

# **APPENDIX A**

---

## **SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

**TABLE A-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

Alternative 1, No-Build	Alternative 2, TSM (Baseline)	Alternative 3/3A/3B, Truxel LRT— Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 4/4A/4B, Truxel LRT—Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 5, I-5/Truxel LRT	Alternative 6, I-5/Truxel BRT	Alternative 7, I-5 LRT	Alternative 8, I-5 BRT
<b>LAND USE AND COMMUNITY IMPACTS</b>							
<b>Consistency with Plans and Policies</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> Inconsistent with adopted General Plans.</p> <p>Auto-oriented land uses would persist.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Requires amending Sacramento General Plan and relevant elements be amended to focus away from TOD.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Inconsistent with adopted General Plans.</p> <p>Less potential for TOD.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Requires amending Sacramento General Plan and relevant elements be amended to focus away from TOD.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> All are consistent with adopted General Plans. High potential for TOD.</p> <p>Alternative. 3/3A impacts 5 acres of prime farmland.</p> <p>Alternative <b>3B</b> has no farmland effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> All alignments are consistent with adopted General Plans, but BRT mode is not. Reduced TOD potential from Alternative 3/3A/3C. Alt. 4/4A impact 5 acres of prime farmland.</p> <p>Alternative <b>4B</b> has no farmland effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Sacramento General Plan and relevant elements would need to be amended to accommodate BRT.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Portions of alignment are inconsistent with adopted General Plans.</p> <p>TOD development potential north of I-80.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Sacramento General Plan and relevant elements would need to be modified for station areas west of I-5.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Portions of alignment and BRT mode are inconsistent with adopted General Plans.</p> <p>TOD development potential from Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Sacramento General Plan and relevant elements would need to be amended to accommodate BRT.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alignment is inconsistent with adopted General Plans.</p> <p>Minimal opportunity for TOD development. May shift employment and some population closer to I-5. Also minimal Farmland effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> General plans would need to be amended to relocate the LRT alignment and TOD to the I-5 corridor.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alignment and BRT mode are inconsistent with adopted General Plans.</p> <p>Minimal opportunity for TOD development. May shift employment and some population closer to I-5. Minimal Farmland effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Similar to Alternative 7; BRT would have to be identified as the technology in the general plans.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact</p>
<b>Community Impacts</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> The effects of implementing the MTP have been addressed in MTP EIR.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No further mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> No adverse community effects. The community would be benefited by additional transit services.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No further mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Construction effects to communities would be significant.</p> <p>Operation could cause noise and visual effects. No bifurcation effects due to at-grade construction.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation would include best management practices during construction and avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant construction impacts.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Construction effects to communities would be significant. Up to one year shorter than LRT Construction.</p> <p>Community bifurcation effects due to aerial structures.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation would include best management practices during construction and avoidance design options, where possible.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant construction impacts. Neighborhood bifurcation are significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Construction effects to communities would be significant but less than Alternatives 3/3A/3B/3B &amp; 4/4A/4B.</p> <p>No bifurcation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation would include best management practices during construction and avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant construction impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Construction effects to communities would be significant but less than Alternatives 3/3A/3B/3B &amp; 4/4A/4B. One year shorter than LRT construction.</p> <p>Potential for some community bifurcation due to aerial structures.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation would include best management practices during construction and avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant construction impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Construction effects to communities would be significant, but less than Alternatives 3/3A/3B/3B &amp; 4/4A/4B, 5, &amp; 6 because this alignment largely avoids residential areas.</p> <p>No bifurcation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation would include best management practices during construction and avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant construction impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Construction effects to communities would be significant but less than Alternatives 3/3A/3B/3B &amp; 4/4A/4B, 5, &amp; 6, because this alignment largely avoids residential areas. One year shorter than LRT construction.</p> <p>No bifurcation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation would include best management practices during construction and avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant construction impact.</p>

**TABLE A-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CONTINUED)**

Alternative 1, No-Build	Alternative 2, TSM (Baseline)	Alternative 3/3A/3B, Truxel LRT— Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 4/4A/4B, Truxel LRT—Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 5, I-5/Truxel LRT	Alternative 6, I-5/Truxel BRT	Alternative 7, I-5 LRT	Alternative 8, I-5 BRT
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACTS</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> The EIR for the MTP has addressed the socioeconomic and fiscal effects of MTP implementation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No further mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Short-term addition of 80 jobs, plus \$9 million in regional labor income.</p> <p>Some improvement in mobility, especially for transit dependent populations, compared to Alternative 1.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No further mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Short-term addition of 860 jobs, plus \$100 million in regional labor income. Respective numbers for 3A are 620 and \$70 million and for 3B are 398 and \$45 million.</p> <p>Some restriction of access of up to nine businesses and five shopping centers during construction.</p> <p>Reduced congestion and improved mobility would have a positive economic effect on the study area.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Maintain access to local businesses during construction.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact. Impacts to business access during construction is less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Short-term addition of 689 jobs, plus \$80 million in regional labor income. Respective numbers for 3A are 441 and \$51 million and for 3B are 294 and \$34 million.</p> <p>Same access restriction issues as described for Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p>Operation effects are comparable to Alternative 3.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Provision of access to local businesses during construction.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact. Impacts to business access during construction is less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Short-term addition of 1,065 jobs, plus \$124 million in regional labor income.</p> <p>Some restriction of access of up to nine businesses during construction.</p> <p>Operational effects are comparable to Alternative 3. Some minor movement of employment may occur to the I-5 corridor south of I-80 as compared to Alternatives 3 and 4.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact. Impacts to business access during construction is less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Short-term addition of 629 jobs, plus \$73 million in regional labor income.</p> <p>Some restriction of access of up to nine businesses during construction.</p> <p>Operational effects are similar to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact. Impacts to business access during construction is less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Short-term addition of 1,002 jobs, plus \$117 million in regional labor income.</p> <p>Some restriction of access of up to nine businesses during construction.</p> <p>Operational effects are generally comparable to Alternative 5 south of I-80. Some movement of employment from the Truxel to the I-5 corridor may occur around transit stations north of I-80.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Short-term addition of 532 jobs, plus \$62 million in regional labor income.</p> <p>Some restriction of access for up to nine businesses during construction.</p> <p>Operational effects similar to Alternative 7.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial impact</p>
<b>PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND RELOCATION</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> No property acquisition over what is documented in the MTP EIR.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> No property acquisition over what is documented in the MTP EIR.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 3/3A may require up to 7 residential and 11 commercial properties or 56 acres for alignment and station locations. Parking will require up to 8 acres and the acquisition of vacant lots. Substations will require up to 2 acres spread over 14 locations. One maintenance facility will require 15 acres. (Approx. total of 81 acres of permanent acquisition)</p> <p>Alternative 3B may require up to 7 residential and 10 commercial relocations for alignment and stations. No maintenance facility, 8 acres for parking, 1 acre for 10 substations. (Approx. 29 acres total)</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Application of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. Use of avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact for Alt. 3. Less than significant impact after mitigation with avoidance design options or the selection of 3A/3B</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Zero relocations, only partial lot acquisitions and parking lot development on 8 acres of vacant lands. No substations or maintenance facility needed. (Approx. total of 20 acres of permanent acquisition)</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Application of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. Use of avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than Significant impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Up to 10 business relocations. Up to 46 acres for alignment, stations and parking, 2 acres for substations and 15 acres for a maintenance facility. (Approx. total of 63 acres of permanent acquisition)</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Application of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. Use of avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 6 could avoid all relocations. Alignment and stations will require acquisition of approximately 20 acres.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Application of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. Use of avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 7 would require up to 10 relocations, but a total of approximately 60 acres of permanent ROW needs for alignment, stations and parking, 2 acres for substations and 15 acres for a Maintenance facility (Approx. total of 77 acres of permanent acquisition)</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Application of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. Use of avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 8 could avoid all relocations. Alignment and stations will require acquisition of approximately 40 acres.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Application of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. Use of avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>

**TABLE A-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CONTINUED)**

Alternative 1, No-Build	Alternative 2, TSM (Baseline)	Alternative 3/3A/3B, Truxel LRT— Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 4/4A/4B, Truxel LRT—Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 5, I-5/Truxel LRT	Alternative 6, I-5/Truxel BRT	Alternative 7, I-5 LRT	Alternative 8, I-5 BRT
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> No disproportionate nor beneficial impacts to minority and low-income populations</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> No disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts through new transit service to low-income or minority or transit-oriented populations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Expected disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations due to construction.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts through new transit service to 10,275 minority and 2,982 low-income and transit-dependent populations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Best management practices during construction, application of the Uniform Relocation Act, avoidance design options, urban design treatments and sound walls and home insulation for noise mitigation.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial but also, Significant and unavoidable for the build-out alternative.</p> <p>Alts 3A/3B (Starter and MOS) can be reduced to less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Expected disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations due to construction.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts through new transit service to 10,275 minority and 2,982 low-income and transit-dependent populations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Best management practices during construction, application of the Uniform Relocation Act, avoidance design options, urban design treatments and sound walls and home insulation for noise mitigation.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Beneficial but also, Significant and unavoidable for the alternative 3.</p> <p>Alts 4A/4B (Starter and MOS) can be reduced to less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Expected disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations due to construction.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts through new transit service to 5,744 minority and 1,884 low-income and transit-dependent populations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Best management practices during construction, application of the Uniform Relocation Act, avoidance design options and urban design treatments.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Same as Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Best management practices during construction, application of the Uniform Relocation Act, avoidance design options and urban design treatments.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Expected disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations due to construction.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts through new transit service to 5,853 minority and 1,883 low-income and transit-dependent populations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Best management practices during construction, application of the Uniform Relocation Act, avoidance design options and urban design treatments.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Same as Alternative 7.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Best management practices during construction, application of the Uniform Relocation Act, avoidance design options and urban design treatments.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant after mitigation.</p>
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> The MTP EIR concluded that both direct and indirect impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation measures were suggested at the programmatic level that include focused studies for individual projects (per NHPA criteria)</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact, but, Individual projects in these areas will need to provide for environmental assessment and mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 1.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 1.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Significant impact to 3 cultural resources: These are Alkali Flats, Sacramento Valley Station and an archaeological site.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Use of avoidance options and low profile catenary to reduce visual conflict. Coordinate with Native American Community to avoid further impacts.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Significant impact to 3 cultural resources, but less visual impact from BRT mode. These are Alkali Flats, Sacramento Valley Station and an archaeological site.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as Alternative 3/3A/3B/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Significant impact to 2 cultural resources. These are Alkali Flats, and Sacramento Valley Station.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Significant impact to 2 cultural resources, but less visual impact from BRT mode. These are Alkali Flats, and Sacramento Valley Station.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5 These are Alkali Flats, and Sacramento Valley Station.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 6. These are Alkali Flats, and Sacramento Valley Station...</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact.</p>

**TABLE A-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CONTINUED)**

Alternative 1, No-Build	Alternative 2, TSM (Baseline)	Alternative 3/3A/3B, Truxel LRT— Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 4/4A/4B, Truxel LRT—Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 5, I-5/Truxel LRT	Alternative 6, I-5/Truxel BRT	Alternative 7, I-5 LRT	Alternative 8, I-5 BRT
<b>PARKLANDS AND RECREATIONAL RESOURCES</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> MTP projects that will have impacts in Segment 1 include the widening of Garden Highway and the widening of the I-5 bridge over the American River for HOV lanes.</p> <p>This will result in permanent visual impacts to the park area from the bridge and shading under the bridge.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> See Visual impacts. Other mitigation is noted in the MTP EIR.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 1. However, the addition of the Baseline elements will result in no significant effects.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No additional mitigation.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> No significant impacts above the MTP projects</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Significant construction effects to the American River Parkway by disturbing 15 acres, restricting use and increase temporary safety concerns.</p> <p>Beneficial operational effects of providing park access to the transit dependent.</p> <p>A permanent ROW requirement of 4 to 6 acres would be required.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> The application of BMPs during construction. Implement security patrol, aesthetic treatment of bridge and routine maintenance.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts during construction. Significant long term commitment of parkland (3-4 acres) for ROW. Security and maintenance impacts would be less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>4/4A/4B Effects.</b> Comparable construction and operational effects to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts, see Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable construction and operational effects to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p>Crossing is near I-5, effects developed parkland in Discovery Park greater than for Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts, see Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable construction and operational effects to Alternative 5</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts, see Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable construction and operational effects to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts, see Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable construction and operational effects to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts, see Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p>
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY</b>							
<b>Safety Impacts</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 1 does not cause adverse impacts to security and safety of transit providers, auto or pedestrians.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Potential concerns for public safety at bus stops and on bus vehicles.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> RT to add proportional increase in security forces to cover increases in transit operation. No further mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 3 holds concerns for public safety at LRT stations and on LRT vehicles. Potential accidents due to 39 at-grade crossings for build-out.</p> <p>Potential accidents due to 43 at-grade crossings for Alternative 3A and 36 for Alternative 3B and mixed flow portions in the alignment.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Security forces would be added proportionately to increases in transit service hours. Life safety criteria would be incorporated into at-grade crossings, LRT stations and park and rides, resulting in a less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 4 holds concerns for public safety at BRT stations and on BRT vehicles. Potential accidents due to 33 at-grade crossings for build-out.</p> <p>Potential accidents due to 36 at-grade crossings for Alternative 4A and 34 for Alternative 4B and mixed flow portions in the alignment.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Concerns for public safety at LRT stations and on LRT vehicles. Potential accidents due to 35 at-grade crossings, but no mixed-flow operation.</p> <p>Difficult and remote access to station locations may increase security risk.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternatives 3 and 4.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Concerns for public safety at BRT stations and on BRT vehicles. Potential accidents due to 14 at-grade crossings. Also, shoulder use along Richards may hold the potential for accidents.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 5, difficult and remote access to station locations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Concerns for public safety at LRT stations and on LRT vehicles. Potential accidents due to 16 at-grade crossings, but no mixed-flow operation.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 5, difficult and remote access to station locations. This alternative has all exclusive</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5. Additionally, access issues to the ROW would need to be addressed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Concerns for public safety at BRT stations and on BRT vehicles. Potential accidents due to 14 at-grade crossings. Also, shoulder use along Richards may hold the potential for accidents.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 5, difficult and remote access to station locations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 7.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant with mitigation</p>

**TABLE A-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CONTINUED)**

Alternative 1, No-Build	Alternative 2, TSM (Baseline)	Alternative 3/3A/3B, Truxel LRT— Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 4/4A/4B, Truxel LRT—Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 5, I-5/Truxel LRT	Alternative 6, I-5/Truxel BRT	Alternative 7, I-5 LRT	Alternative 8, I-5 BRT
<b>VISUAL AESTHETICS</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 1, includes the implementation of several future land use plans which will result in visual improvements along the corridor.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> No adverse visual impacts would result from Alternative 2.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Visual impacts from 11,000 feet of aerial structures for Alternative 3, 8,600 for Alternative 3A, and 5,100 for Alternative 3B, overhead catenary throughout, up to 14 traction power substations and four new Park-and-Ride locations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Screening, aesthetic treatments and public input where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant visual impact due to aerial structures.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Visual impacts from: 20,000 feet of aerial structures, 9,000 for Alternative 4A and 7,000 for Alternative 4B, and four new Park-and-Ride locations.</p> <p>No overhead catenary or traction power substations. Alternative 4 also includes visual impacts from a tunnel at San Juan and Truxel Road.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Screening, aesthetic treatments and public input where appropriate</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant visual impact due to tunnel and aerial structures</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 5, involves visual impacts from: 10,500 feet of aerial structures, catenary wires throughout, 14 traction power substations, 5 new Park-and-Ride locations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Screening, aesthetic treatments and public input where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant visual impact due to aerial structures</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 6, involves visual impacts from: 24,700 feet of aerial structures, and 5 new Park-and-Ride locations. No catenary or traction power substations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Screening, aesthetic treatments and public input where appropriate</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant visual impact due to aerial structures</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 7, involves visual impacts from: 29,000 feet of aerial structures, catenary wires throughout, 13 traction power substations, 3 new Park-and-Ride locations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Screening, aesthetic treatments and public input where appropriate</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant visual impact due to aerial structures</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternative 8, involves visual impacts from: 13,000 (shoulder design or freeway shoulder option) to 21,700 feet of aerial structures, and 3 new Park-and-Ride locations. No catenary or traction power substations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Screening, aesthetic treatments and public input where appropriate</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant visual impact due to aerial structures</p>
<b>NOISE AND VIBRATION</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> Increases in traffic volumes would result in noise level increases between 1 to 3 dBA relative to existing conditions</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> The 2025 MTP calls for mitigation's to be included in project-level analysis as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> The 2025 MTP finds construction impacts to be LSM and the operation and expansion of transportation facilities to be Significant.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> The same general noise conditions as Alternative 1.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Mitigation's should be included in project-level analysis as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> The 2025 MTP finds construction impacts to be LSM and the operation and expansion of transportation facilities to be Significant and this would also apply to Alternative 2.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Noise— Alternatives 3/3A/3B construction will cause noise impacts throughout corridor.</p> <p>Alternative 3/3A/3B noise impacts during operation include crossing the American River Parkway and up to 42 residences if the Urrutia Bridge crossing is chosen. If not, then operation would not result in noise effects.</p> <p><b>Effects.</b> Vibration— Alternative 3 May impact a day care center.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Construction mitigation's would include limiting pile driving and demolition activities to daytime hours and other BMP's. Mitigation's for operations would include sound walls/berms, home acoustical insulation and avoidance.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Construction impacts would result in short term (1 year longer than BRT) significant impacts after mitigation.</p> <p>Operations impacts would be Less than Significant impact after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Noise— Alternatives 4/4A/4B construction will cause noise impacts throughout corridor. Noise impacts during operation include crossing the American River Parkway and up to 211 residences.</p> <p><b>Effects.</b> Vibration—None</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Generally the same as for Alternative 3 with the possible addition of the procurement of quieter BRT vehicles.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Construction impacts would result in short term significant impacts after mitigation.</p> <p>Operation would be Less than Significant impact after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Noise— Construction will cause noise impacts throughout corridor. Noise impacts during operation include crossing the American River Parkway and 42 residences.</p> <p><b>Effects.</b> Vibration—None</p> <p>Construction impacts on this alternative would be somewhat greater than for the BRT alternatives due to a year longer construction duration.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as for Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Noise impacts would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction impacts would result in short term (1 year longer than BRT) significant impacts after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Noise— Construction will cause noise impacts throughout corridor. Noise impacts during operation include crossing the American River Parkway and 84 residences.</p> <p><b>Effects.</b> Vibration—None</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as for Alternative 4.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Noise impacts would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction impacts would result in short term significant impacts after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Noise— Construction will cause noise impacts throughout corridor. Operation will cause noise impacts to the American River Parkway and possibly 42 residences.</p> <p><b>Effects.</b> Vibration—None</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as for Alternative 3.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Noise impacts would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction impacts would result in short term (1 year longer than BRT) significant impacts after mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Noise— Construction will cause noise impacts throughout corridor. Operation will cause noise impacts to the American River Parkway and possibly 45 residences</p> <p><b>Effects.</b> Vibration—None</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as for Alternative 3.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Noise impacts would be Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction impacts would result in short term significant impacts after mitigation.</p>

**TABLE A-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CONTINUED)**

Alternative 1, No-Build	Alternative 2, TSM (Baseline)	Alternative 3/3A/3B, Truxel LRT— Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 4/4A/4B, Truxel LRT—Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 5, I-5/Truxel LRT	Alternative 6, I-5/Truxel BRT	Alternative 7, I-5 LRT	Alternative 8, I-5 BRT
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>							
<b>Wildlife Habitat Resources</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> No impacts associated with this project. Habitat loss for the MTP and projected land use plans are determined significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Impacts are addressed in the Natomas Basin HCP.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> No impacts associated with this project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Alternatives 3/3A/3B effect 7.2 acres of riparian forest habitat, 0.3 acres of willow-cottonwoods, 4.0 urban parkland, and 2 acres of grassland in the American River Parkway.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Provision of BMP's and immediate revegetation. Adoption of avoidance alternatives that minimize destruction of riparian forest habitat.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts to riparian forest habitat. All remaining impacts can be mitigated to less than significant.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> 3.5 acres of riparian habitat, 0 acres of willow-cottonwoods, 6.5 urban parkland, and 5 acres of grassland.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> All impacts can be mitigated to with re-vegetation to less than significant except impacts to riparian habitat are significant and unavoidable impacts.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts to riparian forest habitat. All remaining impacts can be mitigated to less than significant.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts to riparian forest habitat. All remaining impacts can be mitigated to less than significant.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts to riparian forest habitat. All remaining impacts can be mitigated to less than significant.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant impacts to riparian forest habitat. All remaining impacts can be mitigated to less than significant.</p>
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> No impacts associated with this project. Habitat loss for the MTP and projected land use plans are determined significant.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Impacts are addressed in the Natomas Basin HCP.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> No significant construction or operational impacts.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Significant impacts to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Swainson's hawk during nesting season</li> <li>Removal of elderberry beetle habitat.</li> <li>Special-status fish and loss of habitat.</li> <li>Giant Garter Snake habitat.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Avoidance and species removal techniques can mitigate impacts to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact with mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact with mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B. However, the location of the bridge crossing adjacent to I-5 would reduce the effects on habitat.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact with mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Same as Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact with mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Same as Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact with mitigation.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Same as Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Comparable to Alternative 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact with mitigation.</p>

**TABLE A-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CONTINUED)**

Alternative 1, No-Build	Alternative 2, TSM (Baseline)	Alternative 3/3A/3B, Truxel LRT— Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 4/4A/4B, Truxel LRT—Build-out/Starter/MOS	Alternative 5, I-5/Truxel LRT	Alternative 6, I-5/Truxel BRT	Alternative 7, I-5 LRT	Alternative 8, I-5 BRT
<b>SUMMARY OF CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS</b>							
<p><b>Effects.</b> The construction effects of Alternative 1 have been addressed in the EIR for the MTP. Approved general plans accommodate over 12,000 of development over the next 20 years.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Construction impacts were found to be less than significant after mitigation in the MTP EIR.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant impact</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> Approximately 15 acres would be disturbed during construction above Alternative 1.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Construction impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Less than significant</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> 3.5 years Construction period. Alternative 3 effects 170 acres (170 acres for Alternative 3A, 115 acres for Alternative 3B) would be disturbed. Currently, 3,639 persons within 300 of alternatives 3/3A/3B. Community Impacts and Environmental Justice impacts. Approximately 15 acres would be disturbed in the American River Parkway.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> BMPs and implementation of avoidance design options.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Significant and unavoidable construction impacts on biological, parkland resources, minority and low-income persons.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> 2.5 years Construction period. Alternative 4 effects 120 acres (120 acres for 4A, 80 for 4B) would be disturbed. Currently, 3,639 persons within 300 feet of the alignment.</p> <p>Approximately 15 acres would be disturbed in the American River Parkway.</p> <p>Community Impacts and Environmental Justice impacts</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> 3.5 years Construction period. Approximately 175 acres would be disturbed. Currently, 2,232 persons within 300 feet of the alignment. But, Alternative 5 has less the Community and Environmental Justice effects than Alts 3/3A/3B and 4/4A/4B.</p> <p>Approximately 15 acres would be disturbed in the American River Parkway.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> 2.5 years Construction period. Otherwise same as Alternative 5.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Effects.</b> 3.5 years Construction period. Approximately 150 additional acres would be disturbed. Currently, 2,242 persons within 300 feet of the alignment. Alternative 5 has less the Community and Environmental Justice effects than Alts 3/3A/3B and 4/4A/4B.</p> <p>Approximately 15 acres would be disturbed in the American River Parkway.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p>	<p><b>Construction.</b> 2.5 years Construction period. Otherwise, same as Alternative 7.</p> <p><b>Mitigation.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> Same as Alternatives 3/3A/3B.</p>