critical habitat. Available mitigation within the designated area is extremely limited. Alternative 1 would have slightly more potential for impacts on wetlands and seasonal waters (up to 86 acres) compared to up to 69 and 68, respectively, for Alternatives 2/3 (without either Sheldon bypass option) or

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon “No Build” Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
											<p>Alternative 4.</p> <p>Alternatives 2&3 follow the existing Grant Line Road, which currently bisects several areas of high-quality vernal pool complexes. Road widening would result in high levels of direct and indirect impacts. Bridging the roadway in selected areas may provide opportunities to reconnect important segment of the Laguna Creek watershed, and avoid waters and vernal pool complexes—project level engineering would be required to permit calculation of the precise benefits of improving the hydrological connection of the creek and vernal pool habitat connectivity, and offsetting the direct and indirect impacts resulting from the road widening.</p> <p>Alternative 4 has the highest number of water crossings (32 crossings), compared to Alternatives 1 (20 crossings) and 2/3 (21 crossings) (without the Sheldon bypass), all of which must be bridged, or culverted.</p> <p>Impacts to waters in the Bypass options are calculated using the actual sq ft of each pier. If the density of pier placement effectively ‘acts like fill’; the entire width of each row of piers may be used to fill and would result in higher impacts.</p> <p>Both Bypass Options encroach</p>

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
											<p>on prime foraging, spawning, and aquatic, and riparian habitat in the Deer Creek and the Cosumnes River waters and floodplain. Either bypass would also potentially result in direct and indirect effects on other sensitive species, including Swainson's hawk, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, tricolored blackbird, western spadefoot, Bogg's Lake hyssop, and Sanford's arrowhead.</p> <p>The Cosumnes River is the last undammed river between the eastern Sierra Nevada and the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta, and supports a rich aquatic ecosystem considered by resource agencies to be a prime river for spawning habitat restoration. The watershed historically supported fall-run Chinook salmon and restorations efforts are underway in the upper watershed as part of the USFWS's Anadromous Fish Restoration Program. Additionally, the Sacramento/San Joaquin Basin Plan identifies numerous beneficial uses, such as fish habitat and water quality, for upper Deer Creek. Uses within these watersheds, particularly construction of new roadway as would occur with the Bypass option, are likely to be restricted.</p>
b. Minimizes impacts to air quality	TBD	Not evaluated in Phase I study;	Not evaluated in Phase I study;	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data	Not evaluated in Phase I	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data	Not evaluated in Phase I study;	Not evaluated in Phase I study;	Not evaluated in Phase I study;	Not evaluated in Phase I study;	Air quality analysis will be based on traffic data and construction assumptions to be developed

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
		insufficient data to quantify at this time	insufficient data to quantify at this time	to quantify at this time	study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	to quantify at this time	insufficient data to quantify at this time	insufficient data to quantify at this time	insufficient data to quantify at this time	insufficient data to quantify at this time	
<p>c. Avoids/minimizes construction in the 100-year floodplain*</p> <p><i>*Ranges given for a 400 to 800 foot wide corridor, based on GIS mapping of alignments in May 2010 (except 30 feet assumed for off-corridor path option)</i></p>	<p>FEMA 100-year floodplain</p> <p>FEMA 500-year floodplain</p> <p>DWR 100-year floodplain</p>	<p>Potential for floodplain encroachment similar to that of build alternatives.</p>	<p>Potential encroachment on 57-120 acres of 100-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 0 acres of 500-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 48-113 acres of DWR 100-year floodplain</p>	<p>Potential encroachment on 57-120 acres of 100-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 0 acres of 500-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 29-75 acres of DWR 100-year floodplain</p>	<p>Potential encroachment on 28 acres of 100-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 16 acres of 500-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 16 acres of DWR 100-year floodplain</p>	<p>Effects anticipated to be similar to Future No Build</p>	<p>Impacts cannot be quantified until alternative is defined</p>	<p>Potential encroachment on 260-517 acres of 100-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 0 acres of 500-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on <2.5 acres of DWR 100-year floodplain</p>	<p>Potential encroachment on 204-405 acres of 100-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 0 acres of 500-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 4 acres of DWR 100-year floodplain</p>	<p>Potential encroachment on 207-411 acres of 100-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 259-524 acres of 500-year floodplain</p> <p>Potential encroachment on 26-62 acres of DWR 100-year floodplain</p>	<p>Either Sheldon bypass option would add from 204 to 517 additional acres of FEMA floodplain encroachment to Alternative 1 or 2/3 because the bypass is located within the Cosumnes River floodplain.</p> <p>Under Title 23, the mass of new structures located within the floodplain cannot diminish the flow capacity more than 0.05%; pier structures may slow flows, cause back up, or catch debris. I</p> <p>Alternative 4 has the highest potential for total acres of floodplain encroachment (up to 411 acres on 100-year and 524 acres on 500-year FEMA floodplain and up to 62 acres of DWR floodplain—totaling more than 1,000 acres of potential encroachment). It is the only alternative impacting the 500 yr floodplain.</p> <p>Alternatives I and II & III have the same impacts to FEMA 100 yr, but Alt I impacts more DWR 100-yr because Sunrise Blvd crosses the Laguna Creek watershed.</p> <p>The Multi-use trail encroaches upon a disproportionate amount of floodplain because the pathway design follows Laguna</p>

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon “No Build” Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
											Creek; however, the impacts are not comparable due to the level of improvements.
d. Minimizes noise pollution in existing or developing communities		Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Not evaluated in Phase I study; insufficient data to quantify at this time	Sensitive receptors will include hospitals, churches, schools, residential areas. Alternative 2/3 would have a lower potential of impact due to noise pollution relative to residential communities as it traverses through less residential density than Alternatives 1 & 4.
4. Considers cultural resources <i>Note: Data based on Information Center Record Search of a 0.25 mi. area surrounding the alignments; no field studies were conducted</i>		Potentially impacts more than 9 archaeological resources	Potentially impacts 30 prehistoric cultural resources	Potentially impacts 26 prehistoric cultural resources	Potentially impacts 30 prehistoric cultural resources	Effects likely to be similar to Future No Build	Alternative not yet defined	No previously recorded cultural resources within the Sheldon options	No previously recorded cultural resources within the Sheldon options	Potentially impacts 26 prehistoric cultural resources	Based on the Information Center record search, all the alternatives would have similar impacts on cultural resources. <i>Note: Reconnaissance level surveys for the draft PEIR may identify additional potential archaeological sites not currently listed in the Information Center Record Search files.</i>
a. Minimizes impacts on historical sites and historic buildings <i>Note: Data based on Information Center Record Search of a 0.25 mi. area surrounding the alignments; no field studies were conducted</i>	Recorded historic architectural resources, including portions of Old Placerville Road, Western Pacific Railroad, and Central California Traction Company Railroad Recorded archaeological	Potentially impacts more than 48 historic architectural resources	Potentially impacts 48 historic resources	Potentially impacts 49 historic resources	Potentially impacts 121 historic resources <i>*(note: many “sites” identified in the Info Center files may represent related scatters and/or isolates)</i>	Effects likely to be similar to Future No Build	Alternative not yet defined	No previously recorded cultural resources	No previously recorded cultural resources	Potentially impacts 47 historic resources	All the alternatives would have similar impacts on cultural resources. <i>Note: Reconnaissance level surveys for the draft PEIR may identify additional potential historic sites or buildings not currently listed in the Information Center Record Search files.</i>

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
	resources, including Murphy's Ranch/Lent Ranch Mormon Hill Historic District and American River Mining District										
5. Minimize impacts to existing and planned development		TBD	Expressway portions of the alignment are limited to minimize impacts to planned development. Access will be limited.	Impact to planned development is minimized. Existing access will be impacted.	Not anticipated to affect development	Effects anticipated to be similar to (undefined) Future No build	Alternative not yet defined	Existing access impacts in Sheldon area will be minimized, but will still require some access control.	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Potential impacts to planned Mather redevelopment. Expressway portions of the alignment are limited to reduce impacts to existing and planned development. Access will be limited, which may impact existing development.	Alternative 1 would not minimize impacts on planned development and would be inconsistent with general plan build out assumptions.
6. Minimizes inconsistencies with local jurisdiction's General Plans			City of Rancho Cordova GP roadway # of lanes is based on LOS D, Connector interchange locations based on maintaining LOS C where feasible. Therefore a higher service facility and more lanes are	Consistent with land use and circulation elements in the general plans.	Consistent with general plans	Consistent with land use and circulation elements in the general plans.	Alternative not yet defined	Bypass is outside USB and therefore is not consistent with the Sacramento County General Plans	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	City of Rancho Cordova GP roadway # of lanes is based on LOS D, Connector interchange locations based on maintaining LOS C where feasible. Therefore more lanes are shown on Douglas from	Alternative 1 & 4 would have the most impact on planned development along the corridor.

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
			shown on Sunrise Blvd from Jackson to Douglas than may be required by R.C. GP. Segment of Sunrise Blvd from Douglas to WRR is in direct conflict with the land use and circulation plans for the Rio del Oro project.							Sunrise to Grant Line Road than may be required by R.C. GP.	
7. Minimizes the potential for growth inducement beyond the anticipated growth shown in local jurisdiction's General Plans	Areas abutting the alternative corridors that are currently in agricultural and open space use include areas south of Kammerer Road (common to all alternatives), east of Grant Line Road, and south of White Rock Road (common to all alternatives)	Construction of improvements contained in currently adopted City and County general plans would provide additional access to currently undeveloped areas south of the alignment, east of the Grant Line Road, and south of White Rock Road and make these areas more attractive for development.	Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for development	Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for development Portions of the area east of Grant Line Road and west of the Cosumnes River floodplain are designated vernal pool recovery units, which are important for preservation. The existing Grant Line Road currently bifurcates two reaches of Laguna Creek	Not anticipated to induce growth	Effects similar to future no build	Alternative not defined	The Bypass would construct a roadway within open space habitat protected under various state and federal regulations for watersheds, habitat, and floodplains Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for development Portions of the area east of	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for development Much of the alignment along Bradshaw Road is not included within vernal pool recovery unit boundaries, and several large-scale developments and specific plans are currently in planning. However, the connection	While Alternative 2/3 could have the greatest potential for growth inducement, access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for development. Alternatives 2 & 3 are located closest to the UDA and USA limits and are the outermost alignments. However, there are several large-scale developments and specific plans in review with the County that are located between the Alternatives 2 & 3 and the UDA/USA boundaries that would push the limits for growth beyond the Connector if they go to build out.

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
				surrounded by high-density vernal pool landscape. Project designs that include low bridging in these areas present otherwise unavailable opportunities to reconnect vernal pool habitat.				Grant Line Road and west of the Cosumnes River floodplain are designated vernal pool recovery units, which would place restrictions on development		from Bradshaw Road eastward would cross critical habitat (see above) and the South Mather Master Plan.	
8. Minimizes displacement of existing residences and businesses		Existing businesses and residences may be impacted due to widening of existing roadway.	Existing businesses and residences may be displaced due to widening of existing roadway and access control.	Existing businesses and residences may be displaced due to widening of existing roadway and access control.	Not anticipated to result in displacements	Effects similar to future no build	Alternative not defined	Existing rural properties may be impacted due to new alignment.	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Existing business and residences may be displaced due to widening of existing roadway and access control.	At the program level of design, it is not possible to identify the existing businesses and residences that could be displaced. Removal of driveways serving residential and commercial uses and other impacts on existing access points could result in displacements. Based on the criteria developed for I., g, above, Alternative 4 has the most potential for impact because there are more existing driveways along this alignment (154), as compared to Alternatives 1 and 2/3 (91) (and associated costs
9. Minimizes cost prohibitive alternatives and impractical transportation improvements	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	
10. Minimizes features that encourage growth in areas not designated for growth in	No access is currently available for undeveloped areas south of Kammerer	There are no access restrictions identified for these areas in the currently	Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for	Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for	Not anticipated to affect growth	Effects similar to future no build	Alternative not defined	The Bypass would construct a roadway within open space habitat	Similar to Sheldon Bypass Option 1	Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for	

Screening Criteria	Existing Conditions	Future No Build*	Alt 1 Sunrise Alignment	Alt 2 & 3 Grant Line Alignment	Off-Corridor Multi-Use Path Option	Alternative 1, 2&3 Options for the Sheldon Community				Alt 4 Bradshaw Alignment	Comments
						Sheldon "No Build" Option	Limited Access Roadway Option	Bypass Option 1	Bypass Option 2		
adopted local jurisdiction's general plan or the MTP2035** **Source: 2006 Phase I report	Road, east of Grant Line Road, and south of White Rock Road	adopted general plans	development	development Portions of the area east of Grant Line Road and west of the Cosumnes River floodplain are designated vernal pool recovery units, which could place further restrictions on development				protected under various state and federal regulations for watersheds, habitat, and floodplains Access controls would limit access to undeveloped areas not planned for development Portions of the area east of Grant Line Road and west of the Cosumnes River floodplain are designated vernal pool recovery units, which could place further restrictions on development		development Much of the alignment along Bradshaw Road is not included within vernal pool recovery unit boundaries and thus could have fewer restrictions on development	

¹ Note that fastest travel time route under Alternative 4 follows Grant Line Road, not Bradshaw Road

ALTERNATIVES DESCRIPTIONS (figures referenced are from the NOP):

No-Project Alternative

The No-Project Alternative represents the transportation system in SACOG's adopted 2035 MTP, with widening of the existing roadways along the Connector alignments to 4 or 6 lanes. Access along the roadways within the study area under the No-Project Alternative represents "business as usual," with only minor limitations on new driveways. The No-Project Alternative is also assumed to have numerous at-grade intersections with their locations based on adopted and proposed General Plans and Specific Plans. For the Sheldon Area, the Elk Grove Rural Roadway Standards would apply with improvements made as traffic volume thresholds warrant.

Proposed Preliminary Alternatives

Four preliminary build alternatives are proposed, in addition to a no-build (no project) alternative. The build alternatives contain four elements—roadway, non-motorized trails; transit services and facilities; and open space acquisition—and each have a mix of transit services and facilities both along and off the alignment based on the transit policy. The no-build and build alternatives are described below and illustrated in Figure 2 and Figure 5-typical section segments.

Alternative 1. Sunrise Alignment

The Alternative 1 concept utilizes existing Sunrise Boulevard for a portion of the alignment. This alternative, originating at the I-5/Hood-Franklin Road interchange, follows the common Connector alignment to SR99 along Kammerer Road. From the Grant Line/SR99 interchange, the alignment would proceed along Grant Line Road to Calvine Road, continuing as a thoroughfare except in the Sheldon area which has several options that are defined below for the Sheldon Community Options for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. The Connector then continues from Calvine Road to Sunrise Boulevard as an expressway.

From there, the alignment follows Sunrise Boulevard north as an expressway from Grant Line Road to just north of State Route 16 (Jackson Highway) and then a thoroughfare segment north of State Road 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. Alternative 1 continues east as a thoroughfare, utilizing the White Rock Road alignment through Rancho Cordova. East of Grant Line Road, the Connector then follows the common Connector alignment along White Rock Road and the southern boundary of the Folsom sphere of influence to the El Dorado County with an expressway. In El Dorado County, the Connector is proposed to be a thoroughfare segment along White Rock Road to the terminus at U.S. 50. (See Figure 2 and Figure 5)

Alternative 2/3. Grant Line Alignment

The Alternative 2 alignment follows Kammerer Road, Grant Line Road, and White Rock Road. The non-motorized facilities follow the main alignment. This concept is located primarily on Grant Line Road. Similar to the Alternative 1, the alignment would proceed from I-5 to SR99 along Kammerer Road. From the Grant Line/SR99 interchange, the Connector would remain on Grant Line Road through Elk Grove and Sacramento County to White Rock Road in Rancho Cordova. On Grant Line Road, from Bradshaw Road to Calvine Road, several options are being considered for the Sheldon Community under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. From Calvine Road to White Rock Road, the Connector is proposed to be an expressway. This expressway continues on White Rock Road following the common alignment to the El Dorado County line. In El Dorado County, the Connector is proposed to be a thoroughfare segment along White Rock Road to the terminus at U.S. 50. (See Figure 2 and Figure 5)

Off-Corridor Multi-Use Trail

The Alternative 3 alignment is the same as under Alternative 2 except in the design of the non-motorized facilities. The on-corridor bike/pedestrian component under this alternative would be restricted to one side of the roadway and would have limited connections to local streets and few enhancements to intersection and interchange access. However, this alternative would include an additional multi-use trail component aligned off the Connector route. This multi-use path would be constructed along Laguna Creek, the Folsom South Canal, Folsom Boulevard, Alder Creek, and Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to White Rock Road. The multi-use trail location is consistent with the bicycle master plans of the local jurisdictions, and portions of a trail system is already in existence along Laguna Creek and the Folsom South Canal and would be utilized for this alternative. (See Figure 2)

Sheldon Community Options for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

Several options are being evaluated for the portion of the Connector alignment through the Sheldon community as part of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. These options include various alignments for a bypass that would take the Connector route off of the Grant Line Road alignment or that would realignment local street and access points.

Sheldon Bypass Options 1 and 2

These options would construct a bypass of Grant Line Road south of the central part of the Sheldon community. Either bypass would be constructed above grade through the Cosumnes River floodplain, just east of Grant Line Road, from Waterman Road to Eagles Nest (Option 1) or Bradshaw Road to Eagles Nest (Option 2). No access would be provided along the bypass through the floodplain, including at Wilton Road. Under this option, bicycle and pedestrians access would not be accommodated along the bypass because of the need to limit project footprint and alignment widths within the floodplain. Instead, bicycle and pedestrians would be accommodated along Grant Line Road. (See Figure 2 and Figure 4) With a Bypass, the segment of Grant Line Road running through the Sheldon area would not be incorporated into the Project but would remain a rural roadway under the jurisdiction of the City of Elk Grove. This road would be managed in accordance with the Rural Road Guidelines adopted by the City, which anticipate adjustments in capacity as warranted by traffic demand.

Sheldon Limited Access Roadway (LAR) Option

This option proposes to construct a rural road segment, with a raised center median along Grant Line Road thorough the Sheldon Area. This option would eliminate direct driveway access, increasing the capacity of the road while minimizing the right of way impact as much as possible. Controlled spacing of signalized intersections and frontage roads would need to be developed to access businesses and residences at selected locations. An effort will be undertaken to investigate the feasibility of this option and provide sufficient detail for analysis in the EIR. (See Figure 3)

Sheldon No-Build Option

This option proposes the segment of Grant Line Road running through the Sheldon area would not be incorporated into the Project but would remain a rural roadway under the jurisdiction of the City of Elk Grove. This road would be managed in accordance with the Rural Road Guidelines adopted by the City, which anticipate adjustments in capacity as warranted by traffic demand.

Alternative 4. Bradshaw Alignment

The Alternative 4 concept utilizes existing Bradshaw Road for a segment of the Connector. As with all other alternatives, this concept originates at I-5/Hood-Franklin Road interchange, and the first segment, up to Bradshaw Road, matches that of the previously described Alternatives 1 and 2. At Grant Line Road and Bradshaw Road, the Connector would be aligned to the north along a widened Bradshaw Road up to State Route 16 (Jackson Highway) as a thoroughfare, with access limited and consolidated where feasible. Signalized intersection spacing of ½ mile may not be feasible in this area due to the existing and approved development, therefore minimal ¼ mile spacing may be allowed for this stretch. From Jackson Highway, a new expressway would be constructed in a predominantly easterly direction, along the southern boundary of Mather Airport, to the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and Douglas Road. The alignment would then follow Douglas Road, as a thoroughfare segment to Grant Line Road where it then follows Grant Line Road as an expressway. East of Grant Line Road, the Connector continues as an expressway and follows the common Connector alignment along White Rock Road to El Dorado County. In El Dorado County the Connector is proposed to be a thoroughfare along White Rock Road to the terminus at U.S. 50. The additional non-motorized trail alignment is the same as in Alternative 3. (See Figure 2 and Figure 5)