CHAPTER 4 – LAND USE

This chapter presents the potential impacts of each Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) alternative on existing and planned land use conditions, consistency with applicable planning documents, and compatibility with existing and planned land uses.

This chapter also includes a land use compatibility analysis of Franklin Field and Mather Airport, which are within the Planning Area, and the Sacramento Executive, Rancho Murieta, and Eagle’s Nest Airports, which are located outside of but within the vicinity of the Planning Area.

The land use compatibility analysis evaluates the potential for airport safety concerns associated with the implementation of an alternative’s activities or projects within any of the adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs).

4.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This section describes the regulatory and physical environmental setting for land use planning and existing land uses within the Planning Area.

4.1.1 Regulatory Framework

This section includes a summary of applicable federal, state, and local regulations, policies, and the planning documents for those agencies that have land use authority or are involved with land use decisions within the Planning Area. Pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1502.25, these applicable policies and plans helped to determine the appropriate scope of analysis included in Chapter 4. There are no tribal plans available that pertain to land use in the Planning Area; therefore, tribal plans are not discussed.

4.1.1.1 Federal Regulations and Policies

Wildlife Hazard Mitigation Program, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued an Advisory Circular titled “Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports” (FAA 2007). The FAA released this Advisory Circular as part of its Wildlife Hazard Mitigation Program. The FAA recommends the guidance in this Advisory Circular for land use planners and developers of projects, facilities, and activities on or near airports. The FAA requires airports that receive federal grant-in-aid assistance to follow this guidance. Three of the airports within the Planning Area (Mather Airport and Franklin Field) or nearby (Sacramento Executive Airport) receive federal grant-in-aid assistance and are therefore subject to these guidelines (FAA 2007).
This Advisory Circular recommends that local planning efforts evaluate the potential for hazardous wildlife attractants on or near airports since wildlife–aircraft collisions are a serious economic and public safety issue and jeopardize future airport expansions. The Advisory Circular provides guidance to assess and address development projects and land use planning near airports with respect to their potential to attract wildlife or increase airport wildlife hazards.1 Land uses that could attract hazardous wildlife include aquatic resources, agricultural activities, landfills, public parks, and landscaping (FAA 2007). The Advisory Circular recommends that hazardous wildlife attractants be located no closer than 5,000 feet at airports that serve piston-powered aircraft, 10,000 feet between airports that serve turbine-powered aircraft, and 5 miles from airports when the attractant could cause hazardous wildlife movement into or across the approach or departure airspace. The Advisory Circular also contains multiple recommendations on how to minimize hazardous wildlife attractants, such as rapid stormwater detention basin drainage, steep-sided, narrow ponds, and elimination of vegetation (FAA 2007).

4.1.1.2 State Regulations and Policies

Delta Protection Act and the Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta

The islands, marshes, waterways, and lands located at the confluence of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, including the Suisun Marsh, were defined as “the Delta” in 1959 with the passage of the Delta Protection Act (CDWR 1993). The Delta is a network of inland channels and inland “islands” that cover approximately 738,000 acres. The Delta Protection Act identifies a Primary Zone of approximately 500,000 acres where a comprehensive resource management plan, the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013), is applied (see the discussion under the heading “Delta Reform Act of 2009 and the Delta Plan” below). Originally enacted in 1992, established the Delta Protection Commission and designated the Land Use and Resource Management Plan as a comprehensive resource management plan for the approximately 500,000-acre Primary Zone. The southwestern-most portion of the Planning Area in Preserve Planning Unit (PPU) 6, totaling approximately 32,000 acres west of Interstate 5, is within the Primary Zone (Figure 4-1). An additional approximately 9,000-acre portion of PPU 6 east of Interstate 5 is within the Delta Secondary Zone. The Secondary Zone is defined by the Delta Protection Act as being within the legal Delta, but is subject to the land use authority of a local government. The Delta Protection Commission comments on projects in the Secondary Zone that have the potential to impact the Primary Zone, but does not have jurisdiction over projects in the Secondary Zone.

1 Wildlife hazards include airplane collisions with birds (e.g., seagulls, owls, ducks, geese, crows) and mammals (e.g., deer, coyotes).
Figure 4-1  Jurisdictional Boundaries
The Delta Protection Commission prepared the *Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta* (Land Use and Resource Management Plan), which was last updated in 2010 (Delta Protection Commission 2010). The Land Use and Resource Management Plan includes policies for development of land within the Primary Zone of the Delta. Within 180 days of the Delta Protection Commission’s adopting, updating, or changing the Land Use and Resource Management Plan, local governments must submit amendments to their general plans that make them consistent with the Land Use and Resource Management Plan. Applicable policies from the Land Use and Resource Management Plan are identified below (Delta Protection Commission 2010).

**Policy P-2:** Local government general plans, as defined in Government Code Section 65300 et seq., and zoning codes shall continue to promote and facilitate agriculture and agriculturally-supporting commercial and industrial uses as the primary land uses in the Primary Zone; recreation and natural resources land uses shall be supported in appropriate locations and where conflicts with agricultural land uses or other beneficial uses can be minimized.

**Policy P-3:** New non-agriculturally oriented residential, recreational, commercial, habitat, restoration, or industrial development shall ensure that appropriate buffer areas are provided by those proposing new development to prevent conflicts between any proposed use and existing adjacent agricultural parcels. Buffers shall adequately protect integrity of land for existing and future agricultural uses and shall not include uses that conflict with agricultural operations on adjacent agricultural lands. Appropriate buffer setbacks shall be determined in consultation with local Agricultural Commissioners, and shall be based on applicable general plan policies and criteria included in Right-to-Farm Ordinances adopted by local jurisdictions.

**Policy P-8:** Local government policies regarding mitigation of adverse environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act may allow mitigation beyond county boundaries, if acceptable to reviewing fish and wildlife agencies and with approval of the recipient jurisdiction, for example in approved mitigation banks or in the case of agricultural loss to mitigation. Mitigation in the Primary Zone for loss of agricultural lands in the Secondary Zone may be appropriate if the mitigation program

---

2 This portion of Policy P-2 conflicts with the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) proposed requirements that Covered Activity mitigation occur within the Planning Area (see EIS/EIR Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative description in Section 2.3.5). However, the remainder of Policy P-8 remains applicable to all alternatives analyzed in the EIS/EIR, so Policy P-8 has been retained as part of the regulatory environment considered by the lead agencies when determining the scope of the analysis in Chapter 4, pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.25(b).
supports continued farming in the Primary Zone. California Government Code Section 51256.3 (Assembly Bill 797) specifically allows an agricultural conservation easement located within the Primary or Secondary Zone of the Delta to be related to Williamson Act contract rescissions in any other portion of the secondary zone without respect to County boundary limitations.

**Delta Reform Act of 2009 and the Delta Plan**

The Delta Reform Act created the Delta Stewardship Council and directed the council to complete the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013). The Delta Plan includes land use policies that encourage the location of new development in areas within the Delta where existing infrastructure is available and land is designated for development (Delta Stewardship Council 2013). Local governments whose jurisdiction falls within the legal boundary of the Delta and Suisun Marsh must certify to the council that certain agency decisions—such as approval of a development project or land use policy—are consistent with the Delta Plan. Individuals who disagree with that certification may file an appeal with the council, and if the appeal is upheld, the project or policy must be revised to enable a new certification to be granted.

Approximately 41,000 acres within the southwestern portion of the Planning Area falls within the Primary Zone or Secondary Zone of the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013).

Relevant policies from the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013) include the following:

**Locate New Urban Development Wisely**

a. New residential, commercial, and industrial development must be limited to the following areas, as shown in Appendix 6 and Appendix 7 [of the Delta Plan]:
   
   (1) Areas that city or county general plans as of May 16, 2013, designate for residential, commercial, and industrial development in cities or their spheres of influence;
   
   (4) The unincorporated Delta towns of Clarksburg, Courtland, Hood, Locke, Ryde, and Walnut Grove.

b. Notwithstanding subsection (a), new residential, commercial, and industrial development is permitted outside the areas described in subsection (a) if it is consistent with the land uses designated in county general plans as of May 16, 2013, and is otherwise consistent with this element of the Delta Plan.

c. For purposes of Water Code section 85057.5(a)(3) and section 5001(j)(1)(E), this policy covers proposed actions that involve new residential, commercial, and industrial development that is not located within the areas described in subsection (a).
d. This policy is not intended in any way to alter the concurrent authority of the Delta Protection Commission to separately regulate development in the Delta’s Primary Zone.

**Respect Local Land Use When Siting Water or Flood Facilities or Restoring Habitats**

a. Water management facilities, ecosystem restoration, and flood management infrastructure must be sited to avoid or reduce conflicts with existing uses or those uses described or depicted in city and county general plans for their jurisdictions or spheres of influence when feasible, considering comments from local agencies and the Delta Protection Commission. Plans for ecosystem restoration must consider sites on existing public lands, when feasible and consistent with a project’s purpose, before privately owned sites are purchased. Measures to mitigate conflicts with adjacent uses may include, but are not limited to, buffers to prevent adverse effects on adjacent farmland.

b. For purposes of Water Code section 8507.5(a)(3) and section 5001(j)(1)(E) of this Chapter [of the Delta Plan], this policy covers proposed actions that involve the siting of water management facilities, ecosystem restoration, and flood management infrastructure.

**ER P3. Protect Opportunities to Restore Habitat**

a. Within the priority habitat restoration areas depicted in Appendix 5 of the Delta Plan, significant adverse impacts to the opportunity to restore habitat as described in section 5006, must be avoided or mitigated.

b. Impacts referenced in subsection (a) will be deemed to be avoided or mitigated if the project is designed and implemented so that it will not preclude or otherwise interfere with the ability to restore habitat as described in section 5006.

c. Impacts referenced in subsection (a) shall be mitigated to a point where the impacts have no significant effect on the opportunity to restore habitat as described in section 5006. Mitigation shall be determined, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, considering the size of the area impacted by the covered action and the type and value of habitat that could be restored on that area, taking into account existing and proposed restoration plans, landscape attributes, the elevation map shown in Appendix 4, and other relevant information about habitat restoration opportunities of the area.
d. For purposes of Water Code section 85057.5(a)(3) and section 5001(j)(1)(E) of this Chapter, this policy covers proposed actions in the priority habitat restoration areas depicted in Appendix 5 of the Delta Plan. It does not cover proposed actions outside those areas.

Delta Plan Policy G P1. Delta Plan Policy G P1 requires that actions not exempt from CEQA and subject to Delta Plan regulations must include applicable feasible mitigation measures consistent with those identified in the Delta Plan EIR or substitute mitigation measures that are equally or more effective. Delta Plan Policy G P1 also states that actions subject to Delta Plan regulations must document use of the best available science as relevant to the purpose and nature of the project. Finally, Delta Plan Policy G P1 requires that ecosystem restoration and water management covered actions include adequate provisions for continued implementation of adaptive management, appropriate to the scope of the action. This requirement is satisfied through A) the development of an adaptive management plan that is consistent with the framework described in Appendix 1B of the Delta Plan, and B) documentation of adequate resources to implement the proposed adaptive management plan.

Delta Plan Policies DP P1 and DP P2. Delta Plan Policy DP P1 states that new residential, commercial or industrial development is permitted outside the urban boundaries only if it is consistent with the land use designated in the relevant county general plan. It is intended to strengthen existing Delta communities while protecting farmland and open space, providing land for ecosystem restoration needs, and reducing flood risk. Delta Plan Policy DP P2 states that plans for ecosystem restoration must be sited to avoid or reduce conflicts with existing uses when feasible.

Delta Plan Policy ER P2. Delta Plan Policy ER P2 states that habitat restoration must be consistent with Appendix 3 of the Delta Plan regulations and that restoration will occur at appropriate elevations.

Delta Plan Policy ER R2. This policy states, for the Cosumnes-Mokelumne Confluence: “Allow these unregulated and minimally regulated rivers to flood over their banks during winter and spring frequently and regularly to create seasonal floodplains and riparian habitats that grade into tidal marsh and shallow subtidal habitats.”

Delta Plan Policy ER P3. This policy requires that, within the priority habitat restoration areas depicted in Appendix 5 of the Delta Plan, significant adverse impacts to the opportunity to restore habitat must be avoided or mitigated. Much of the overlap between the Legal Delta and the SSHCP Plan Area includes the Cosumnes-Mokelumne Confluence PHRA.
Delta Plan Policies RR P2, RR P3, and RR P4. Policy RR P2 requires flood protection for residential development in rural areas. Policy RR P3 restricts encroachment in floodways. Policy RR P4 restricts encroachment in floodplains, including the Cosumnes-Mokelumne Confluence. Policy RR P4 specifically states that “no encroachment shall be allowed or constructed unless it can be demonstrated by appropriate analysis that the encroachment will not have a significant impact on floodplain values and functions.”

Delta Plan Policy ER P5. Policy ER P5 calls for avoiding introductions and habitat improvements for invasive nonnative species or mitigating these potential impacts in a manner that appropriately protects the ecosystem. Analysis on this matter should address both nonnative wildlife species as well as terrestrial and aquatic weeds. To the maximum extent practicable, design of habitat restoration and creation actions should avoid or minimize effects that would lead to the establishment of nonnative invasive species populations on site before relying on mitigation measures. In the event that mitigation is warranted, those mitigation and minimization measures should be equally or more effective than the Delta Plan mitigation measure 4-1.

4.1.1.3 Regional Regulations and Policies

Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is an association that includes the Counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba, as well as 22 cities, including two of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) Permit Applicants (the City of Galt and the City of Rancho Cordova). As a metropolitan transportation organization, SACOG is required to prepare a long-range transportation plan for all modes of transportation—including public transit, automobile, bicycles, and pedestrians—every 4 years for the six-county area. SACOG is also required to integrate land use, housing, and transportation strategies into a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that achieves the California Air Resources Board emissions reduction targets for greenhouse gases.

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2036 (the 2036 MTP/SCS) (SACOG 2016) was prepared to establish regional access and to identify mobility goals; identify present and future transportation needs, deficiencies, and constraints within the transportation system; analyze potential solutions; estimate available funding; propose investments; and achieve regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The 2036 MTP/SCS plan does not present requirements for urban development within the Planning Area; rather, it forms the foundation for regional transportation investments, as described in the Regional Housing Needs Plan 2013–2021 (SACOG 2012), and provides regional compliance with federal air quality and state greenhouse gas emissions requirements.
Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan

In recognizing future regional environmental effects of continuing the historical pattern of growth in the six-county area—including loss of habitat, agricultural land, and open space, as well as an increase in traffic congestion and pollution—SACOG initiated preparation of the Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan in 2002 to identify the region’s housing/employment needs through year 2050, and to propose different scenarios for future urban development to accommodate those housing/employment needs. SACOG identified a “base-case” representing development trends at that time and projecting development trends out to year 2050. Alternative future urban development strategies were developed, each implementing differing levels of “smart growth” strategies. After extensive outreach and public involvement, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the preferred blueprint scenario in December 2004 (SACOG 2004). The preferred blueprint scenario represents a balanced approach that emphasizes infill and revitalization, and relies on smart growth principles to encourage development at higher densities, while offering a wide choice of housing options (SACOG 2004).

Recent SACOG documents, such as the 2036 MTP/SCS (SACOG 2016) described previously, use the preferred blueprint scenario as the land use basis for future transportation investments.

4.1.1.4 Local Regulations, Policies, and Plans

Land uses in the Planning Area are governed by the general plans and other local plans and policies of Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. The general plans of these three jurisdictions guide the location and type of land use by establishing each community’s planning goals, objectives, and policies.

Land uses in the Planning Area are also influenced by the 2036 MTP/SCS and by the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans of each public-use airport located in or adjacent to the Planning Area.

Sacramento County General Plan

The Land Use Element of the adopted Sacramento County General Plan of 2005–2030 (Sacramento County General Plan) (Sacramento County 2011) identifies a goal of establishing “an orderly pattern of land use that concentrates urban development, enhances community character and identity through the creation and maintenance of neighborhoods, is functionally linked with transit, promotes public health, and protects Sacramento County’s natural, environmental and agricultural resources” (Sacramento County 2011, p. 17).

The Land Use Element also establishes Sacramento County’s growth boundary system, which it describes as the “backbone of Sacramento County’s urban planning philosophy” (Sacramento County 2011, p. 18). Sacramento County has two growth boundary designations: the Urban Service Boundary (USB), which indicates the ultimate boundary of the urban area in the
unincorporated county and the Urban Policy Area, which identifies the areas where urban development will occur through the year 2030. Please see Chapter 1 for a detailed description of these plan boundaries. While the USB is intended to be a permanent boundary, the Urban Policy Area is adjusted incrementally as needed to ensure that Sacramento County can accommodate anticipated growth throughout the 25-year planning cycle. The area between the two lines is reserved for future urbanization.

As discussed in Section 1.1.1, the term Urban Development Area (UDA) is used by the EIS/EIR to discuss all lands where urban development Covered Activity projects or activities could occur under the action alternatives. Therefore, the term “UDA” means all lands within Sacramento County’s USB boundary that are also within the Planning Area (including lands within the Rancho Cordova city limits that are within the Planning Area), all lands within Galt’s city limits, and all lands within Galt’s sphere of influence (SOI) (see Figure 1-1).

The Sacramento County General Plan and the current County Urban Policy Area boundary assume that most growth in the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County would occur east of the City of Sacramento, north of the City of Elk Grove, and southwest of the City of Rancho Cordova. In addition, expansion of the Urban Policy Area to create several new communities within the Mather Core Recovery Area (MCRA) (USFWS 2005) was anticipated in the General Plan, which notes that stringent criteria for expanding the Urban Policy Area would require such proposals to demonstrate “high quality design and the creation of complete communities that offer a range of housing, employment, commercial uses, transportation choices and community amenities” (Sacramento 2011, Executive Summary, p. 3).

The Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Element establishes an objective of allowing “Limited agricultural–residential land use expansion outside the USB that does not compromise objectives for protecting prime agricultural lands and open space, and avoids groundwater overdraft and contamination” (Sacramento County 2011, p. 72).

Policies relevant to this EIS/EIR from Sacramento County’s Land Use Element include the following (Sacramento County 2011):

**Policy LU-2:** The County shall maintain an Urban Service Boundary that defines the long-range plans (beyond twenty-five years) for urbanization and extension of public infrastructure and services, and defines important areas for protecting as open space and agriculture.

**Policy LU-15:** Planning and development of new growth areas should be consistent with Sacramento County-adopted Habitat Conservation Plans and other efforts to preserve and protect natural resources.
Policy LU-120: The County shall only consider approval of a proposed Urban Policy Area expansion and/or Master Plan outside of the existing Urban Policy Area if the Board finds that the proposed project is planned and will be built in a manner that meets specific standards such as density, jobs-housing balance, financing, mix of uses, etc., specified in the policy (note: this is a summary of this policy. See pages 124 through 135 of the Land Use Element).

Policy LU-122: The Urban Policy Area is intended to provide an adequate supply of developable land sufficient to accommodate projected growth. The Urban Policy Area shall also include additional preserve lands to ensure an appropriate supply of open space. It is the policy and intent of the County to evaluate the Urban Policy Area at a minimum of five-year intervals, to determine if an expansion is needed to maintain a constant adequate supply of land.

- Guidelines to be considered by the Board in determining the expansion of the Urban Policy Area include:
  - Buildout rates by type of use, unit type and density for the previous 5-year period.
  - Infill trends and opportunities.
  - Population and job growth projections as reflected by a minimum of three independent sources.
  - Evidence that the infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be extended to the property.
  - Evidence that the proposed expansion is consistent with Sacramento County adopted Habitat Conservation Plan goals and objectives, or where such a draft or adopted Plan does not exist, evidence that important natural resources lands, agricultural lands, and open space lands will be protected and integrated into a cohesive and interconnected network of open space within the Urban Policy Area.

Policy LU-127: The County shall not expand the Urban Service Boundary unless:

- There is inadequate vacant land within the USB to accommodate the projected 25-year demand for urban uses; and
- The proposal calling for such expansion can satisfy the requirements of a master water plan as contained in the Conservation Element; and
- The proposal calling for such expansion can satisfy the requirements of the Sacramento County Air Quality Attainment Plan; and
- The area of expansion does not incorporate open space areas for which previously secured open space easements would need to be relinquished; and
The area of expansion does not include the development of important natural resource areas, aquifer recharge lands or prime agricultural lands;

- The area of expansion does not preclude implementation of a Sacramento County-adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; OR

- The Board approves such expansion by a 4/5ths vote based upon a finding that the expansion would provide extraordinary environmental, social or economic benefits and opportunities to the County.

**Galt General Plan**

The *2030 Galt General Plan: Policy Document* (Galt General Plan) (Galt 2009) Land Use Element establishes a goal of expanding the City of Galt “as necessary in an orderly pattern consistent with economic, social, and environmental needs” (Galt 2009). Several policies include requirements to protect habitat and open space, including areas proposed for development within the Galt’s SOI. Galt General Plan policies relevant to this EIS/EIR include the following (Galt 2009):

**Policy LU-1.10:** The City shall coordinate habitat preservation efforts with Sacramento County to maintain critical species habitat preservation zoning on open space north of the Planning Area and within the proposed South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan. The City shall continue to mitigate impacts on special habitats and endangered species in consultation with applicable Federal and State agencies prior to adoption of the South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan.

**Policy LU-9.1:** The City should participate in regional efforts to establish a permanent agriculture, open space, and wildlife habitat greenbelt between the northern boundary of the Planning Area and the City of Elk Grove.

**Rancho Cordova General Plan**

The Land Use Element in the *Rancho Cordova General Plan* (Rancho Cordova 2006a) focuses on development of the predominantly urban land uses anticipated within Rancho Cordova’s limits, with a vision of creating a “series of walkable neighborhoods, villages, and districts, each with a center of activity that promotes interactions between residents, employees, and visitors.” The Rancho Cordova General Plan also recognizes the need to preserve natural resources as an important community feature. It establishes Rancho Cordova’s goals of achieving a “balanced

---

3 The Galt General Plan uses “Planning Area” to describe the geographic area that will be directly addressed by the General Plan, and typically encompasses the city limits and potentially annexable land within its SOI (Galt 2009, p. 3).
and integrated land use pattern” and participating in the “decision-making on land-use, circulation, and park issues outside the City limits that have an impact on the City” (Rancho Cordova 2006a). Other elements of the Rancho Cordova General Plan do include relevant policies, as noted below.

The Rancho Cordova General Plan Natural Resources Element identifies the Rancho Cordova’s specific goals and policies intended to position Rancho Cordova as “a leader in natural resource conservation, managing natural resources to ensure long-term sustainability while evaluating new opportunities and techniques in conservation” (Rancho Cordova 2006a). The Natural Resources Element contains goals related to protecting and preserving diverse wildlife and plant habitat and natural aquatic resources and several supporting policies. Those policies that relate to land use and are relevant to this EIS/EIR are as follows (Rancho Cordova 2006a):

**Policy NR.1.2:** Conserve Swainson’s hawk habitat consistent with State policies and Department of Fish and Wildlife guidelines.

**Policy NR.1.6:** Participate in the development of a habitat conservation plan to address the unique biological resources in Rancho Cordova.

**Airport Plans and Guidelines**

Three of the public airports located within the Planning Area (Mather Airport, Franklin Field, and Sacramento Executive Airport) have adopted a CLUP. An airport CLUP addresses airport noise, land use compatibility, and safety. The Rancho Murieta Airport and Eagle’s Nest Airport (which is located within Amador County, immediately adjacent to the eastern edge of the Planning Area) do not have adopted CLUPs; similar guidance is provided through the *Airport Land Use Commission Policy Plan* (Airport Land Use Commission 1992) and the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* (Airport Handbook) (State of California Department of Transportation 2011). Each of the airport land use plans define compatible and incompatible land uses within three airport safety zones: the “Clear Zone,” “Approach–Departure Zone,” and “Overflight Zone.” Figures 4-3 through 4-7 depict each of the airports and include the limits of the airport, Overflight Zones, and 5-mile radii. There are multiple factors that are included in the airport land use plans that provide direction on compatible land uses adjacent to or nearby airports. Given the nature of the SSHCP as a conservation-planning tool, these airport land use compatibility analyses focus on the presence of or increase/decrease of natural areas that may attract wildlife, either on the

---

4 The “Clear Zone” is near the end of the runway and carries the most restrictions in terms of compatible land uses. The “Approach–Departure Zone” is located under the takeoff and landing slopes and is slightly less restrictive than the “Clear Zone” but more restrictive than the “Overflight Zone.” The “Overflight Zone” is the area under the air traffic pattern and is the least restrictive (SACOG 1997, p. 30). The “Overflight Zone” roughly corresponds to the “Airport Operations Area,” as defined in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B.
ground or in flight, or result in microclimatic conditions that may affect navigation. In all of the airport land use plans, open space and natural areas, including natural water areas, are compatible only if they do not result in the possibility that a water area may cause ground fog, a wildlife strike hazard from species such as deer or geese that are attracted to grazing opportunities, or a bird–aircraft collision hazard. These plans allow existing incompatible land uses to continue; however, no existing incompatible land use may be changed to another incompatible land use except by a 4/5 majority vote of the County Board of Supervisors.

4.1.2 Existing Conditions

Figure 4-1 illustrates the city and county jurisdictional boundaries, including the SOI for each city, within the EIS/EIR Planning Area. Table 4-1 identifies the acreage of the Planning Area within Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Acreage within the Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County (unincorporated)</td>
<td>307,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Galt</td>
<td>2,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>8,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres in the Planning Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,655</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-2  Existing Land Use Designations

SOURCE: Aerial ESRI 2014, Jurisdictional Boundaries: County of Sacramento 2013

SOUTH SACRAMENTO HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN EIS/EIR

FIGURE 4-2
Existing Land Use Designations
Figure 4-3  Mather Airport Wildlife Hazard Conditions
Figure 4-4 Franklin Field Wildlife Hazard Conditions
Figure 4-5  Sacramento Executive Airport Wildlife Hazard Conditions
Figure 4-6 Rancho Murieta Airport Wildlife Hazard Conditions

FIGURE 4-6
Rancho Murieta Airport Wildlife Hazard Conditions

SOURCE: Aerial ESRI 2014, County of Sacramento 2014
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Figure 4-7  Eagle’s Nest Airport Wildlife Hazard Conditions
4.1.2.1 Past and Current Land Use in the Planning Area

Sacramento County was formed in 1850 as one of the original 27 counties of the State of California. As discussed in Sections 1.3.1 and 3.7.1, Sacramento County has a strong agricultural history. Agriculture and grazing lands dominated the landscape throughout the early twentieth century. Urbanization increased in the 1940s and again between 1950 and 1960, with new growth occurring primarily near the City of Sacramento and in smaller cities such as Folsom, Galt, and Isleton. Growth continued at a moderate rate between 1960 and 1990, resulting in an expansion of urban land use patterns and infrastructure into the southern and eastern portions of Sacramento County. Development slowed in the early 1990s, picked up again in the early 2000s, and softened or slowed considerably from 2007 to 2009. Approximately 46,000 people lived in the Sacramento metropolitan region in 1900. The population in Sacramento County reached one million between 1980 and 1990, and in 2010 the population was 1.4 million (Sacramento County 2011).

Sacramento County covers approximately 990 square miles and includes seven incorporated cities—Sacramento, Elk Grove, Citrus Heights, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, and Rancho Cordova—and many other unincorporated communities. Communities within the Planning Area, located primarily in the central and western portions of the unincorporated County, typically include land designated for agricultural uses with minimum parcel sizes of 20, 40, or 80 acres. These communities include Alta Mesa, Clay Station, Herald, Point Pleasant, Sloughhouse, and Wilton. These six Planning Area communities are located outside of the UDA, in the southern and eastern portions of the Planning Area, where the Sacramento County General Plan provides for continuation of the historically agricultural-based land use patterns (Sacramento County 2011). Although it is not included in the Planning Area, the unincorporated community of Rancho Murieta is also located in the southeastern portion of Sacramento County outside the UDA (Figure 4-2).

Unincorporated areas of Sacramento County located within the UDA include Florin, Rosemont, Mather, and Vineyard. These areas include existing residential, commercial, and industrial development. The Sacramento County General Plan land use diagram (Sacramento County 2011) indicates that a majority of new urban (residential, commercial, and industrial) land uses would be located north of Elk Grove and east of Sacramento (residential and commercial), while new industrial land uses would be located south of Mather Airport.

4.1.2.2 Land Use Designations in the Planning Area

Table 4-2 provides a summary of the existing land use designations in the Planning Area, also depicted on Figure 4-2. The existing land uses were compiled from the Rancho Cordova, City of Galt, and Sacramento County General Plan land use maps (Sacramento County 2011; Galt 2009; Rancho Cordova 2006a). However, specific land use designations for each Planning Area local jurisdiction were somewhat different. To create a uniform list of Planning Area land use
designations, the EIS/EIR assigned the land use designations used in each general plan to one of the 18 land use designations listed in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2. Existing Land Use Designations within the Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation¹</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total Planning Area (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Cropland</td>
<td>82,279</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Residential</td>
<td>24,926</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Urban Reserve</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (20 Acres)</td>
<td>38,720</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (80 Acres)</td>
<td>106,692</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>254,524</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>6,263</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Offices</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Extensive</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Intensive</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Area</td>
<td>7,008</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Urban Development Area²</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Urban</td>
<td>24,365</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Preserve</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-Way³</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Area TOTAL</td>
<td>317,655</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Land use designations used in Chapter 4 are closely based on the land use designations in Sacramento County 2011.
² The Misc. Urban Development Area designation is included to capture the entirety of the Planning Area.
³ The “rights-of-way” designation represents areas of roadways, utility corridors, and other areas where a local land use authority has granted rights-of-way, and no land use designation was retained.

SACOG predicts that the region will continue to experience strong growth over the EIS/EIR 50-year study period discussed in Section 3.6.3 (SACOG 2004). SACOG has forecasted that Sacramento County will see an increase in population from 1,223,499 in 2000 to 1,695,498 by 2025 and over 2 million by 2050 (SACOG 2005, 2009, as cited in Sacramento County et al. 2017). The six-county Sacramento region is predicted to see an increase in population from 1,886,165 in 2000 to 2,814,254 in 2025. A large portion of this growth is expected to occur within the Planning Area in southern and eastern Sacramento County (Sacramento County et al. 2017). The general planning processes conducted by Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova have taken into account these regional population estimates and have laid out land use frameworks to accommodate this projected population increases. As indicated in Table 4-2, generally, the land use designations for Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova include...
agriculture (including different parcel sizes and land use intensities), urban development (including different residential densities, commercial, and industrial uses), natural preserve, public or quasi-public, and recreational.

4.1.2.3 Airports

There are two public-use airports located within the Planning Area (Mather Airport and Franklin Field) and another three (Sacramento Executive, Rancho Murieta, and Eagle’s Nest) located outside of the Planning Area, but within the project vicinity. In addition, there are several private airports within the Planning Area. Private airports are not part of the national air transportation network and serve private individuals, including agricultural spraying operators. Private airports in the Planning Area vary in size from single dirt airstrips to paved runways with hangars. Private airports in the Planning Area include Boeckmann Ranch Airport, Bottimore Ranch Airport, Flying B Ranch Airport, Flying R Airport, Lucchetti Ranch Airport, Mosier Airport, Mustang Airport, Sky Way Estates Airport, and Van Vleck Airport. All of the private airports are located outside of the UDA.

Mather Airport

Mather Airport, which was formerly the Mather Air Force Base, is located in the UDA portion of unincorporated Sacramento County, adjacent to Rancho Cordova (Figure 4-3). The airport is owned and operated by Sacramento County. Current redevelopment activities on the former base property include airport-related, commercial, and industrial uses (Sacramento County 2010). Mather Airport is bordered to the north and west by residential and commercial development and to the south and east by undeveloped land and agricultural operations.

Water bodies and other land uses that attract birds near Mather Airport include Mather Lake, located in Mather Regional Park approximately 2 miles east of the airport. The American River also flows approximately 3 miles northwest of the airport. Several smaller water bodies are present within Mather Airport’s airport safety zone (which includes the Clear, Approach–Departure, and Overflight Zones), as are extensive areas of vernal pools. Within the airport’s 5-mile separation zone are additional seasonally wet vernal pool areas to the east and south; the American River to the northwest (as noted above); and other open water/aquatic resources to the west, south, and east, including Laguna Creek. In addition, another bird attractant is the 1,084-acre Kiefer Landfill, located approximately 4.5 miles southeast of the airport.

Since its conversion from a military airfield to a public/commercial facility, non-military operations have increased at this facility, specifically air cargo, as have issues relative to local
development. During 2012, Mather Airport, a controlled airport, supported 79,786 flight operations, including cargo, general aviation, air taxi, and military. Over the 5 years from 2008 to 2012, an average of 79,535 flight operations occurred annually (FAA 2013a). The Mather Airport CLUP (SACOG 1997), as noted above, defines compatible and incompatible land uses within three airport safety zones: Clear Zone, Approach–Departure Zone, and Overflight Zone. Open space and natural areas, including natural water areas, are compatible in all three zones only if they do not result in a possibility that a water area may cause a wildlife hazard. The Mather Airport Master Plan update was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in August 2014.

Franklin Field

Franklin Field is located outside the UDA, in southern Sacramento County, approximately 1 mile northeast of the intersection of Twin Cities Road and Franklin Boulevard (see Figure 4-4). Franklin Field is currently a public-use airport owned and operated by Sacramento County.

Franklin Field is surrounded by agricultural land uses, including row crops and grazing lands. Existing drainage canals separate many of the agricultural fields, and similar canals elsewhere in the Planning Area provide habitat and resources for birds and other wildlife. Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge is located less than 5 miles northwest of Franklin Field and contains over 11,000 acres of publicly owned land that comprises freshwater sloughs, wetlands, vernal pools, riparian forest, and grasslands (USFWS 2013). Additional sloughs are located to the east and south of Franklin Field, which ultimately drain into the San Pablo Bay west of Vallejo. Several smaller water bodies are located within Franklin Field’s airport safety zone (which includes the Clear, Approach–Departure, and Overflight Zones), as described previously. Within the 5-mile separation zone are additional vernal pool areas to the north and east; streams and drainages along the eastern and western portions of the 5-mile separation zone; the Cosumnes River along the east and south; Stones Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to the west (as noted previously); and other open water/aquatic resources, including freshwater marshes to the south and west.

Franklin Field is considered an uncontrolled airport since it does not have an air traffic control tower or personnel. There were approximately 36,000 operations in 2008 at Franklin Field, including flight training. The Airport Master Plan Working Paper anticipates that operations at this airport will increase over time, reaching approximately 64,000 operations by 2027 (Sacramento County Airport System 2008). Currently, Franklin Field has prepared a CLUP, which was amended in 1992 (SACOG 1992). The Franklin Field CLUP (SACOG 1992), as noted in Section 4.1.1, defines compatible and incompatible land uses within the following same three airport

---

5  A controlled airport is an airport that has an operating airport traffic control tower. An uncontrolled airport does not include a traffic control tower.

6  See footnote 4 for a definition of each zone.
safety zones as the Mather Airport CLUP: Clear Zone, Approach–Departure Zone, and Overflight Zone. Open space and natural areas, including natural water areas, are compatible in all three zones only if they do not result in a possibility that a water area may cause a wildlife hazard.

**Sacramento Executive Airport**

Sacramento Executive Airport is a controlled general aviation airport located in the City of Sacramento on Freeport Boulevard, outside of but within the vicinity of the Planning Area (Figure 4-5). Over 30 businesses operate at this airport, offering a wide variety of aviation-related services, including a full-service fixed-base operator, flight schools, aircraft maintenance, avionics, and aerial photography (Sacramento County 2010).

Sacramento Executive Airport is completely surrounded by urban development, including residential and commercial land uses. Reichmuth Park is located approximately 1 mile west of the runway, and Bing Maloney golf course is adjacent to the southern edge of the airport. Neither Reichmuth Park nor Bing Maloney golf course contains any water bodies. The Sacramento River is approximately 1.5 miles west of the airport at its closest point. Few aquatic resources are present within the Sacramento Executive Airport’s safety zone (which includes the Clear, Approach–Departure, and Overflight Zones). Within the 5-mile separation zone are the Sacramento River and the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel, which are located to the west, and other open water/aquatic resources, including Laguna Creek to the south.

Although Sacramento Executive Airport is located outside of the Planning Area, its area of influence extends into the Planning Area. This airport is approximately 540 acres, and much of it is already developed or in a Clear (Safety) Zone. During 2012, Sacramento Executive Airport supported 88,619 flight operations, including air carrier, air taxi, general aviation, and military. Over the 5 years from 2008 to 2012, an average of 91,784 flight operations occurred annually (FAA 2013b). Sacramento Executive Airport has a CLUP that was amended in 1999 (SACOG 1999). The Sacramento Executive Airport CLUP (SACOG 1999), as noted previously, defines compatible and incompatible land uses within the same three airport safety zones as the Mather Airport CLUP: Clear Zone, Approach–Departure Zone, and Overflight Zone. Open space and natural areas, including natural water areas, are compatible only if they do not result in a possibility that a water area may cause a wildlife hazard.

---

7 “Area of Influence” is defined as the airport planning boundaries where height, noise, or safety restrictions are imposed. Height standards for defining obstructions to air navigation are established by the FAA and are defined in Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace. Noise restrictions are governed by California Administrative Code, Title 21, Subchapter 6. Airport safety areas are determined by the Airport Land Use Commission. The total area encompassed by these three sets of boundaries is referred to as the “Airport Area of Influence” (SACOG 1999, p. 8).
Rancho Murieta Airport

Rancho Murieta Airport is an uncontrolled airport located approximately 1 mile west of the business district of Rancho Murieta in eastern Sacramento County. The community of Rancho Murieta, including the Rancho Murieta Airport, is excluded from the Planning Area (Figure 4-6). Although this airport is not within the Planning Area, its area of influence extends into the Planning Area. The Rancho Murieta Airport is approximately 76 acres and has been active since 1970.

The airport is predominantly surrounded by residential development or agriculture to the north, east, and west. An existing riparian preserve is located adjacent to and south of the airport as part of the Cosumnes River. Thus, the Cosumnes River, as well as other open water/aquatic resources located to the south and northwest, is a major riparian resource within the Rancho Murieta airport safety zone (which includes the Clear, Approach–Departure, and Overflight Zones). Within the 5-mile separation zone are other creeks, including the continuation of the Cosumnes River, which passes in an east–west direction; vernal pools located in all directions around the airport; and other open water/aquatic resources that are located to the southeast, west, and northwest.

Rancho Murieta Airport has two relatively short runways, which are approximately 3,800 feet long (FAA 2013c), and can only accommodate smaller aircraft. It has no control tower. On average, there are 73 aircraft operations daily (based on data for the 12-month period ending December 2015) (AirNav.Com 2016a). There is no CLUP for this airport, but instead the Airport Land Use Commission Policy Plan (Airport Land Use Commission 1992) governs activity at this facility. This plan, as noted in Section 4.1.1, defines compatible and incompatible land uses within the same three airport safety zones as the Mather Airport CLUP: Clear Zone, Approach–Departure Zone, and Overflight Zone. Open space and natural areas, including natural water areas, are compatible only within all three zones if they do not result in a possibility that a water area may cause a wildlife hazard.

Eagle’s Nest Airport

Eagle’s Nest Airport is an uncontrolled private airport located approximately 1 mile east of the Planning Area, in the town of Ione in Amador County (Figure 4-7). It has been open since 1988 and covers approximately 600 acres. Low-density commercial and residential land uses composed of grasslands, oak woodlands, and scattered vernal pools are located in proximity and to the west and south of the airport. Willow Creek is approximately 1 mile south of the southern end of the runway. Thus, vernal pools and Willow Creek are aquatic resources within the Eagle’s Nest airport safety zone (which includes the Clear, Approach–Departure, and Overflight Zones). Within the 5-mile separation zone are other creeks, including the Cosumnes River to the north; vernal pools located generally in the north, west, and south; and other open water/aquatic resources to the northwest of the airport.
Eagle’s Nest Airport has a single 4,000-foot-long runway and is used by smaller aircraft. It has no control tower and averages 21 aircraft operations per week (AirNav.Com 2016b). The lead agencies could not confirm if a CLUP was adopted for this airport but assumes the airport is operating in compliance with the Airport Land Use Commission Policy Plan (Airport Land Use Commission 1992). This plan, as noted previously, defines compatible and incompatible land uses within the same three airport safety zones as the Mather Airport CLUP: Clear Zone, Approach–Departure Zone, and Overflight Zone. Open space and natural areas, including natural water areas, are compatible within all three zones only if they do not result in a possibility that a water area may cause a wildlife hazard.

**Airport Hazards**

There are many hazards associated with airports that are applicable in regional land use planning. Location of new urban development must be planned in the context of airport height restrictions, noise compatibility, and wildlife hazard considerations. Given the fact that the SSHCP is a conservation planning document, the focus of this analysis is on wildlife hazards.

Birds frequently use airports and surrounding habitats because there is open space, food resources, perches, and often ponds or other aquatic resources. The use of aquatic resources by wildlife in the vicinity of airports depends greatly on the species that are present and their behaviors. Some species are resident year-round, while others are only present during migration in the spring or fall or during summer months. Species that present the greatest wildlife-strike hazard for aircraft include waterfowl and gulls, raptors, blackbirds, and other passerines (Blackwell et al. 2008).

Wildlife collisions with airplanes have increased in frequency as air traffic has increased, with approximately 11,520 wildlife collisions reported in California since 1999 (FAA 2013d). Birds are a management concern for airports, airlines, the military, and wildlife managers. Wildlife strikes on aircraft result in annual damage costs of at least $400 million, the loss of human life, and the deaths of at least 65,000 birds (Sodhi 2002; Blackwell et al. 2008). There has been a marked increase in the incidence of avian strikes in recent decades, which may be attributable to larger, wider-bodied aircraft that are quieter, which makes evasion by birds more difficult (Sodhi 2002).

Therefore, the FAA regulates the management of wildlife attractants within air operation areas to reduce the risk of wildlife collisions. Most (66%) of bird strikes that damaged aircraft occurred less than 500 feet from the ground and within 1.5 miles of the airfield. Almost all (95%) of bird strikes occur within 3,280 feet from the ground and within 11.5 miles of the airfield (Dolbeer 2006). Analysis of this data indicates that the collisions that occur within 1.5 miles of the airfield likely result from birds that reside in the immediate vicinity of the airport.
Although it is not required by regulations or policies, the FAA Office of Airports encourages general aviation airports to conduct wildlife hazard assessments to determine what, if any, measures are needed to reduce wildlife hazards to aircraft. As part of these wildlife hazard assessments, airports would identify potential wildlife attractants within a 5-mile radius of the airport and develop measures to reduce any threats posed to aircraft by the attractant, such as issuing notices to airmen regarding the hazard or changing approach and departure paths to avoid the attractant. This can also include collaborating with the owner or proponent of the attractant to notify the airport when potentially hazardous wildlife, especially migratory waterfowl, are present at off-site locations. The FAA supports general aviation airports by making Airport Improvement Program grants available to conduct a wildlife hazards assessment.

The risk of wildlife strikes is generally increased by the presence of aquatic resources near airports, which attract large waterfowl such as ducks and geese. Waterfowl populations in managed wetlands in Central Valley flood basins can reach extremely dense concentrations, with thousands of large waterfowl covering an area of just a few acres (Silveira 1998). By contrast, vernal pools are generally relatively small, often isolated, wetlands that support only small numbers of waterfowl, shorebirds, and other water birds and only for a short period of time because vernal pools dry quickly. Often, only a single bird or pair of birds is observed at an inundated vernal pool (Silveira 1998). Vernal pools with a large surface area are reported to receive greater waterfowl use than smaller pools (Baker et al. 1992, as cited in Silveira 1998), which may be related to the large pools’ longer inundation period.

4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

4.2.1 Methodology for Assessing Impacts of Each Alternative on Land Use

The change in land use conditions anticipated under each alternative is evaluated and compared to the existing and planned land uses within the Planning Area. Impacts are identified where the actions or projects associated with an EIS/EIR alternative would be incompatible with an existing land use or would conflict with an adopted land use plan.

Potential ways the alternatives could affect land use would be by introducing uses that would be incompatible and/or inconsistent with applicable land use plans, goals, and policies. This includes assessing safety hazards of airports by assessing potential conflicts between proposed activities, including lands proposed for preservation, existing land uses, and goals and policies contained in airport planning documents.

The future projects and activities expected under each EIS/EIR alternative are described in Chapter 2. As discussed in Sections 3.6.5, the EIS/EIR impact methodology uses geographic information system (GIS) datasets that were prepared using the best available information about the amounts and locations of ground disturbance from the future projects and activities.
expected under each alternative. The impact analyses presented in Sections 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.2.4 are described using the Planning Area land use designations listed in Table 4-1. The analysis of each alternative also incorporates by reference certain impact analyses from the planning documents listed in Section 3.4. In accordance with NEPA regulation 43 CFR 46.135(b), where a prior analysis is incorporated, the source document, including pertinent page numbers, is cited, and the analysis is briefly described. The study period used in the Chapter 4 impact analyses is described in Section 3.6.3.

In addition, a land use compatibility analysis was also performed for each EIS/EIR alternative to identify potential incompatible uses near airports. The primary consideration was locations of aquatic land covers, which tend to be most attractive for large-bodied birds, including gulls and waterfowl, and which can also cause formation of ground fog. Using GIS, the Overflight Zones for each airport were compared to the potential locations of future preserves. The Overflight Zones identify a 10,000-foot radius from the center of each end of primary surface runways and incorporate the Clear Zone and Approach–Departure Zone. The GIS analysis then evaluated changes to any aquatic land covers within those preserves that would be potentially attractive to birds, resulting in an incompatible use within the aircraft separation zones.

The cumulative analysis of impacts from each EIS/EIR alternative was evaluated using the methodology generally described in Section 3.7. The Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova General Plan EIRs (Sacramento County 2010; Galt 2008; Rancho Cordova 2006b) evaluated the cumulative effects of the future urban development planned by that jurisdiction. (However, the Sacramento County General Plan (2011) did not analyze new development outside the current Urban Policy Area boundary but instead established policies for how such future development could be considered.) Where the cumulative impact analysis and assumptions used in a general plan EIR document was determined by the lead agencies to be appropriate for use in the impact analyses of an EIS/EIR alternative, a brief summary or description of the incorporated analysis is provided. As discussed in Section 3.4, the three General Plan EIRs used different study periods ending in 2030 (Galt 2008), 2030 (Rancho Cordova 2006b), and 2050 (Sacramento County 2010). However, the 50-year study period for this EIS/EIR ends in 2065 (Section 3.6.3). Therefore, additional urban development can be expected to occur within Galt, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento County in the years after their General Plan EIR study period ends but before this EIS/EIR’s study period ends in 2065. Consequently, the impact analyses and conclusions incorporated from the three General Plan EIRs may not have considered all of the future urban development that is included in the project description of each EIS/EIR alternative. Therefore, when determining the significance of each impact described in the EIS/EIR, the lead agencies considered the impact analysis and the conclusions incorporated by reference from the General Plan EIRs, along with the effects of all urban development activities and projects that are included in the description of each EIS/EIR alternative.
Determination of Impact Significance

As discussed in Section 3.8.1, the criteria used to evaluate the significance of each alternative’s impacts on land use are based on Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) and on typical thresholds used to evaluate land use effects and incompatibilities in recent EIRs prepared by Sacramento County. Based on these sources, a significant adverse impact would occur if the alternative would:

1. Conflict with any applicable adopted land use plan, policy or regulation of a federal, state or local agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to a general plan, specific plan or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
2. Physically disrupt or divide an established community;
3. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip;
4. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; or
5. Displace substantial amount of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) does not provide suggested criteria for determining a beneficial effect. The following criteria and thresholds were developed by the lead agencies:

A beneficial effect to land use would occur if the alternative would:

1. Reduce existing conflicts with an applicable adopted land use plan, policy, or regulation of a federal, state, or local agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to a general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
2. Reduce physical disruption or division of an established community;
3. Reduce a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip;
4. Reduce changes in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that reduces substantial safety risks; or
5. Reduce displacement of existing housing, necessitating less construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

### 4.2.2 No Action/No Project Alternative

The No Action/No Project Alternative is described in Section 2.2.

#### 4.2.2.1 Direct and Indirect Effects of the Alternative

Anticipated changes to the existing land use designations within the Planning Area are shown in Table 4-3.

**Table 4-3. Changes to Existing Land Use Designations under the No Action/No Project Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designations in Planning Area (acres)</th>
<th>Existing % of Planning Area</th>
<th>Land Use Designations Removed from Development (acres)</th>
<th>New Land Use Designations in Planning Area (acres)</th>
<th>New % of Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Cropland</td>
<td>82,279</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>80,016</td>
<td>25.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Residential</td>
<td>24,926</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>21,442</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Urban Reserve</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (20 Acres)</td>
<td>38,720</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9,528</td>
<td>29,192</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (80 Acres)</td>
<td>106,692</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>100,239</td>
<td>31.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>254,524</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>22,437</td>
<td>232,087</td>
<td>73.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>6,263</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial – Office</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Extensive</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Intensive</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Area</td>
<td>7,008</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed-Use Development</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Future)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>37,484</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Urban</strong></td>
<td>24,365</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14,079</td>
<td>51,564</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Preserve</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>18,166</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-Way</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Urban (future) represents the total area of projected urban development under the No Action/No Project Alternative; The land use designation of these areas after development is not known at this time.
2. The “rights-of-way” designation represents areas of roadways, utility corridors, and other areas where a local land use authority has granted rights-of-way, and no land use designation was retained.
3. Table columns may not total precisely due to rounding.
As described in Section 2.2.2, the urban development expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative (Table 4-3) would occur under the General Plans of Sacramento County, Rancho Cordova, and Galt. The General Plan EIRs, described in Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2, and 3.4.3, analyzed the compatibility of land uses and consistency with general plan policies within Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. The land use analyses from each of these General Plan EIRs provide the foundation of the impact analysis for the No Action/No Project Alternative. The relevant land use impact analyses from each General Plan EIR are summarized and incorporated by reference below.

The impact analyses presented in the Final Environmental Impact Report: Sacramento County General Plan Update (Sacramento County General Plan EIR) (Sacramento County 2010) determined the following within Sacramento County:

- Proposed future land uses would not conflict with existing adjacent land use plans or programs or divide an existing community resulting in a less-than-significant impact (Sacramento County 2010, pp. 3-22 to 3-66).
- General plan policies for expansion of the UPA would conflict with some smart growth principles, and the physical effects of the policy conflicts could result in significant impacts related to loss of open space and development outside of the urban environment (Sacramento County 2010, pp. 3-22 to 3-66).
- Displacement of housing due to roadway expansions would result in a less-than-significant impact (Sacramento County 2010, pp. 3-22 to 3-66).
- Compliance with the airport CLUPs would ensure airport safety impacts would be less than significant (Sacramento County 2010, pp. 3-22 to 3-66).
- Planned urban growth within the Jackson Highway Corridor\(^8\) would conflict with “smart growth principles” that direct development towards existing urbanized areas and away from open space, and this urban growth would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to existing land use policy (Sacramento County 2010, pp. 3-22 to 3-66).

The impact analysis presented in the City of Galt General Plan Update: 2030 Final EIR (Galt General Plan EIR) (Galt 2008) determined the following within the City of Galt SOI:

- Planned Urban development described in the Galt General Plan (Galt 2009) would not physically divide an established community, or conflict with an adopted land use plan

---

\(^8\) As described further in Section 3.4.1, the proposed project analyzed within the Sacramento County General Plan EIR assumed development within a designated “Jackson Highway Corridor New Growth Area” that was not a part of the alternative ultimately selected by the County. However, the County is currently processing Master Plans in the Jackson Highway Corridor, so the referenced conclusions from the proposed project analysis are relevant to the No Action/No Project Alternative.
including a habitat conservation plan, resulting in a less-than-significant impact (Galt 2008, pp. 4-1 to 4-9).

- Planned Urban development along Highway 99 would be located within one mile of Mustang Airport which could result in a land use conflict. The addition of a new policy requiring using the Caltrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook when reviewing projects within a mile of the airport would reduce impacts to less than significant (Galt 2008, pp. 4-1 to 4-9).

The Galt General Plan EIR did not address displacement of existing housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The impact analysis presented in the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan Final EIR (Rancho Cordova General Plan EIR) (Rancho Cordova 2006b), determined the following within Rancho Cordova:

- New urban development would not divide an established community, conflict with a habitat conservation plan, or result in incompatible land uses based on compliance with general plan land use policies resulting in a less-than-significant impact (Rancho Cordova 2006b, pp. 4.1-1 to 4.1-62).
- Conflicts with other land use plans, policies and regulations would occur with the Mather Airport CLUP, Sacramento County General Plan, and the Mather Field Specific Plan resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact (Rancho Cordova 2006b, pp. 4.1-1 to 4.1-62).
- New urban development would not result in the displacement of existing housing resulting in a less-than-significant impact (Rancho Cordova 2006b, p. 4.3-14).

The 50-year study period for this EIS/EIR ends in 2065, which is after the study periods of the three previously referenced General Plan EIRs. Consequently, additional urban development not analyzed in the three General Plan EIRs would occur between the end of the three General Plan EIRs’ analysis periods and the end of the EIS/EIR’s study period. This additional development would include the displacement or shifting of 1,900 acres of urban development outside the UDA under the No Action/No Project Alternative (as described in Section 2.2.3) and would result in longer or increased vehicle trips, an increase in air pollutants (Chapter 14), and a potential loss of agricultural land (Chapter 6). Because the No Action/No Project Alternative would be inconsistent with regional transportation plans (Chapter 13) and result in extension of development beyond the existing USB, the No Action/No Project Alternative is inconsistent with the 2036 MTP/SCS (SACOG 2016). Similarly, because the Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan (SACOG 2004) emphasizes infill and other revitalization and relies on smart growth principles, the shift or displacement of 1,900 acres of new development to locations beyond the current USB would also conflict with the Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan.
Development outside the current UDA would also be inconsistent with Sacramento County and Rancho Cordova’s adopted general plans, specifically smart growth policies discussed in Section 4.1.1. For example, Sacramento County’s Policy LU-122 (Sacramento County 2011) specifically states the “Urban Policy Area is intended to provide an adequate supply of developable land sufficient to accommodate projected growth,” and Sacramento County will “evaluate the UPA at a minimum of five-year intervals, to determine if an expansion is needed to maintain a constant adequate supply of land.” Policy LU-127 states that Sacramento County shall not expand the USB unless specific conditions are met or that Sacramento County finds the expansion “would provide extraordinary environmental, social or economic benefits and opportunities to the County” (Sacramento County 2011, pp. 132, 134). The intent of these policies is to ensure any expansion of the UPA or USB is done thoughtfully to avoid inconsistencies with potential impacts to adjacent areas. An inconsistency with smart growth policies would contribute further to the already significant, unavoidable impacts described in the Sacramento County and Rancho Cordova General Plan EIRs discussed previously.

Consistency with the Delta Plan was not analyzed as part of the EIRs for the General Plans of Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. Based on a review of the Delta Plan screening criteria9 (Delta Stewardship Council 2014) that local land use authorities would use to make this determination and the fact that most new development under the No Action/No Project Alternative would be located outside the southwestern portion of the Planning Area that is within the Primary or Secondary Zones of the Delta Plan, few of the projects and activities implemented under the No Action/No Project Alternative would be subject to Delta Plan consistency. However, urban development outside the UDA could potentially conflict with Policy P-3 that requires buffers between urban development and agricultural operations. This would be a less-than-significant, adverse impact to consistency with adopted plans and policies.

As explained in Section 2.2, under the No Action/No Project Alternative, mitigation for impacts to listed species or existing aquatic resources from new urban development would continue to include avoidance and compensation, including establishment of on-site or off-site preserves. As discussed in Section 2.2.5, management of mitigation preserves and mitigation banks could continue to include a variety of habitat management activities, such as livestock transportation for grazing management, fence repair, and visits by preserve managers for maintenance and monitoring. Many of these preserves established under the No Action/No Project Alternative would be located in the UDA and would eventually be

---
surrounded by urban development. With that proximity to development, preserve management and monitoring activities could result in conflicts with existing and planned land uses. However, under the No Action/No Project Alternative management and monitoring activities on new preserves are not expected to be intensive relative to existing conditions, and management and monitoring activities would not result in incompatibility with adjacent land uses or inconsistencies with any applicable planning document. Therefore, mitigation preserves established under the No Action/No Project Alternative would not be incompatible with adjacent land uses or with any of the planning documents discussed in Section 4.1.1. Consequently, the No Action/No Project Alternative preserves would result in a less-than-significant impact to adjacent land uses and would not be inconsistent with existing planning documents. Agricultural compatibility is analyzed in Section 6.2.2.

Preserves established as mitigation under the No Action/No Project Alternative would not be located within any established community, and the Preserve System would not require physically changing or altering an existing developed area or adding a new population. Therefore, the No Action/No Project Alternative would not disrupt an established community or displace existing housing and would have No Impact on any established community or existing housing.

Depending on the location, establishment of new on-site or off-site mitigation preserves could contribute to potential safety hazards associated with wildlife strikes on aircraft. In general, the airports within or adjacent to the Planning Area, including Sacramento Executive, Mather, Franklin Field, Rancho Murieta, and Eagle’s Nest, are located near urban development, undeveloped lands, and agricultural areas. The urban development that would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative could eliminate some aquatic resources that currently attract hazardous wildlife, and re-established or established aquatic resources could create new hazardous wildlife attractants. As stated in Section 2.2.2, re-establishment and/or establishment to mitigate for impacts to aquatic resources under the Clean Water Act, Section 404, would typically occur at a 1:1 ratio; therefore, there would be no net change in wetlands acres in the Planning Area from activities and projects authorized under Clean Water Act, Section 404. Aquatic resources could be re-established or established in open space areas within the Overflight Zone to replace those wetlands lost due to development; however, the CLUPs and the Airport Land Use Commission Policy Plan note that open space and natural areas, including natural water areas, are compatible within all the airport safety zones only if the mitigation area does not cause a wildlife hazard (Airport Land Use Commission 1992; State of California Department of Transportation 2011). Therefore, the Clean Water Act, Section 404, compensatory mitigation for project impacts under the No Action/No Project Alternative could increase aquatic resources within existing airport safety zone areas, potentially creating an incompatible use due to increased wildlife hazards. Based
on the FAA’s recent interest in projects near airports, the EIS/EIR assumes that local land use authorities in the Planning Area will continue to consider potential wildlife hazards when evaluating proposed projects in their jurisdictions, including wetland establishment and/or re-establishment. However, that oversight by local land use authorities would only occur if the project is subject to CEQA review. Otherwise, the project would likely proceed without consideration to wildlife hazards.

In summary, aquatic resources re-establishment and establishment mitigation expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative could potentially increase the safety hazards associated with wildlife strikes on aircraft if the location of re-established or established aquatic resources creates a greater risk of wildlife strike than the existing aquatic resources that are removed by the new development. However, it is equally likely that new aquatic resource locations will be farther away from airport safety zones. Therefore, the No Action/No Project Alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on airport safety.

4.2.2.2 Cumulative Effects of the Alternative

As discussed in Section 3.7.1 and 4.1.2.1, past and present agricultural operations; urban development; development of agricultural-residential neighborhoods and other rural development; mining operations; and construction of energy, water conveyance, flood control, and transportation infrastructure projects, such as facilities owned and managed by the California Department of Transportation and the Department of Water Resources, have altered land use throughout the study area. These past and present alterations have resulted in the existing conditions of land use described in Section 4.1.2.

The types of reasonably foreseeable future other projects, activities, and actions, described in Section 3.7.2, are similar to the types of past and present actions that occurred in the study area. The reasonably foreseeable future other actions in the study area (see Section 3.7.2 and 4.1.2.1) that were not included in the Section 2.2.2 description of the No Action/No Project Alternative include additional new urban development in Elk Grove and Rancho Murieta, master planned developments inside the UDA named Rio Del Oro and Mather South, further rural residential development outside the UDA, continued development of cultivated agricultural lands, expansion of existing preserves, and development of major infrastructure projects such as the California High-Speed Rail and the California WaterFix (see Section 3.7.2 for details of these projects). Some of these foreseeable “other” future actions are consistent with the existing land use plans discussed in Section 4.1.1.4; however, the buildout of the Elk Grove’s future SOI expansion and development north of Rancho Murieta would affect the existing land use designations in the Planning Area outside the UDA. These other foreseeable developments would conflict with Sacramento County General Plan (Sacramento County 2011), the 2036 MTP/SCS (SACOG
2016), and the *Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan* (SACOG 2004), which prioritize locating new development within the existing USB. These inconsistencies of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future other projects and activities with existing land use plans would be a cumulatively significant adverse impact.

In addition, as discussed in Section 4.2.2, under the No Action/No Project Alternative, approximately 1,900 acres of planned urban development would be shifted or displaced to areas outside the current UDA, which would probably be to areas south of the Elk Grove SOI or areas near Rancho Murieta. This displaced development of the No Action/No Project Alternative would add to the land use impacts of reasonably foreseeable development in the Elk Grove SOI and Rancho Murieta areas. Because the No Action/No Project Alternative would add to the existing land use plan conflicts of past and present activities and the reasonably foreseeable future projects, the No Action/No Project Alternative would substantially contribute to the existing significant cumulative impact to land use from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects present in the study area.

### 4.2.3 Proposed Action/Proposed Project

The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative is described in Section 2.3.

#### 4.2.3.1 Direct and Indirect Effects of the Alternative

Under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, approval, issuance of Incidental Take Permits, and implementation of the SSHCP would occur as described in Section 2.3.

As shown in Table 4-4, under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, approximately 19.2% of the Planning Area (34,852 acres) would be developed with urban uses during the 50-year study period.
Table 4-4. Changes to Existing Land Use Designations under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designations in Planning Area (acres)</th>
<th>Existing % of Planning Area</th>
<th>Land Use Designations Removed from Development (acres)</th>
<th>New Land Use Designations in Planning Area (acres)</th>
<th>New % of Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Cropland</td>
<td>82,279</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>80,679</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Residential</td>
<td>24,926</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>21,867</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Urban Reserve</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (20 Acres)</td>
<td>38,720</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>29,595</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (80 Acres)</td>
<td>106,692</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>101,123</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>254,524</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>20,198</td>
<td>234,325</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>6,263</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial – Office</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Extensive</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Intensive</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Area</td>
<td>7,008</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed Use Development</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban (Future)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,852</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Urban</strong></td>
<td>24,365</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9,993</td>
<td>49,227</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Preserve</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>18,001</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-Way²</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,852</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Urban (future) represents the total area of projected urban development under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, which would be located primarily within the UDA. The land use designation of these areas after development is not known at this time.
2. The “rights-of-way” designation represents areas of roadways, utility corridors, and other areas where a local land use authority has granted rights-of-way, and no land use designation was retained.
3. Table columns may not total precisely due to rounding.

The Covered Activities of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative include the same types of urban development projects and activities that are discussed under the No Action/No Project Alternative. However, under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, 1,900 acres of urban development would not be “displaced” outside of the UDA. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would not result in urban development replacing agricultural lands outside the UDA, and therefore, would not result in the inconsistencies with existing general plans that are described for the No Action/No Project Alternative in Section 4.2.2.
As discussed in Section 2.3.5, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would include an interconnected and coordinated SSHCP Preserve System. Within the UDA, the locations of some individual preserves of the future SSHCP Preserve System are already known because they are proposed as part of pending projects. Both inside and outside of the UDA, other preserves needed to complete the Preserve System would be acquired by following certain criteria to preserve existing habitat for Covered Species, including preservation of currently undeveloped lands that support vernal pools. Although the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative does not identify the specific locations of lands that would be acquired for the Preserve System, it is anticipated that preserves would be located on undeveloped or agricultural lands with high quality habitats or special-status species populations or on lands natural land that connect existing preserve areas. Such potential preserve sites would be non-urbanized and typically outside of established communities, and therefore, it is not anticipated that the establishment of new preserves under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would affect established communities.

However, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would allow for more development in the MCRA than the No Action/No Project Alternative (refer to Section 2.2.2). This would allow urban development Covered Activities within the MCRA and the rest of the UDA to be implemented consistently with the Sacramento County General Plan and the Rancho Cordova General Plan without urban development shifting or being displaced to locations outside the current USB.

The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative has been designed to complement and help implement the goals and policies of the Sacramento County General Plan and of ordinances adopted for the protection of resources, as discussed in Section 4.1.1.4. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative provides a means to implement several of the policies in the Land Use Elements of the Sacramento County General Plan, Rancho Cordova General Plan, and Galt General Plan, contributing to consistency with these plans. These include, but are not limited to, Sacramento County General Plan Policy CO-58 (Sacramento County 2011), which ensures no net loss of wetlands, riparian woodlands, and oak woodlands, and Sacramento County General Plan Policy CO-65 (Sacramento County 2011), which requires the creation of a network of preserves linked by wildlife movement corridors (see Section 4.1.1.4). The Sacramento County General Plan (Sacramento County 2011) also includes numerous conservation and open space policies to ensure resources and habitat are identified and protected as development occurs and specifically supports the goals and objectives of the SSHCP.

The Galt General Plan (Galt 2008) and the Rancho Cordova General Plan (Rancho Cordova 2006a) include policies designed to protect species habitat and aquatic resources as Galt and Rancho Cordova continue to develop, and the Proposed Action/Proposed Project
Alternative would be consistent with those policies. Specifically, the Galt General Plan (Galt 2008) includes Policy LU-1.10, which requires working with Sacramento County to coordinate habitat preservation efforts, and Policy LU-9.1, which states that Galt will participate in establishing a permanent agriculture, open space, and wildlife habitat greenbelt between Galt and Elk Grove. The Rancho Cordova General Plan (Rancho Cordova 2006a) includes several policies to conserve natural resources within Rancho Cordova and specifically supports the goals and objectives of the SSHCP. Rancho Cordova General Plan Policy NR.1.1 requires the protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and their habitats in compliance with federal and state law; Rancho Cordova General Plan Policy NR.1.6 requires participation in the development of an HCP; and Rancho Cordova General Plan Policy NR.2.1 requires “no net loss” of wetlands consistent with current federal and state aquatic resource regulations (discussed in Section 4.1.1.4) (Rancho Cordova 2006a).

As discussed in Section 4.1.1, approximately 41,000 acres within the southwestern portion of the Planning Area falls within the Primary Zone of the Delta Plan. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative’s stated biological goals (Section 2.3) are consistent with the Delta Plan policies for restoring, protecting, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem and water supply (Section 4.1.1). Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would be less likely to result in inconsistencies with the Delta Plan, relative to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Because projected urban development described under the adopted general plans would be accommodated within the existing UDA, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result in fewer potential conflicts with existing general plans than under the No Action/No Project Alternative, in which approximately 1,900 acres of planned urban development could be shifted or displaced to areas outside the current USB (see Section 4.4.4).

Further, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would implement more of the natural resource protections included in the Sacramento County General Plan (Sacramento County 2011), the Delta Plan (Delta Stewardship Council 2013), and the Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta (Delta Protection Commission 2010) compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result in a Minor Beneficial effect to land use plan compatibility compared to the land use plan compatibility expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative.

As indicated in Section 2.3.5, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative includes a large, interconnected Preserve System and a comprehensive preserve management program. Most preserve land management activities would maintain existing land uses (e.g., grazing, agriculture), with only minor modifications to enhance quality of species habitat. As with the No Action/No Project Alternative, preserve management under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would also include a variety of habitat management activities, including transportation of sheep, goats, or cattle for grazing management; fence repair; wildlife or vegetation surveys; and visits by preserve managers for maintenance and monitoring (Table 2-3, Section 2.3.6). Similar to the No
Action/No Project Alternative, preserves located inside the UDA would eventually be surrounded by urban development. With that proximity to development, preserve management and monitoring have potential to conflict with existing and planned land uses. However, a preserve management plan would be prepared for each SSHCP preserve located inside the UDA, which would avoid or minimize preserve activities potential effects on surrounding areas. The preserve management plan would provide a coordinated way to minimize incompatibilities with existing or planned land uses or conflicts with existing land use plans. Avoidance and Minimization Measure (AMM) EDGE-1 would prioritize compatible adjacent uses next to SSHCP preserves. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would include an interconnected Preserve System, which includes larger core preserves (rather than the often smaller and more isolated preserves that would be established without a coordinated process under the No Action/No Project Alternative) (see Section 2.3.5). The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative preserve design would reduce conflicts between urban uses and open space/wildlife uses when compared to the conflicts expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, there would be either no difference to or a minor benefit to (i.e., reduction in) land use impacts from preserve activities under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative when compared to land use impacts expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative preserve system would have a Minor Beneficial effect on land use plan compatibility relative to the land use plan compatibility of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Agricultural compatibility is analyzed in Section 6.2.3.

The interconnected Preserve System would not be located within any established community, and the Preserve System would not require physically changing or altering an existing developed area or adding a new population. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would have No Impact on disrupting an established community or displacing existing housing compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative includes acquisition, monitoring, and management of a Preserve System. The Preserve System would create habitat to support a variety of natural land covers and species habitats in the Planning Area. The creation or establishment of new aquatic habitats or the re-establishment of aquatic habitats could contribute to the potential for airport safety hazards (e.g., wildlife strikes) to occur. An analysis is provided below that addresses this potential safety concern for airports within or adjacent to the Planning Area (see Figures 4-3 through 4-7 and the existing condition of each Planning Area airport presented in Section 4.1.2).

Aquatic habitat is a focus of the airport wildlife hazard assessment because it has potential to attract water birds that are considered hazardous to aircraft. The assessments include evaluation of the potential for collisions by birds with aircraft above the Planning Area and elsewhere as a result of synergistic effects between new and existing aquatic resources or other wildlife attractants.
As indicated in EIS/EIR Chapters 8 and 10, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would prioritize re-establishment/establishment of vernal pools in the MCRA rather than freshwater marsh or open water aquatic resources. As discussed in Section 4.1.2.3, vernal pools hold water for only a few weeks or months and for much shorter periods than freshwater marsh, seasonal wetlands, and other aquatic resources, and thus, attract water birds for less time per year than other wetland types. Therefore, wildlife attractants near Mather Field in the MCRA may be reduced under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

Further, AMM AIRPORT-1 indicates that, prior to any re-establishment or establishment of wetlands that would result in a net increase in area of freshwater marsh or open water in the Preserve System or a substantial increase in the proximity of open water or freshwater marsh to airports, an approved biologist must evaluate the proposed establishment/re-establishment activity and the types of wildlife that it will attract (including types/quantities of birds or other wildlife), and provide recommendations on how to reduce wildlife hazards, if feasible. Therefore, AMM AIRPORT-1 would further reduce potential impacts on aircraft hazards and improve the coordination between aquatic resource re-establishment/establishment projects and the Sacramento County Department of Airports.

The Preserve System of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would not re-establish or establish aquatic resources within the safety zones of Sacramento Executive Airport. Thus, there would not be an increased risk of wildlife strike hazards at Sacramento Executive Airport compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative could result in additional preserves being established within the Overflight Zones or 5-mile separation zones for other airports within or adjacent to the Planning Area. Aquatic resources, especially vernal pools, would be re-established and/or established within the Preserve System. The CLUPs and FAA’s latest Advisory Circular note that open space and natural areas, including natural wetland areas, are compatible within all the airport safety zones only if wetland areas or preserves do not cause a wildlife hazard. Relative to freshwater marsh or open water wetland, vernal pools rarely hold water, and thus, are only occasionally used by water birds (Silveira 1998). During preserve planning, the planning for re-establishment or establishment of aquatic resources would comply with the policies and regulations of the relevant airport safety zone (see Sections 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.4, and 4.1.2.1). The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative’s adherence to wildlife hazard policies in the CLUPs or FAA Advisory Circular would ensure that established or re-established aquatic resources do not result in wildlife hazards at any Planning Area airport. Potential increases in wildlife strike hazards at these airports would also be reduced through the planning process described for AMM AIRPORT-1 in Chapter 5 of the SSHCP document (EIS/EIR Appendix D).
In addition to wildlife strike hazard, aquatic resources located within the Overflight Zone and/or 5-mile separation zone can generate ground fog. The analysis for the potential of ground fog creation is based on the elevation of the water area, the distance from the runway, and the prevailing winds. AMM AIRPORT-1 in the SSHCP (Appendix D) would ensure that the design of preserve areas, including wetlands, takes into consideration the potential for ground fog creation.

The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result in less potential for inconsistencies with the adopted airport CLUPs and other relevant policies relative to inconsistencies expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative condition. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would also not increase the risk of wildlife strike hazards at the airports in the Planning Area compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would have a Minor Beneficial effect on airport safety when compared to airport safety under the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

**Significance of Direct and Indirect Impacts**

Compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would include the following actions:

- Avoid inconsistencies with existing land use plans
- Minimize potential conflicts of preserve management and monitoring activities by siting compatible uses near preserves and by providing a coordinated way to minimize incompatibilities with existing or planned land uses or conflicts with existing plans
- Improve compatibility with airports and minimize potential airport safety hazards by implementing a planning process that coordinates wetlands re-establishment/establishment with airport planning staff

Therefore, when considering the totality of direct and indirect effects discussed previously, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result in Minor Beneficial effects to land use when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

**4.2.3.2 Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative**

As described in Sections 3.7.1 and 4.1.2.1, past and present human activities in the Planning Area converted much of the historically undeveloped lands to agricultural use, and then some of that agricultural use has been converted to developed land. These and other past and present human activities are reflected in the acres of existing land use described in Table 4-2.

The types of reasonably foreseeable future other projects, activities, and actions described in Section 3.7.2 are similar to the types of past and present actions that occurred in the Planning
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Area. These foreseeable “other” projects, activities, and actions include new urban development within the City of Elk Grove and within Rancho Murieta, master planned developments in the UDA named “Rio Del Oro” (3,828 acres) and “Mather South” (885 acres) further rural residential development outside the UDA, continued urban development on cultivated agricultural lands, expansion of existing preserves, and development of major infrastructure projects such as the California High-Speed Rail and the California WaterFix.

Two of the reasonably foreseeable future projects described in Section 3.7, the buildout of the City of Elk Grove’s future SOI expansion and new development north of Rancho Murieta, would ultimately affect the planned land uses outside the UDA. These two foreseeable other projects would conflict with the Sacramento County General Plan (Sacramento County 2011), the 2036 MTP/SCS (SACOG 2016), and the Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan (SACOG 2004), which are all land use planning documents that prioritize new urban development within the existing USB. The types and amounts of urban development Covered Activities (including associated transportation and recycled water Covered Activities) described under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative (Section 2.3.3) are very similar to the planned urban development described within the General Plans for Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova. The changes in land use designations to allow the urban development and infrastructure Covered Activities of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would be consistent with the 2036 MTP/SCS, the Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan, and the Delta Plan because they would confine urban development to the UDA. Further, the changes in land use designations under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative to allow urban development and infrastructure Covered Activities are consistent with the Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova General Plan land use policies that encourage development projects to evaluate conservation to minimize or avoid impacts to biological resources.

As identified in Section 4.2.2, the incremental impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative on existing land use designations, when considered together with changes to land use designations resulting from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities in the cumulative study area, would have a significant adverse cumulative effect on land use by conflicting with up to six existing land use plans. As discussed in Section 3.6.1, this EIS/EIR evaluates the future impacts of the two action alternatives relative to the future conditions expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative. Because the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would not conflict with any existing land use plans, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would have a smaller incremental contribution to the Planning Area’s cumulative conflicts with existing land use plans. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative would result in a Minor Beneficial Cumulative effect when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.
4.2.4 Reduced Permit Term Alternative

The Reduced Permit Term Alternative is described in Section 2.4.

4.2.4.1 Direct and Indirect Effects of the Alternative

As described in Section 2.4, the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would include similar types of new urban development as the No Action/No Project Alternative (Section 4.2.2) and the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative (Section 4.2.3).

As shown in Table 4-5, under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative, approximately 16.2% of the Planning Area (37,398 acres) would be developed with urban uses by the end of the 50-year study period.

Table 4-5. Changes in Existing Land Use Designation under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designations in Planning Area (acres)</th>
<th>Existing % of Planning Area</th>
<th>Land Use Designations Removed from Development (acres)</th>
<th>New Land Use Designations in Planning Area (acres)</th>
<th>New % of Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Cropland</td>
<td>82,279</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>80,612</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Residential</td>
<td>24,926</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>21,694</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Urban Reserve</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (20 Acres)</td>
<td>38,720</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9,811</td>
<td>28,909</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agriculture (80 Acres)</td>
<td>106,692</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>6,476</td>
<td>100,216</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Agriculture</strong></td>
<td><strong>254,524</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,031</strong></td>
<td><strong>232,493</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>6,263</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial – Office</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Extensive</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Intensive</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Area</td>
<td>7,008</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed Use Development</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Future)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,398</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Urban</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,365</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,412</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,351</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Preserve</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>18,004</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-Way</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,398</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The GIS mapping exercise conducted for the Reduced Permit Term Alternative was focused on identifying the areas of development impacts to natural land covers and did not include all potential redevelopment of existing developed land covers.

1 Urban (future) represents the total area of projected urban development under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative, which would be located primarily within the UDA. The land use designation of these areas after development is not known at this time.

2 The "rights-of-way" designation represents areas of roadways, utility corridors, and other areas where a local land use authority has granted rights-of-way, and no land use designation was retained.

3 Tables may not total precisely due to rounding.
Under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative, new urban development would occur inside the UDA, as directed by the General Plans of Sacramento County, Rancho Cordova, and Galt, and no new urban development would “shift” or be displaced to areas outside the UDA. The Reduced Permit Term Alternative would result in only 210 acres of less direct impact to natural land covers than the No Action/No Project Alternative. However, 896 acres more of direct impacts to natural land covers would occur in the MCRA portion of the UDA, and 597 acres more of direct impacts to natural land covers would occur in the UDA outside the MCRA when compared to the direct impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, 406 fewer acres of lands with agricultural land use designations would be changed to urban development under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative (Table 4-5). By avoiding a shift or a displacement of new development to areas outside the UDA, the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would have a **Minor Beneficial** effect on compatibility with existing land use plans when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

As with the No Action/No Project Alternative, preserve management activities under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would include grazing management, fence repair, trash removal, mowing and/or vegetation removal to control thatch and invasive species, and visits by preserve managers for maintenance and monitoring. These activities would neither conflict with applicable land use policies from Sacramento County or Galt and Rancho Cordova nor would they physically divide an existing community or displace residents. However, the preserve system established during the 30-year Reduced Permit Term Alternative would have more intensive management and monitoring than the preserves established during the same period of the No Action/No Project Alternative. Many of the preserves under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would be located in the UDA and thus, would be near urban development. The management and monitoring of these preserves could result in some conflicts with existing or planned land uses. However, a preserve management plan would be prepared for each preserve and would take into account how preserve activities affect surrounding areas. That preserve management plan would provide a coordinated way to minimize incompatibilities with existing or planned land uses or conflicts with existing plans. AMM EDGE-1 would prioritize compatible adjacent uses next to preserves established during the 30-year permit term. Overall, there would be either no difference or a minor benefit in land use impacts from preserve activities when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative. Therefore, the preserve system would have a **Minor Beneficial** effect on land use plan compatibility compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition. Agricultural compatibility is analyzed in Section 6.2.4.

Potential impacts on wildlife strike hazard to aircraft would be essentially the same for years 1–30 as for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative (Section 4.2.3). Effects on aircraft strike hazard would be reduced through implementation of AMM AIRPORT-1, which
would ensure coordination between airport planners and the entities siting wetland re-
establishment/establishment projects. From years 31–50, the potential impacts would be
essentially the same as for the No Action/No Project Alternative (Section 4.2.2). Because of
the enhancement coordination with airport planners during the 30-year permit term, the
Reduced Permit Term Alternative would have a Minor Beneficial effect on wildlife strike
hazard compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

Significance of Direct and Indirect Impacts

Compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition, the Reduced Permit
Term Alternative would include the following actions:

- Avoid inconsistencies with existing land use plans by avoiding urban development
  outside the UDA
- Minimize potential conflicts of preserve management and monitoring activities by siting
  compatible uses near preserves and by providing a coordinated way to minimize
  incompatibilities with existing or planned land uses or conflicts with existing plans
  during years 1–30 of the EIS/EIR study period
- Improve compatibility with airports and minimize potential airport safety hazards by
  implementing a planning process during years 1–30 of the EIS/EIR study period that
  coordinates wetlands re-establishment/establishment with airport planning staff

Therefore, when considering the totality of direct and indirect effects discussed previously, the
Reduced Permit Term Alternative would result in Minor Beneficial effects to land use compared
to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.

4.2.4.2 Cumulative Effects of the Alternative

As described in the No Action/No Project Alternative, the Planning Area has transitioned from
undeveloped land to agriculture to developed land, and this transition is reflected in the land
use designations described in Table 4-2. The adopted General Plans of Sacramento County,
Galt, and Rancho Cordova have attempted to minimize the adverse effects of future urban
development land use changes (e.g., increased traffic, increased loss of agricultural lands)
through zoning and land use designations that minimize incompatible land uses (Section 4.1.1).

Reasonably foreseeable future actions, as described in Section 3.7.2, consist of actions that are
similar in nature to the past and present actions in the Planning Area, including additional urban
development in Elk Grove and Rancho Murieta, master planned development at Rio Del Oro and
Mather South, further rural residential development outside the UDA, continued development of
cultivated agricultural lands, expansion of existing preserves, and development of major infrastructure projects such as the California High-Speed Rail and the California WaterFix.

The buildout of the City of Elk Grove’s future SOI expansion and the development north of Rancho Murieta, which are reasonably foreseeable future projects in Section 3.7, would affect the ultimate land use mixture outside the UDA. These developments would conflict with the Sacramento County General Plan, MTP/SCS, and the Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan, which prioritize development within the existing USB.

Urban development (including transportation and recycled water Covered Activities) described under the Reduced Permit Term Alternative is very similar to urban development included within the General Plans of Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova General Plans and would be consistent with the 2036 MTP/SCS, the Sacramento Region Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Plan, and the Delta Plan, which provide frameworks for coordinated land use planning. Further, the Reduced Permit Term Alternative is consistent with the Sacramento County, Galt, and Rancho Cordova General Plan land use policies that encourage development projects to evaluate conservation to minimize or avoid impacts to biological resources.

As identified in Section 4.2.2, the land use changes outside the UDA under the No Action/No Project Alternative, when considered together with land use changes resulting from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities in the study area, would have a significant adverse cumulative effect on land use by conflicting with existing land use plans. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project Alternative has been designed to complement and help implement the goals and policies of the Sacramento County General Plan and of ordinances adopted for the protection of resources, as discussed in Section 4.1.1.4 and other chapters of this EIS/EIR.

However, this EIS/EIR evaluates the impacts of the No Action/No Project Alternative relative to the existing conditions but evaluates the impacts of the two action alternatives relative to the future conditions expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative (see Section 3.6.1). Because the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would result in less development outside the UDA than the No Action/No Project Alternative, it would have a smaller cumulative contribution to conflicts with existing land use plans. Therefore, the Reduced Permit Term Alternative would result in a Minor Beneficial Cumulative effect when compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative baseline condition.
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