

---

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Mandatory Findings of Significance. There are 16 specific environmental issues evaluated in this chapter. Cumulative impacts to these issues are evaluated in Section 4.0. The environmental issues evaluated in this chapter include:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Circulation
- Utilities and Services Systems

For each issue area, one of four conclusions is made:

- **No Impact:** No project-related impact to the environment would occur with project development;
- **Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures;
- **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant, but the incorporation of mitigation measure(s) would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level; or,
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

Each issue area also identifies whether or not the impact was addressed under a previous document (GP-EIR):

- **Reviewed Under Previous Document:** The impact has been adequately addressed in previous environmental documents, and further analysis is not required. The discussion will include reference to the previous documents.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

#### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the project, involving at least one impact that is a “Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation” or “Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality       | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils               | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing        |   |

#### PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan project, as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. This document incorporates both an Initial Study and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). The discussion below demonstrates that there are no potentially significant impacts identified that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level or impacts that have not been fully addressed under a previous environmental document. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is not warranted.

#### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “*No Impact*” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A “*No Impact*” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to a project like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “*No Impact*” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) A “*Less than Significant Impact*” applies when the proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.
- 4) “*Potentially Significant Impact*” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more “*Potentially Significant Impact*” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 5) “*Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation*” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “*Potentially Significant Impact*” to a “*Less than Significant Impact*”. The initial study must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

- 6) “*Reviewed Under Previous Document*” applies where the impact has been evaluated and discussed in a previous document<sup>1</sup>. Discussion will include reference to the previous documents. If an impact is reviewed under a previous document, an impact of “Potentially Significant” does not necessarily require an EIR. If the Program EIR identified a significant and unavoidable impact, and the proposed project was adequately described in the Program EIR, an impact of “Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document” does not require an EIR, pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3.
- 7) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program Environmental Impact Report, or other CEQA process, an impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.

---

<sup>1</sup> For this IS/MND the “previous document” referred to throughout this section is the General Plan Environmental Impact Report, Certified and Adopted by the City Council of Rancho Cordova on June 26, 2006 (State Clearinghouse Number 2005022137).

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Rancho Cordova General Plan Environmental Impact Report (GP-EIR) identified that impacts to scenic vistas within the City would be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-6). The primary scenic vistas identified within the City occur along the American River in the vicinity of the American River Parkway Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-6). The American River Parkway Plan is currently under the jurisdiction of the Sacramento County Municipal Services Agency Department of Regional Parks, Recreation, and Open Space. Because the American River Parkway Plan is not under the jurisdiction of the City, the American River Parkway cannot be modified by development projects in the City.

The project area is fully urbanized and developed with no identified scenic views visible from any portion of the area. While the American River and the associated American River Parkway are located within two miles of the project area, ground features and existing development prevent those aesthetic features from being visible from the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to any scenic vista.

- b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR found that there were no highways within the General Plan Planning Area (GP PA) that were designated by State or local agencies as “scenic highways” (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-6).

As identified above, the Rancho Cordova GP PA does not contain any state designated scenic highways. The project area is completely within the GP PA. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* associated with scenic resources visible from a designated scenic highway.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts relating to the alteration of scenic resources in the City were identified in the GP-EIR and were predominantly associated with the urbanization of the rural and undeveloped portions of the City and areas east of the incorporated boundaries (GP DEIR, pp. 4.13-8 through 4.13-10). Impacts of the General Plan to visual resources were found to be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-10).

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

The project area currently consists of commercial and residential development with the potential for new development and redevelopment in accordance with the City's General Plan. Development and redevelopment of the project area per the General Plan may include a mix of residential/office mixed use, transit oriented development, industrial, commercial, office and retail mixed use. This redevelopment potential could result in altering the existing visual character of the area. Implementation of the proposed Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan would encourage new development and redevelopment activities that could alter the visual character of the annexation area. However, any impacts to the scenic character of the project area would not be greater than those impacts previously addressed in the GP-EIR, and it is anticipated that any alterations to the existing visual character of the project area would be improvements that would increase the scenic value of the development along the Folsom Boulevard corridor. Further, the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan document includes design guidelines for future projects within the project area that will ensure that new development within the project area is reviewed for compatibility with City design standards and is consistent with the City's vision for the redevelopment of the project area with an attractive and vibrant mix of well designed land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to the existing visual character and quality of the project area and its surroundings.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts relating to light and glare were identified in the GP-EIR and were related to both reflective glare from new structures built under the General Plan and the introduction of new sources of light associated with development and redevelopment of the City (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-13). Areas of the City and the City's Planning Area that are currently undeveloped would see the majority of the impact due to the current lack of reflective surfaces and light sources in undeveloped areas (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-14). Due to design guidelines adopted by the City and adherence to City Policy UD.4.2, impacts of the General Plan due to light and glare were found to be less than significant.

The project area is fully urbanized and is surrounded substantially by urban development. Future development and redevelopment of the project area could introduce new sources of daytime glare and change levels of nighttime lighting and illumination, though these impacts are likely to be minimal considering the existing development of the area. Though the proposed project could result in redevelopment that would introduce new sources of daytime glare, and change nighttime lighting and illumination levels in the annexation area, the proposed project would not increase impacts to lighting over the impacts previously discussed in the General Plan and GP-EIR. Additionally, all future development and redevelopment within the project area would be subject to the City's design and exterior lighting standards, which include measures to ensure that impacts associated with light and glare are reduced. Such measures include, but are not limited to, prohibitions on the use of reflective building materials, the requirement that exterior lighting be shielded and directed downward, etc. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from light and glare on day or nighttime views.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified that a significant amount of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance would be lost with urban development of previously undeveloped portions of the City and of the City Planning Area outside the incorporated boundaries (GP-DEIR, p. 4.2-17 through 4.2-18). Impacts from buildout of the General Plan were found to be significant and unavoidable.

The Important Farmland Map for Sacramento County designates the project area as Urban and Built-up Land as shown in Figure 4.2-1 of the GP DEIR. None of the land within the project area is considered to be Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to Farmlands.

b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Just as with other types of farmland, the GP-EIR identified impacts to farmland currently under Williamson Act Contracts (GP-DEIR, pp. 4.2-22 through 4.2-23). Impacts from implementation of the General Plan to Williamson Act land were found to be significant and unavoidable due to the significant loss of such land at buildout of the General Plan.

Although the GP-EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts to Williamson Act contracts, there are no agriculturally zoned land uses within the project area. Additionally, there are no parcels under a Williamson Act contract within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* from conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts.

c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR stated that impacts could occur to agricultural land uses as a result of urbanization of adjacent areas to operating agricultural operations (GP DEIR, p. 4.2-20). Placing urban development immediately

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

adjacent to agricultural uses can potentially result in interface conflicts between the uses, which could ultimately result in cessation of agricultural uses in those locations (GP DEIR, pp. 4.2-20 through 4.2-21). Impacts to agriculture as a result of these interface conflicts from implementation of the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable.

Although the GP-EIR identified agricultural interface conflicts as significant and unavoidable, there are no operating agricultural uses that exist in the project area or adjacent area. The nearest agricultural zoned land is more than two miles to the south of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to agricultural uses.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento region is currently out of compliance with federal requirements for 8-hour ozone air quality standards and 1-hour ozone air quality standards. The region is in compliance with all other emissions standards. SMAQMD released the final "Sacramento Regional Nonattainment Area 8-Hour Ozone Rate-of-Progress Plan" (Ozone Plan) in February 2006. According to the GP-EIR, projected buildout of the General Plan Planning Area would be consistent with the assumptions used during preparation of the Ozone Plan (GP FEIR, pp. 4.0-5 through 4.0-6). However, because there currently exists no feasible methods to completely offset air pollutant emission increases from land uses under the General Plan, the impact of the General Plan was considered to be significant and unavoidable (GP FEIR, pp. 4.0-6).

The proposed project would have no direct impacts to air quality as no construction or physical improvements are proposed at this time. However, since the project area is located in the GP PA, future projects within the project area could result in impacts to air quality. Any impacts created by future redevelopment projects within the project area would be mitigated by complying with the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Air Quality section of the GP DEIR. Additionally, future projects within the project area could be subject to additional environmental review under CEQA, as determined by the City at the time of project submittal, and specific project-related impacts to air quality would be identified and mitigated. Future projects within the project area will be screened for applicability of further air quality analysis pursuant to SMAQMD's guidelines.

In order to assist local agencies and municipalities with analyzing project-specific impacts to air quality and compliance with local air district attainment plans, SMAQMD has provided a Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento (2004). The Air Quality Guide includes



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

information on significance and mitigation for common air emissions issues with the goal of reducing emissions from development projects and providing information and standards useful in CEQA analyses of such projects. The Air Quality Guide includes thresholds of significance for ozone precursors, shown in **Table 1** below.

**TABLE 1**  
**CURRENT SMAQMD EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS (POUNDS PER DAY)**

Pollutant	Threshold of Significance
NO <sub>x</sub> During Construction	85
ROG During Operation	65
NO <sub>x</sub> During Operation	65

Source: SMAQMD Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County, 2004.

Should future projects be anticipated to result in construction NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in excess of SMAQMD's thresholds of significance, the following mitigation measure shall be applied:

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 3.1a** *Category 1: Reducing NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment.*

The project proponent shall provide a plan, for approval by the City and SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction and operation of the proposed project will achieve a fleet-averaged 20 percent NO<sub>x</sub> reduction and a 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. The project proponent shall submit to the City and SMAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during the project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and hours of use or fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no activity occurs; and,

*Category 2: Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment.*

The project proponent shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used on the proposed project sites does not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity shall be repaired immediately, and the City and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be performed at least weekly by a qualified third-party professional, and a monthly summary of the visual results shall be submitted to the City and SMAQMD throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulation.

In the event construction equipment meeting the requirements set forth above is determined not to be available, the project proponent shall notify the City and SMAQMD. Upon verification that required low-emission construction equipment is not available, the City may waive this measure. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Equipment Inventory shall be submitted and approved prior to site disturbance. Remainder of measure shall be complied with throughout construction and operation of the project.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and SMAQMD.*

According to SMAQMD's Air Quality Guide, implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.1a would reduce off-road construction emissions by an estimated 20 percent. Emission reducing mitigation measures for off-road NOx emissions are not applicable to on-road NOx emissions. If the level of construction NOx emissions with mitigation as directed in mitigation measure MM 3.1a is still in excess of the threshold, further mitigation is required. The following mitigation measure is proposed to further reduce the impacts of NOx emissions during construction:

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 3.1b**      The project proponent shall offset excess construction emissions to less than 85 lbs/day by paying an off-site operational mitigation fee to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Construction Mitigation Fee Program. The final amount of the fee is to be determined by SMAQMD in consultation with the project proponent. The project proponent shall provide documentation of the payment of the fee to the City prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Rancho Cordova in consultation with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.*

Should future projects be anticipated to result in operational ROG and/or NOx emissions in excess of SMAQMD's thresholds of significance, the following mitigation measure shall be applied:

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 3.1c** The project proponent shall develop and adhere to an operational emissions reduction plan which is designed to reduce operation ROG and NOx emissions. Should further operational emission mitigation be required, the project applicant may be required to pay mitigation fees to SMAQMD. The final amount of the fee is to be determined by SMAQMD in consultation with the project proponent. The project proponent shall provide documentation of the payment of the fee to the City prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova in consultation with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.1a, MM 3.1b, and MM 3.1c would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to current air quality standards.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential air quality impacts from both construction and operation of new development in the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.6-17 through 4.6-26). While policies, actions, and mitigation was included in the EIR, development in the General Plan Planning Area would still be intensified from current conditions. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts were expected as a result of the implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.6-20 and 4.6-26).

See discussion a) above. The GP and GP-EIR programmatically addressed the environmental impacts of construction and redevelopment within the project area. As future projects are brought forward to the City, the City will determine, at that time, whether additional CEQA analysis is required pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, any impacts created from the proposed project would not be greater than those impacts previously addressed in the GP-EIR.

While SMAQMD does not currently have thresholds of significance for particulate matter (PM) emissions, the following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potential particulate matter emissions from the project area:

**MM 3.2a** The project proponents for subsequent projects within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan Area shall require that all exposed surfaces, graded areas, and storage piles are watered at least twice daily during demolition and construction activities.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to approval of any project plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until completion of all construction activities.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department

**MM 3.2b** The project proponents for subsequent projects within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan Area shall require that the amount of material actively worked, the amount of disturbed ground, and the amount of material stockpiled is minimized throughout demolition and construction of the project.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to approval of any project plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until completion of all construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

**MM 3.2c** The project proponents for subsequent projects within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan Area shall require that paved streets adjacent to the project site are washed or swept at least once daily to remove accumulated dust.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to approval of any project plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until completion of all construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

**MM 3.2d** The project proponents for subsequent projects within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan Area shall require that, when transporting materials by truck during construction activities, two feet of freeboard shall be maintained by the contractor, or that the materials are covered at all times.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to approval of any project plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until completion of all construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.2a through MM 3.2d would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to air quality as the Plan Area is redeveloped over time.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified that increases in Ozone precursors (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG) would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on the region's status of nonattainment (GP DEIR, pp. 4.6-17 through 4.6-26). See discussions a) and b) above for more information on the GP-EIR findings related to ozone precursors.

The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Sacramento region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. As described in discussion a) above, future development and redevelopment projects would result in less than significant increases in

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

ozone precursors after mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative air quality issues in the region is expected to be *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. Sensitive receptors are those parts of the population that can be severely impacted by air pollution. Sensitive receptors include children, the elderly, and the infirm. The GP-EIR identified potential impacts to sensitive receptors due to both mobile and stationary sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and odors. Impacts of the General Plan from TACs were reduced by City Policies and Action Items, but the impact remained significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.6-31). Impacts to sensitive receptors from exposure to odors were reduced by City Policies and Action Items to a less than significant level (GP DEIR, p. 4.6-33).

Since the project area is located in the GP PA, future development must be consistent with the General Plan. Impacts from the proposed project would not be greater than those identified in the GP-EIR. Subsequent projects within the project area that include sensitive receptors in proximity to sources of TACs shall be subject to additional environmental review under CEQA to ensure that sensitive receptors are not exposed to TACs and other pollution sources in excess of City standards or state and federal standards. Therefore, impacts from substantial pollutant concentrations on sensitive receptors from the proposed project are considered *less than significant*.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. See discussion d) above. The proposed project could lead to future development and redevelopment within the project area. Certain existing or future uses could create objectionable odors for any new population growth in the area. Since the project area is located within the GP PA, the impacts from the proposed project would not be greater than those identified under the GP-EIR. Subsequent development projects within the project area shall be reviewed by City staff to ensure that impacts associated with the introduction of objectionable odors into the project area are addressed and mitigated. Therefore, impacts from objectionable odors from the proposed project are considered *less than significant*.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>	Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential direct and indirect impacts to special-status species as a result of the implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48). While City Policies and Action Items would mitigate much of the impact of the General Plan, widespread development of undeveloped portions of the General Plan Planning Area as well as construction of the Circulation Plan would result in a net loss of biological resources. Therefore, the General Plan was found to result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-43 and 4.10-48).

The project area is highly developed and does not include areas where special-status species have been recorded. However, existing trees within the project area could potentially provide nesting habitat for raptors and birds. Any future projects within the project area that have on-site trees shall be required to mitigate for potential impacts to nesting raptors and special-status species. Therefore, the following mitigation measure,

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

pursuant to City Policy NR.1.7, is included in order to mitigate potential impacts to nesting raptors and special-status species:

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 4.1** Prior to each phase of grading and construction or any other site disturbance between the dates of March 1 and August 31, a determinate survey shall be conducted to determine if active nesting by birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) or other special-status bird species is taking place. Surveys shall be conducted according to the following requirements:

- The survey(s) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or other equivalent professional.
- The survey(s) shall be conducted no more than 30 days and no less than 14 days prior to site disturbance to occur between March 1 and August 31.
- The survey(s) shall include all areas within 100 feet of the project site.
- A copy of the survey(s) shall be provided to the City of Rancho Cordova no less than 7 business days prior to site disturbance.

If any special-status bird species are found to be nesting within the survey area, the project proponent shall immediately contact the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in order to determine the appropriate mitigation, if any, required to minimize impacts to nesting birds. No activity of any kind may occur within 100 feet of any nesting activity or as otherwise required following consultation with the City Planning Department and the California Department of Fish and Game until such time as the young have fledged or the City and/or DFG have determined that construction activities may proceed.

If all construction activities are to be completed outside the nesting season (identified above), determinate surveys shall not be required.

*Timing/Implementation:* All necessary surveys shall be provided to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department no less than 7 days prior to site disturbance between March 1 and August 31.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.1 would ensure that all impacts to special status birds and raptors from implementation of the proposed project are *less than significant*.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

- b) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above for information on identified impacts of the General Plan on special-status species. The GP-EIR combined discussion of special-status species impacts to include impacts to habitat as well as individuals of special-status species. Impacts to habitat from the implementation of the General Plan occurred for the same reasons and in the same intensity as impacts to individuals of any special-status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48).

The project area is urbanized and any natural habitats have been disturbed. The existing cover types of high-density development (see Figure 4.10-1 of the GP DEIR) have limited functions to support foraging habitat for migratory birds and other wildlife. Future development within the project area shall be reviewed for potential adverse effects on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. To ensure that all future development projects within the project area are examined for potential biological resources, the following mitigation measure is proposed:

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 4.2** Prior to site disturbance, a biological resources survey shall be conducted to determine if the project site contains any biological resources. Surveys shall be conducted according to the following requirements:

- The survey(s) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or other equivalent professional.
- The survey(s) shall include all areas within 100 feet of the project site.
- A copy of the survey(s) shall be provided to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

If any biological resources requiring mitigation are found to within the survey area, the project proponent shall immediately contact the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in order to determine the appropriate mitigation, if any, required to minimize impacts to the resource.

*Timing/Implementation:* All necessary surveys shall be provided to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department prior to site disturbance.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1 and MM 4.2 would ensure that the proposed project and subsequent projects within the project area would result in *less than significant* impacts to sensitive communities.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR addressed potential direct and indirect impacts to Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. (Jurisdictional Waters) as a result of wide-spread development of the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-52 through 4.10-56). Policies and Action Items included in the General Plan would reduce impacts to Jurisdictional Waters, especially Policy NR.2.1 which requires “no net loss” of wetlands (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-56). While no net



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

loss of wetlands will occur regionally, some loss of Jurisdictional Waters will occur within the General Plan Planning Area (Ibid.). Because of this local loss of Jurisdictional Waters, the impact of the General Plan was found to be significant and unavoidable (Ibid.).

There have been no jurisdictional waters identified in the project area. Any future development could be subject to additional environmental review under CEQA, as determined by the City at the time of project submittal. As required by mitigation measure MM 4.2, a biological resources survey shall be required of future projects within the project area. A biological resources survey would reveal the presence of any jurisdictional waters should they exist. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to jurisdictional waters.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts to habitat for raptors and other nesting birds were addressed in the GP-EIR (GP-DEIR, pp. 48 through 4.10-52). Raptors are protected by the California Department of Fish and Game and are considered a special-status species under CEQA. Just as with impacts to habitat for other special-status species, wide-spread development of the City and the General Plan Planning Area would result in a net loss of raptor and nesting habitat and a significant and unavoidable impact was expected (GP DEIR, pp. 52). Discussion of impacts to movement corridors was also included in the GP-EIR (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-56 through 4.10-61). Development of greenfield areas of the General Plan Planning Area would change the biological condition and characteristics of the area, resulting in changes in animal movement throughout the area (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-56). While City Policies and Action Items would reduce this impact, loss and/or modification of movement corridors would still occur and the impact of the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-61).

Any natural habitat within the project area has been disturbed, so future development within this area would not likely interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Further, adherence to mitigation measures MM 4.1 and MM 4.2 would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts on wildlife movement corridors.

- e) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts to trees from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-61 and 4.10-62). Development of greenfield areas of the City and the General Plan Planning Area could potentially result in the removal of special-status, landmark, and other trees (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-61). Landmark and oak trees would be adequately protected by City Policies and Action Items, as well as large wooded areas and urban trees. However, some loss of native trees would occur and the overall impact to trees from implementation of the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-62).

Future projects within the project area may contain trees. To ensure compliance with General Plan Policy NR.4.4, the following mitigation measure is included:

#### Mitigation Measure

- MM 4.3** Prior to the start of construction, the project proponent shall submit a survey identifying the specific type, size, general health, and location of all existing on-site trees. If any native oaks or other native trees six inches or more in

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

diameter at breast height (dbh), multi-trunk native oaks or native trees of 10 inches or greater dbh, or non-native trees of 18 inches or greater dbh that have been determined by a certified arborist to be in good health are found to occur, such trees shall be avoided if feasible. If such trees cannot be avoided, the project applicant shall mitigate the loss of protected trees by replacement planting at an inch-for-inch ratio. A replacement tree planting plan shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova for approval prior to the removal of trees. Prior to the removal of the any trees, the project proponent shall submit to the City a Tree Removal Plan identifying each tree to be removed and the species, size, location, and relative health of each tree. Removal of trees shall not occur until the Rancho Cordova Planning Department approves the Tree Removal Plan.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Tree Removal Plan and Tree Replacement Planting Plan shall be approved by the City prior to approval of grading or improvement plans.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.*

Mitigation measures MM 4.1 and MM 4.2 above will ensure that the project is consistent with all applicable City Policies and Action Items related to biological resources. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3 above would ensure that impacts to trees would be *less than significant*.

- f) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR addressed potential impacts related to conflicts between the General Plan and any adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-62 and 4.10-63). While the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) and the Vernal Pool Recovery Plan are currently being prepared by the County and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (respectively), no such plans have been adopted (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-63). Therefore, no impact was expected as a result of the General Plan.

Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova do not currently have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is being prepared by the County and will be adopted within the next few years. However, the SSHCP is still being formulated and no portion of the plan has been adopted. Likewise, the Vernal Pool Recovery Plan is currently being prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and no part of the plan has been adopted. The City has not committed to participating in either plan, though it may commit in the future. No natural community conservation plans are in effect in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified that known and unknown historic resources within the Rancho Cordova Planning Area could potentially be impacted by implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.11-9 through 4.11-14). These impacts were primarily associated with development in undeveloped areas and impacts to unknown resources in portions of the General Plan Planning Area that have not been studied. Rancho Cordova Policies mitigated some of the potential impacts to historical resources. However, as many resources could be located within the General Plan Planning Area that are previously unknown, accidental impacts may still occur and the impact of the General Plan was considered significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, pp. 4.11-14).

The proposed project does not propose any physical changes to the project area at this time. However, subsequent development and redevelopment projects within the project area and subject to the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan could cause physical changes in the area. Several resources in the project area have been evaluated for eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The GP-EIR recognized Folsom Boulevard as historically significant to local government (GP DEIR, pp.4.11-4). The General Plan includes requirements that would protect historic resources from significant impacts as a result of development projects within the Planning Area. Given the status of Folsom Boulevard as historically significant, each development or redevelopment project should be examined for applicability of historic resource investigations as set forth in General Plan Action CHR.3.3.3. The following mitigation measures are included in order to reduce the potential for impacts of future discretionary projects within the project area:

#### Mitigation Measures

- MM 5.1a** All discretionary projects within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan shall be evaluated for the potential for containing historic, cultural, or paleontological resources in accordance with CEQA regulations. Any project with the potential to impact historic, cultural, or paleontological resources shall require applicable studies and investigations. The studies should identify the resources in the project area, determine their eligibility for inclusion in the

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and provide mitigation measures for any resources in the project area that cannot be avoided.

*Timing/Implementation:* Projects shall be screened by staff as early as possible in the planning process. All required studies shall be submitted prior to approval of any project plan.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

**MM 5.1b** The City Planning Department shall be notified immediately if any cultural resources (e.g. prehistoric or historic artifacts, structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, fossils, or architectural remains) are uncovered during construction. All construction must stop immediately in the vicinity of the find and an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interiors Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology or a paleontologist shall be retained by the project proponent to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate action. The recommendations of the archaeologist and/or the paleontologist shall be implemented prior to continuing construction.

*Implementation/Timing:* This measure shall be included on all improvement and grading plans prior to approval. The measure shall be carried out throughout all phases of construction.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

**MM 5.1c** The City Planning Department shall be notified immediately if any human remains are uncovered during construction. All construction must stop immediately in the vicinity of the remains. The Planning Department shall notify the County Coroner according to Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the procedures outlined in State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(d-e) shall be followed.

*Implementation/Timing:* This measure shall be included on all improvement and grading plans prior to approval. The measure shall be carried out throughout all phases of construction.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 5.1a, MM 5.1b, and MM 5.1c will reduce any project-specific impacts to historical resources to *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified possible impacts to paleontological resources as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-14). However, no such paleontological resources were identified in the Rancho Cordova Planning Area and City

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

policy would protect unknown resources. For these reasons, the impact of the General Plan was found to be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-15).

See discussion a) above. Just as with historic resources, archaeological resources would be adequately protected by City Policies, restated in this document as mitigation measures MM 5.1a, MM 5.1b, and MM 5.1c. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant impacts* to archaeological resources.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The discussion in the GP-EIR concerning historic resources impacts included discussion of potential impacts to human remains [see discussion a) above]. Impacts were the same in that known resources were adequately protected but unknown human remains outside established cemeteries could potentially be affected. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts as a result of the General Plan were expected (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-14).
- d) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* No human remains are expected on the project site. However, due to the large Native American population known to reside in the general area in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked grave sites. The proposed project area is not expected to contain any such sites. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1c above would ensure that any impacts to human remains from the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

e)

- i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR stated that significant seismic shaking was not a concern within the Rancho Cordova Planning Area as there are no active faults within Sacramento County and because the City is not located within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake hazard zone (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-19). However, some minor seismic shaking is a possibility as the City is located within a Seismic Zone 3, which is considered an area of relatively low ground shaking potential (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-20). Adherence to City policies as well as the California Building Code (CBC) and the Uniform Building Code (UBC) would ensure less than significant impacts as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-21).

The proposed project is located within the incorporated boundaries of the City and, as discussed in the GP-EIR, is not expected to be subjected to strong seismic shaking. Minor shaking is a concern as, according to the California Geological

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

Survey, the project is located within Seismic Zone 3. However, as identified in the GP-EIR, compliance with the UBC and CBC will ensure that impacts are *less than significant*.

- ii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion under i) above. The potential for strong seismic ground shaking on the project site is not a significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic activity of the area. Additionally, as stated in discussion i) above, the project would be required to comply with any seismic standards enforced by the UBC and the CBC. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact from seismic ground shaking.
  - iii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, is considered minimal due to the infrequency of seismic activity in the area [See discussions i) and ii) above], building and site design, and adherence to the UBC and CBC. According to the GP-EIR, the depth of groundwater in the City is generally greater than 50 feet, rendering the potential for liquefaction low (GP DEIR, p 4.8-9). The potential for other secondary hazards (i.e., ground lurching, differential settlement, or lateral spreading) occurring during or after seismic events in the vicinity of the project site is also considered to be low due to the distance of active faults. Therefore, the project would have *less than significant* impacts from seismic-related ground failure.
  - iv) *No Impact.* The project area is generally flat and does not include any features that would create the possibility of landslide. Adjacent areas are also generally flat. Therefore, *no impacts* related to landslides would be expected.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts related to soil erosion from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.8-21 through 4.8-23). These erosion impacts were generally associated with construction of new roadways and other capital infrastructure and development of undeveloped portions of the City and the Planning Area. Additional impacts were due to increases in runoff due to a net increase in impervious surfaces in the City. However, compliance with the City's Erosion Control Ordinance and the current NPDES permit conditions for the City would ensure that impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan would be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-23).

The project area is already developed and contains impervious surfaces and existing buildings. Any future projects within the project area which would involve demolition of existing structures and construction of new structures would not result in significantly additional impervious surfaces within the project area. All future development projects would be subject to the City's Erosion Control Ordinance. Also, the project proponent would be required to submit and adhere to a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), further reducing potential erosion-related impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant impacts* from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR stated that impacts relating to soil stability as a result of implementation of the General Plan would be minor (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-23). Primary concerns with soil stability in the City are associated with shrink/swell potential – the potential of soils to expand during wet seasons and shrink during dry seasons. Impacts due to soil stability would be mitigated by consistency with the

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

UBC and the CBC (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-24). Therefore, the impact of the implementation of the General Plan was found to be less than significant.

As discussed in iii) above, landslides, lateral spreading, and subsidence are not significant threats within the project area. Additionally, adherence to the UBC and CBC requirements as well as the City's Erosion Control Ordinance would ensure that proposed project's potential to result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. See discussion c) above.
- e) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. The GP-EIR identified potential soils impacts of the General Plan related to the use of alternative wastewater handling systems such as septic systems resulting from development of residential lots of two acres or more (GP DEIR, pp. 4.8-24 through 4.8-26). The portions of the Rancho Cordova General Plan Planning Area that could contain such lots exist outside the City boundaries in the outlying Planning Areas. For residential development with lots less than two acres in size, City policy requires the use of the public sewer system (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-26).

The project area is currently served by the County Sanitation District CSD-1 (CSD-1). Future development within the project area would continue to be served by CSD-1; therefore, there would be no requirement for the additional approval and installation of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* from soils incapable of supporting septic or other alternative wastewater systems.



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b> Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (GP DEIR, pp. 4.4-23 and 4.4-24). Impacts concerned transportation of hazardous materials on the roadway network within the City and the routine use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials related to construction during development and redevelopment in the City. Adherence to General Plan policies and federal, state, and local regulations regarding hazardous material were found to reduce potential impacts of the General Plan to a less than significant level (GP DEIR, pp. 4.4-24 and 4.4-28).

According to the California Highway Patrol (CHP), U.S. 50 is an approved route for the transportation of explosives and poisonous inhalation hazards within the project area. As the roadways on which hazardous materials may be transported are limited, there would be

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

minimal routine transport of hazardous materials within the project area. Transportation of hazardous materials is regulated by the CHP, Caltrans, U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act), and other regulatory agencies (which includes provisions regarding securing materials and container design) that provide standards designed to avoid release.

Existing and future uses within the project area require the limited use of hazardous materials usually associated with machinery and cleaning activities (including, but not limited to lubricants, industrial cleaning supplies, and refrigerants). Also, retail operations within the project area include the sale of common household hazardous materials, such as cleaning products and motor oil. The transportation, use, and disposal of these materials would be subject to local, State, and federal laws as well as City Safety Policies. Consistency with these laws and policies would limit hazards to the public from the use of these materials. While operations within the project area would involve the use, storage, and sale of hazardous materials, compliance with local, State, and federal regulations and City Safety Policies would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from hazardous materials.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR described potential impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials (GP DEIR, pp. 4.4-24 through 4.4-28). Primary sources of potential accidental release concerned PCB-containing transformers, groundwater pollution, and underground storage tanks (USTs). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items, as well as all applicable federal, State, and local regulations would result in a less than significant impact from the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28).

Future projects within the project area may result in the storage and use of hazardous materials during construction, landscaping, and operational activities, which could lead to the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts from the accidental release of hazardous materials within the project area were found to be less than significant, as previously analyzed in the GP-EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from the accidental release of hazardous materials.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR discussed the siting of public schools as being subject to the siting requirements of the California Department of Education (GP-DEIR, p. 4.4-25). In addition to CEQA review, potential school sites will be reviewed by various agencies to ensure the new school site is safe from toxic hazards (GP-DEIR, p. 4.4-25). General Plan policies and action items will reduce the potential impacts of General Plan implementation from hazardous materials transport, use, and storage from surrounding uses, including school sites, to a less than significant level (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28).

Two schools, John Muir Charter School and Kinney Continuation High School, are located within the project area. There are currently no plans for future schools within the project area. Discussions a) and b) above have demonstrated less than significant impacts resulting from hazardous wastes. The proposed project does not propose any operations that were not analyzed in the GP-EIR. All future development or redevelopment activities within the project area would be required to adhere and comply with all local, State, and federal regulations as well as City Policies. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts on existing or proposed schools.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

- d) *Less than Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR included information regarding federal and State listed hazardous materials sites as well as a map of such sites (GP DEIR, pp. 4.4-2 through 4.4-10). These sites included leaking underground storage sites, groundwater contamination plumes, PCB contaminated sites related to prior rocket engine testing (Aerojet/Gencorp), and other smaller sites (pp. 4.4-5, 4.4-6). Impact discussions were included in discussions of accidental release of hazardous materials [see discussion b) above] and were found to be less than significant due to compliance with federal, State, and local laws and regulations (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28).

Research undertaken for the GP-EIR located a number of Underground Storage Tank (UST) and Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites in the project area. For the location of USTs and LUSTs, please refer to Figure 4.8-2 of the GP DEIR.

Future development within the annexation area has the potential to discover additional USTs/LUSTs. If UST/LUSTs are discovered during any phase of a project, removal is required prior to additional site preparation or development activities. This must be done in accordance with California Health and Safety Code 25282 and the California State Water Resources Control Board Underground Storage Tank Program.

Compliance with General Plan policies and action items, along with adherence to all federal, state and local regulations regarding the use and removal of USTs/LUSTs would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with known or unknown hazardous materials sites.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP EIR identified potential impacts of development within an airport land use plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28). The Mather Airport CLUP Safety Restriction Area overlies several portions of the City, restricting development in those areas to uses allowed within the CLUP. Adherence to General Plan policies, federal regulations, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and Mather Airport Planning Area provisions would reduce the potential for safety hazards. Therefore, the General Plan was found to have a less than significant impact (GP FEIR, p. 4.0-29).

Portions of the project area are located within the 150 foot and 150-300 foot conical surface height restriction areas for Mather Airport, which limits building height in overflight areas to reduce safety-related hazards. Future development projects within the project area would be reviewed to ensure compliance with these height restrictions. Therefore, aircraft related hazards to individuals on the ground are minor. Considering the above factors, hazards to people on the ground from operations at or near Mather Airport would be *less than significant*.

- f) *No Impact.* The project area is not located within two miles of any private airstrip. The nearest private airstrip to the annexation area is the Rancho Murieta Airport, located more than twelve miles to the southeast. Additionally, per the Federal Aviation Administration's requirements, aircraft in the airspace directly over the project area would be under the control of Mather Airport's control tower, not the control tower of a private airport. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* associated with hazards near private airstrips.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed potential impacts that could impair implementation or physically interfere with the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Disaster Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-29). The GP-EIR found that implementation of the proposed roadway system within the General Plan would improve

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

city roadway connectivity, allowing for better emergency access to residences as well as evacuation routes and resulting in a net positive effect on implementation success of the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Disaster Plan. Therefore, the General Plan was found to have a less than significant impact (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-29).

The proposed project does not include any physical changes at this time. However, future projects subject to the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan could involve site work which has the potential to have impacts to area roadways. The City requires that a Traffic Control Plan be submitted by the individual project proponents prior to approval of improvement plans, as administered by the Public Works Department. The Traffic Control Plan will minimize traffic impacts from construction and thereby reduce any effects on the ability of emergency responders to travel through the City. Formulation and adherence to a Traffic Control Plan for the project would ensure that the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact.

- h) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP EIR identified potential impacts of safety hazards associated with wildland fires due to the construction of residential areas adjacent to open space and natural areas (GP DEIR, pp.4.12-9). Adoption of General Plan policies and action items, as well as required project review by the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD), would ensure minimal impacts to residential areas from wildland fires, resulting in a less than significant impact from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-10).

The proposed project is located in entirely urbanized area. The nearest wildland area is the American River Parkway, located adjacent to the northeastern portion of the project area. Given the existing development of the area and distance to wildlands, the proposed project would result in *less than significant impacts with* respect to wildland fire risks.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute to the potential for discharge of storm water from material storage areas, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas or loading docks, or other outdoor work areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create or contribute to the potential for discharge of storm water to impair the beneficial uses of the receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Create or contribute to the potential for the discharge of storm water to cause significant harm on the biological integrity of the waterways and water bodies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential surface and ground water quality impacts that would occur as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, 4.9-34 through 4.9-40). Both impacts from implementation of the General Plan were found to be less than significant with implementation of City Policies and Action Items as well as compliance with the City's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit conditions.

The project area has been previously developed and consists of existing buildings and paved surfaces. Activities associated with the demolition and construction of future projects have the potential to result in limited short-term impacts to surface water quality from dust, debris, and substances associated with heavy machinery, such as gasoline and oil. Future development projects would be subject to a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), California Stormwater Quality Association's Construction Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs), and applicable local ordinances and State requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact resulting from water quality or waste discharge

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential ground water supply and recharge impacts (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-43 through 4.9-57). Both the addition of impervious material as well as additional use of groundwater in the region would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to groundwater levels from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-57).

Implementation of the proposed project would not cause groundwater consumption to increase beyond the consumption levels considered in the GP-EIR. The GP-EIR identified impacts from increased demand for water supply and increased groundwater production for the GP PA as significant and unavoidable; since the project area is located in the GP PA, any impacts created by future development and redevelopment projects would be *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts due to erosion and siltation as a result of new development in the City and the Planning Area (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-34 through 4.9-39). Adherence to City policies, action items, the conditions of the City's NPDES permit, and the City's Erosion Control Ordinance would result in less than significant impacts related to erosion and siltation as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-39).

The American River is located just outside the project area. Though the proposed project could result in the redevelopment of the project area, future construction and development activities would not alter the course of any streams or rivers in the area. Future development activities could, however, involve soil disturbing activities that in turn could result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Since the project area is located in the overall GP PA, any impacts from soil disturbing activities in the project area would not be greater than those previously identified in the GP-EIR. Therefore, impacts due to erosion and siltation are considered *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts from flooding due to implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-41 through 4.9-43). These impacts were associated with the addition of impermeable

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

surfaces, primarily roads, within the City. City Policies and Action Items would be adequate to reduce any flooding impacts. Therefore, the GP-EIR found that the impact of the General Plan on flooding would be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-43).

See discussion for c) above. The proposed project would not create impacts to existing drainage patterns over what was previously addressed in the GP-EIR. Therefore, impacts to existing drainage patterns would be *less than significant*.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above for information on the GP-EIR and impacts to water quality. While general stormwater impacts as a result of physical characteristics of future development projects are not expected to be significant, construction impacts to water quality could occur as a result of discharge of stormwater from material storage areas, vehicle or equipment fueling or maintenance (including washing), waste handling, and hazardous materials handling or storage areas on-site. The formation of and adherence to a SWPPP as required by the Public Works Department, and standard best management practices (BMPs) would ensure that future development projects within the project area would result in *less than significant* impacts from stormwater discharge
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions a), b), and d) above.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion f) above.
- h) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion c) above. Urban development typically includes the addition of impervious surfaces (such as roads, parking lots, driveways and conventional roof tops) that alter drainage conditions and storm water runoff rates. Though the proposed project would promote the redevelopment of this area, the project area is built-out and has few vacant parcels that could support new development, and therefore increase the total impervious surfaces that would substantially alter drainage conditions and storm water runoff rates. As the potential increase in impervious surfaces is not substantial, surface runoff rates would not increase substantially, even though large storms may produce surface runoff that does have the potential to exacerbate existing flooding issues. Therefore, impacts are considered *less than significant*.
- i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.
- j) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR discussed impacts related to flooding, which included consideration of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.9-41 through 4.9-43). City Policies and Action Items would prevent either an increase in the 100-year floodplain from the result of the construction of any structures as or the placement of housing within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, impacts from the General Plan were found to be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-43).

The project area includes a small area which is located within the 100-year floodplain along the American River. The proposed project would encourage redevelopment activities and could result in additional housing within the project area in the future. However, any future housing projects would be required to adhere to policies and action items in the General Plan regarding development required outside the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from the placement of housing in a 100-year flood hazard area.

- k) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion j) above.
- l) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions c), d), h), j), and k) above for information on the GP-EIR's findings regarding flooding impacts.

The project area faces the risk of flooding mainly due to a complete failure of the Folsom Dam. The GP-EIR however, concluded that such an event has an extremely low probability of occurring and is not considered to be a reasonable foreseeable event. Therefore, impacts are considered *less than significant*.

- m) *No Impact.* The project area is not located near a large body of water or ocean, precluding the possibility of a tsunami or seiche occurring that could impact the project area. As the topography of the project area is generally flat and the surrounding area is heavily developed, mudflows are not a possibility. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in *no impact* from these types of events.



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an existing community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR described possible impacts related to the division of existing communities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.1-38 through 4.1-40). The GP-EIR states that development and redevelopment described in the General Plan was specifically designed so that barriers between communities would be prevented. Additionally, City policies and action items were included in the General Plan to further prevent divisions of communities. The GP-EIR found that impacts of implementation of the General Plan to existing communities would be less than significant (GP DEIR, pp. 4.1-39 and 4.1-40).

Most of the project area is urbanized with commercial, retail, and residential uses comprising the majority of current land uses. Future development and redevelopment projects within the project area as proposed under the City's General Plan would not result in adverse environmental impacts or substantial changes in the character of existing land uses, since the goals, policies and action items proposed under the City's General Plan seek to enhance and improve these areas. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the physical division of established communities and therefore would result in *less than significant* impacts.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR included discussion of potential impacts to adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations of other jurisdictional agencies in the area (GP DEIR, 4.1-46 through 4.1-56). Conflicts were identified between the General Plan and the Sacramento County General Plan and the Mather Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Mather CLUP). While City policies were included in the General Plan to reduce these conflicts, significant and unavoidable conflicts were expected as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.1-56; GP FEIR, p. 4.0-4).

The majority of the project area is urbanized and built out with commercial, residential, retail and office uses. Future land uses envisioned for the project area were analyzed in the City's General Plan and would comply with all applicable plans, policies or regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

and regulations. While the GP-EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts to conflicts with existing plans, the proposed project would not create any additional impacts to those previously identified in the GP-EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations of other jurisdictional agencies in the area.

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR addressed potential impacts related to conflicts between the General Plan and any adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-62 and 4.10-63). While the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) and the Vernal Pool Recovery Plan are currently being prepared by the County and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (respectively), no such plans have been adopted (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-63). Because of this, the General Plan would have no impact on adopted plans (Ibid.).

Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova do not currently have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is being prepared by the County and will be adopted within the next few years. However, the SSHCP is still being formulated and no portion of the plan has been adopted. Likewise, the Vernal Pool Recovery Plan is currently being prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and no part of the plan has been adopted. The City has not committed to participating in either plan, though it may commit in the future. No natural community conservation plans are in effect in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts resulting from the loss of availability of mineral resources in the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.8-26 through 4.8-27). Only those areas already identified as either MRZ-2 or as containing existing mining operations were expected to be impacted by development of the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-26). Even with adoption of City Policies and Action Items regarding mineral resources and mining, the General Plan would still have a significant and unavoidable impact (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-27).

Portions of the project area have been designated with a MRZ-2 classification (see Figure 4.8-1 of the GP DEIR). An MRZ-2 classification identifies areas in which significant mineral deposits are known to exist. The project area and surrounding areas have been urbanized during the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As mining operations generally take place on sites prior to development, it is unlikely that the project area would be mined in the future. Furthermore, no part of the project area is located within an area identified in the GP-EIR as containing existing or planned mining operations. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss or impede the mining of regionally or locally important mineral resources and *less than significant* impacts would result. .

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XI. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR addressed increases in noise levels as a result of buildout of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.7-20 through 4.7-30). Significant and unavoidable impacts were expected due to construction noise, increased traffic noise, and the potential construction of noise generating land uses (GP DEIR, pp. 4.7-22, 4.7-27, 4.7-30). Policies and Action Items included in the General Plan would reduce these impacts; however, various factors exist throughout the General Plan Planning Area that would make total mitigation impossible. Therefore, the impact of implementation of the General Plan remained significant and unavoidable.

The project area is located within the GP PA. The proposed project could lead to future development and redevelopment within the project area; however, it would not create noise impacts that are greater than the noise impacts discussed under the GP-EIR. Future projects could include demolition, site preparation, and construction activities, which would include the use of heavy equipment and trucks and would result in temporary noise increases in the project area. In order to ensure that construction noise does not exceed City noise standards, the following mitigation measure is included:

#### Mitigation Measure

- MM 11.1** The project applicant shall adhere to the following standard mechanisms for mitigation of construction-related nuisances:

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

- Construction activities shall be limited to between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM on weekends;
- Stationary sources of construction noise such as compressors and generators shall be placed as far as possible from existing residential uses neighboring the project site; and,
- The project proponent shall post visible signage providing a name, address, and 24-hour phone number for information and/or complaints regarding the construction activities, as well as the phone number for the City planning Department.

*Timing/Implementation:* Requirement shall be included on all plans prior to approval of the grading/improvement plans. Measure shall be complied with throughout construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 11.1 would ensure that impacts related to noise exposure would be *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR discussed groundborne noise and vibration concurrently with construction related noise impacts [see discussion a) above; also GP-DEIR, pp. 4.7-20 through 4.7-22]. As large-scale construction of various land uses is ongoing in the City and will continue for some time, guided by the General Plan, significant noise and vibration generation is expected. While City Policies and Action Items would reduce the impact of such vibration and noise, significant and unavoidable impacts as a result of implementation of the General Plan are expected in some cases (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-22).

Any impacts from excessive ground borne vibrations due to increased traffic, construction activities, and/or future stationary noise sources resulting from the proposed project were analyzed in the GP-EIR. Impacts were identified as being significant and unavoidable. However, any impacts created from the proposed project would not result in any impacts greater than those discussed in the GP-EIR. Therefore, impacts from excessive ground borne vibrations are considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified uses that may result in significant stationary (permanent) noise generation (GP DEIR, pp. 4.7-28 through 4.7-30). Uses and equipment that would generate significant permanent noise impacts include loading docks, industrial uses, HVAC equipment, car washes, daycare facilities, auto repair, as well as some recreational uses (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-28). While the impact of these and other significant sources of permanent noise would be lessened by Policies and Action Items included in the General Plan, some impacts would remain and the GP-EIR found impacts of the implementation of the General Plan to be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-30).

Currently, the project area is predominantly built with commercial, retail, office, and residential uses. The proposed project could result in future development and redevelopment projects that could increase residential dwelling units within the project area.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

Future development and redevelopment projects could result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the project area. However, permanent increases in ambient noise levels for the project area would not be greater than those identified in the GP-EIR. Therefore, impacts from permanent increases in ambient noise levels resulting from the proposed project are considered *less than* significant.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion b) above. Construction noise impacts resulting from future projects within the project area are expected to be minor and short in duration, and are therefore not expected to exceed City standards for stationary noise [see discussion a) above]. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 11.1 would ensure that construction related noise impacts from the proposed project would be *less than significant*.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed noise impacts related to airports, specifically the Mather Airport located immediately south and west of the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.7-30 through 4.7-32). Five planning areas within the City were identified as having potential airport-related noise impacts: Mather Planning Area, Jackson Planning Area, Sunrise Boulevard South Planning Area, Rio del Oro Planning Area, and the Aerojet Planning Area (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-30). Single-event noise impacts were also identified for those portions of the City that lie under the primary flight paths for Mather Airport (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-30). For the five planning areas identified above and areas of the City directly under the approach path for Mather Airport the impact from the implementation of the General Plan was found to be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-32).

The project area is located within the vicinity of Mather Airport. However, the noise contours for the airport are located south of the project area. No measurable noise contours overlay the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact associated with aircraft noise.

- f) *No Impact.* The nearest private airport to the project area is Rancho Murieta Airport, located more than ten miles to the southeast. Therefore, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airport and *no impact* would occur.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* In the GP-EIR the General Plan was found to result in substantial increases in the number of dwellings, residents, and employees in the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.3-10 through 4.3-14). These increases were higher than those previously anticipated by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). Substantial population growth is expected and significant and unavoidable impacts from the implementation of the General Plan were identified (GP-DEIR, p. 4.3-14).

Current land uses in the project area are primarily commercial, retail, office, and residential. The proposed project would encourage development and redevelopment activities as were analyzed in the GP-EIR. Future development projects in the project area will be required to comply with all General Plan policies. Compliance with General Plan policies would ensure that future projects within the project area do not have impacts greater than those addressed the GP-EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to population growth, either directly or indirectly.

b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts due to the displacement of people and housing as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.3-14). These impacts were primarily due to the installation of infrastructure such as streets (Ibid). Consistency with State and federal laws relating to displacement of existing residents and housing would ensure that impacts of the General Plan would be less than significant (Ibid.).

There are currently many residential dwellings within the project area. Many of the adopted land use designations within the project area include mixed land uses, which would allow for future opportunities to develop additional housing within the project area. Should future projects within the project area displace housing and/or residents, it is anticipated that overall housing and population would increase, making it unnecessary to require additional housing in other areas. However, it is important to note that housing opportunities and densities within the project area would not exceed the housing opportunities and densities addressed in the GP-EIR. Therefore, the indirect impacts associated with increased housing (increased traffic, air quality impacts, noise, demand for public services, etc.) would

### **3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

not exceed the short-term or cumulative demand for these services that was addressed in the GP-EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to existing housing or population in the area.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion b) above.



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:					
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### EXISTING SETTING

The Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan area is located within the following public service districts:

- Fire Protection: Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD)
- Police Protection – Rancho Cordova Police Department (RCPD)
- School District – Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD)
- Park District – Cordova Recreation and Park District (CRPD)
- Electrical Service – Sacramento Metropolitan Utilities District (SMUD)
- Natural Gas Service – Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed the impact of the General Plan on fire protection services and the resulting environmental impact of any additional infrastructure required (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-5 through 4.12-9). As the General Plan would result in substantial growth, additional fire stations and other infrastructure would be required to serve the increased number of dwellings and urban land uses (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-5 and 4.12-6). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items would result in a less than significant impact from the implementation of the General Plan to the environment from construction and provision of additional infrastructure and facilities.

Though the proposed project would result in future redevelopment of the project area, future uses would be consistent with those identified in the City's General Plan, and impacts on fire service for the project area would not be greater than impacts identified in the GP-EIR. Also, the potential growth in the project area would increase the tax revenues that support fire protection/emergency services and related infrastructure. Future development would also have to comply with SMFD standards. Therefore, impacts to fire protection services are considered *less than significant*.

b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts related to the need for additional police protection infrastructure and facilities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-16 through 4.12-20). Just as with fire protection, the

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

substantial growth predicted in the GP-EIR would require additional police protection infrastructure and facilities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-16 and 4.12-17). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items would result in less than significant impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-17).

The project area is currently served by the City of Rancho Cordova Police Department via a contract with the Sacramento County Sheriff. Though the proposed project would result in future redevelopment of the project area, future uses would be consistent with those identified in the City's General Plan, and impacts on police protection and facilities for the project area would not be greater than impacts identified in the GP-EIR. Also, the potential growth in the project area would increase the tax revenues that support police protection/emergency services and related infrastructure. Future development would also have to comply with RCPD standards. Therefore, impacts to police protection services are considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts to all four school districts servicing the General Plan Planning Area as a result of substantial growth expected during the life of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-77 through 4.12-80). While additional schools would be required as growth in the General Plan Planning Area continues, consistency with City Policies and Action Items, as well as required CEQA and State Board of Education review of future school sites would result in less than significant impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-80).

The project area is located within the boundaries of the Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD) and the Sacramento City Unified School District (SCUSD) – see Figure 4.12.6-1 of the GP DEIR. On a district level, the FCUSD is operating at or near capacity for elementary and high schools. Currently, the project area includes two schools: John Muir Charter School and Kinney Continuation High School.

The proposed project could lead to increased development and redevelopment activities within the project area. Proposed land uses for this area, as identified by the City's General Plan include mixed-use residential uses that may increase demand for school facilities and services within the project area. However, the project area is urbanized and does not have large vacant parcels suitable for future school sites. The siting of new schools or expansion of nearby public schools, to accommodate an increase in residential population (and a potential need to accommodate school-age children) would have to be undertaken by the School Board.

The project area is located in the GP PA; therefore, any impacts to school facilities in the project area would not be greater than those impacts in the larger GP PA. The GP-EIR identified impacts to public school facilities to be less than significant. Though the proposed project could result in the future redevelopment of the project area, future uses would be consistent with those identified in the City's General Plan, and impacts to schools would not be greater than those impacts identified in the GP-EIR. Therefore, no additional impacts to public school facilities are anticipated for the proposed project and impacts to public school facilities are considered *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential environmental impacts related to the provision of additional parks to serve the growth anticipated in the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-89 through 4.12-96). Adherence to City

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

Policy and Action Items as well as the requirements of the Cordova Recreation and Park District (CRPD) would ensure less than significant impacts from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-95 and 4.12-96).

The project area is located within the boundaries of the Cordova Recreation and Park District (CRPD). The proposed project could result in increased redevelopment activities within the project area, which in turn could result in an increased demand for park and recreational facilities. However, the project area is built-out and there are no large vacant parcels suitable for the dedication of new park/recreation space at the 5 acres of land per 1,000 population ratio set by the CRPD.

The project area is located within the GP PA and as such, future impacts to parks due to increases in development activity in the project area would not be greater than impacts to parks in the GP PA. The GP-EIR identified impacts to park and recreational facilities to be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to park and recreational facilities.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact.* The GP-EIR identified impacts to other public facilities (electrical, natural gas, and infrastructure) to be less than significant. Though the proposed project could result in the future redevelopment of the project area, future uses would be consistent with those identified in the City's General Plan. Since none of the utility companies currently serving the GP PA anticipate availability or service problems to meet the increased demands under the General Plan, there should be no additional problems with increased demand for public facilities in the project area. Therefore, impacts to other public facilities are considered *less than significant*.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XIV. RECREATION</b>					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion d) of checklist XIII, Public Services above for information on the GP-EIR's conclusions as to impacts related to parks and recreation. There are no existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities in the project area. No existing parkland would be converted to non-recreational use as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less than significant* impacts to the physical deterioration of such facilities.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. However, implementation of the proposed project could result in redevelopment of the project area, which includes commercial and office mixed uses with residential components. The GP-EIR identified impacts to existing or new recreational facilities as less than significant. Impacts resulting from the proposed project would not be greater than the impacts previously addressed in the GP-EIR. Therefore, impacts to recreational facilities are considered *less than significant*.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b> Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed traffic impacts to the existing roadway network in the General Plan Planning Area as a result of the population, dwelling unit, and employee increases expected to occur with implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-27 through 4.5-45). Several new roadways and improvement of existing roadways were described in the General Plan in order to address the additional expected traffic load. However, even with these improvements and adherence to City Policies and Action Items the impact from implementation of the General Plan would remain significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.5-42).

The GP-EIR identified that levels of service for the major arterials within the project area (Folsom Boulevard, Sunrise Boulevard) would deteriorate, and the number of vehicle trips would increase under build out conditions. The GP-EIR also identified impacts from increases in traffic for the GP PA as significant and unavoidable. Since the proposed project is consistent with the land use and development density assumptions that were used for the traffic analysis in the GP-EIR, any impacts to the existing traffic load and street system resulting from the proposed project would not be greater than those previously analyzed in the GP-EIR.

As future development projects within the project area are proposed, they shall be reviewed by City staff to determine if further project-specific traffic studies are required. At this time,

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

any project anticipated to generate more than 1,000 vehicle trips daily or more than 100 trips during the AM or PM peak hours would be required to submit a detailed traffic study. To ensure compliance with City requirements, the following mitigation measure are included:

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 15.1** Should the proposed project be likely to generate in excess of 1,000 daily vehicle trips, 100 AM peak trips, or 100 PM peak trips (as determined by City staff), the project proponent shall submit to the City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department a detailed traffic analysis. The project proponent shall contact the Public Works Department to determine the extent and scope of the required analysis. Traffic studies shall determine project-specific impacts to area roadways and identify mitigation measures in the form of roadway improvements and fair-share payments towards planned roadway improvements that are adequate to off-set project generated impacts.

Based on the results of the traffic study, additional mitigation measures may be required by the Public Works Department.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Coordination with the Public Works Department shall begin during the project review period prior to discretionary approval of future projects.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Rancho Cordova Planning and Public Works Departments.*

**MM 15.2** Subsequent development and redevelopment projects within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan Area shall be subject to fair-share traffic mitigation fees that shall be applied towards the construction of planned roadway improvements identified in the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan and the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The project's fair-share shall be determined by City staff in consultation with the Public Works Department.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Coordination with the Public Works Department shall begin during the project review period prior to discretionary approval of future projects.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Rancho Cordova Planning and Public Works Departments.*

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 15.1 and MM 15.2 would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to traffic in the area.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above. Any impacts from changes in levels of service resulting from the proposed project would not be greater than those impacts identified in the GP-EIR. Further, any construction activities associated with future development or redevelopment projects within the project area would be required by the Public Works Department to submit a Traffic Control Plan.

The Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan includes planned roadway improvements that will assist the City in improving traffic flow and levels of service throughout the project area. While implementation of the Specific Plan will allow for redevelopment of the project area, which may lead to increased traffic within the project area, the Specific Plan proposes to shift land uses from their current auto-orientation to a more mixed-use land use array with an increased reliance on public transit. Ultimately, implementation of the Specific Plan is anticipated to improve traffic conditions in the project area through a series of roadway improvements, increased access to alternative transportation options and a mix of land uses that will foster pedestrian connectivity and reduce automobile use throughout the project area. This impact is considered *less than significant*.

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed safety and hazards impacts related to the provision of land uses within the Mather Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Mather CLUP) and their impact on safety related to air traffic in and out of the airport (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28 and 4.4-29). The General Plan established the Mather Planning Area that corresponds to the Master Plan boundaries of the Mather Airport. Policies included in the General Plan were more stringent than the safety restrictions of the Mather CLUP (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items as well as the requirements of the Mather CLUP would ensure less than significant impacts from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-29).

The project area is located within the 150 and 150-300 foot conical surface height restriction area for Mather Airport, above which it is understood that impacts to air navigation could occur. The GP-EIR analyzed potential impacts from development within the restricted areas. Future projects within the project area would be subject to City Policies and Action items as well as the requirements of the Mather CLUP. The proposed project does not propose any impacts beyond those analyzed in the GP-EIR. The proposed project would not construct any structures above the height restrictions mandated for the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not necessitate any change in current air traffic patterns and *no impact* is expected.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed potential impacts related to roadway safety as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.5-48). The City's design standards for roadways, as well as the land use planning and other City Policies, would ensure that impacts from implementation of the General Plan related to roadway safety are less than significant (Ibid.).

The proposed project could lead to future development and redevelopment in the project area. Since the GP-EIR identified impacts to roadway safety as less than significant, and the proposed project is consistent with the development densities used for preparation of the GP-EIR traffic study, the proposed project would not create any impacts greater than those previously analyzed. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified impacts related to emergency access within the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, p.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

4.5-48). As the roadway network in the City was to be improved and additional routes were to be added by the General Plan, impacts were found to be less than significant (Ibid.).

The proposed project could result in the redevelopment of the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan area that could indirectly increase the amount of vehicular traffic and the number of potential safety and emergency access conflicts for this area. However, impacts from inadequate emergency access in the project area would not be greater than the impacts previously addressed in the GP-EIR. Therefore impacts to emergency access are considered *less than significant*.

- f) *Less than Significant Impact*. The proposed project could result in the redevelopment of the project area. This could lead to increased parking needs for future uses. As a result of uses more intensive than those currently existing, redevelopment of existing properties and development of existing vacant properties could occur. The parking needs would be assessed on a project specific basis. Therefore, impacts to inadequate parking capacity created from the proposed project are considered *less than significant*.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. The GP-EIR analyzed potential impacts to transit, pedestrian, and bicycle provisions within the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-49 through 4.5-53). Development of the City's Transit Master Plan and the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan would ensure that impacts from implementation of the General Plan to these provisions would be less than significant (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-49 and 4.5-50).

The proposed project could lead to redevelopment of existing properties and development of existing vacant properties. The City of Rancho Cordova's Transit Master Plan establishes the City's vision for transit. The proposed project aims to implement the goals of the Transit Master Plan. Therefore, the proposed Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan would have *less than significant* impacts on alternative transportation plans or programs.



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>	Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts relating to the capacity of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCS D) treatment facilities to treat wastewater flows from the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-45 through 4.12-51). Current capacity at the SRWTP is adequate to meet projected growth by 2020; however, growth beyond that point will require expansion of existing capacity which could result in environmental impacts (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-47). Because of this, the GP-EIR identified the impact from implementation the General Plan as significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-51).

The Sacramento County Sanitation District-1 (CSD-1) provides collection and disposal services to the City of Rancho Cordova and surrounding unincorporated areas. The main CSD-1 collection system includes over 2,400 miles of sewer pipelines ranging in size from 4 to 75 inches in diameter. The collection system in Rancho Cordova includes trunks (designed to carry flows from 1 – 10 mgd) and laterals, which are wastewater conveyance facilities that carry wastewater flows of less than 1 mgd. The CSD-1 facilities collect and transport wastewater into Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District's (SRCS D) regional treatment and disposal facilities. The SRCS D Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) located at 8521 Laguna Station Road, north of the City of Elk Grove, has a dry weather flow design capacity of 181 million gallons per day (mgd). The SRWTP receives

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

and treats an average of 155 mgd. Treated effluent charges from Rancho Cordova and the surrounding area are conveyed to SRCSD's regional system and ultimately discharged into the Sacramento River near the unincorporated town of Freeport in Sacramento County.

The department operates under the Regional 2020 Master Plan, which is used to determine how the SRCSD will provide future wastewater treatment service to the community. The Master Plan is updated every five years to incorporate revised land use plans and projections. The projections are based on Sacramento County General Plan and local jurisdictions land use projections within the Urban Services Boundary through 2014. The Master Plan also identified improvements and modifications needed to ensure sufficient capacity in both conveyance and treatment facilities.

The project area would continue to receive wastewater conveyance service from CSD-1 and treatment and disposal services from SRCSD. The project area falls within the GP PA and contains development densities consistent with those used in the GP-EIR. Impacts to wastewater treatment facilities were previously addressed in the GP-EIR as being significant and unavoidable. Future development or redevelopment activities could occur as a result of the proposed project. Since the GP-EIR previously identified impacts to wastewater treatment facilities as a result of buildout of the Planning Area consistent with the land use densities included in the GP, which included analysis for the project area, impacts resulting from the proposed project are considered *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* In addition to required expansion in treatment capacity, the GP-EIR identified potential impacts associated with the construction of additional water and wastewater conveyance infrastructure (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-45 through 4.12-51). CSD-1 has planned expansion of sewerage infrastructure into the General Plan Planning Area and the environmental effects of this expansion were addressed in an EIR (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-46 and 4.12-47). However, increased growth expected with implementation of the General Plan will require more infrastructure than that currently planned by CSD-1. Therefore, the impact from implementation of the General Plan was found to be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-51).

See discussion for a) above. The project area is currently served by the Golden State Water Company and the Cal American Water Company for water conveyance services (as indicated by Figure 4.9-3 in the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan EIR). The project area is served by the Sacramento County Sanitation District (CSD-1) for sewer conveyance services. The existing sewer and water infrastructure currently serves the project area. Any future redevelopment projects or new development that could occur within the project area would connect with the existing infrastructure. Therefore, impacts of construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities from the proposed project are considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion h) in checklist VII, Hydrology and Water Quality for information on stormwater drainage facilities and their associated environmental effects.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential environmental impacts related to available water supplies and the increased demand in the City and the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.9-43 through 4.9-57). According to the analysis in the GP-EIR, adequate supplies of water exist through buildout of the current incorporated boundaries of the City (GP DEIR, p. 45). However, new

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

sources of water will be required to serve buildout conditions for those portions of the General Plan Planning Area that lie outside current City boundaries. Significant environmental effects may occur from the acquisition of these additional sources. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan are expected (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-57).

As discussed above, adequate water supplies exist to support buildout conditions within the City boundaries. The project area is completely within the current City boundaries and was analyzed as part of buildout conditions of the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts for increased water supply.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions a) and b) above.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts related to the capacity of local landfills and those landfills to which solid waste from the City and the General Plan Planning Area are shipped (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-60 through 4.12-63). Current capacity exists at all landfills that serve the General Plan Planning Area and expansion in capacity is not expected to be required (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-61). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items as well as federal, State, and local laws and ordinances would ensure less than significant impacts as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-63).

As identified in the General Plan EIR, all three landfills that receive solid waste from the City have adequate capacity to serve the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-60 through 4.12-63). Solid waste generated within the proposed project would be trucked to local landfills for disposal. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

- g) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be served by an existing waste handling service, provided by either BFI or Allied Waste. BFI and Allied Waste operate consistent with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations. All landfills that would serve the proposed project also conform to all applicable statutes and regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As demonstrated in checklists I through XVI above, the proposed project is not expected to result in any significant impacts related to biological or cultural resources. Further, adherence to City policies and the mitigation measures presented above would ensure that the project's impacts are *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Potential development within the project area does not include any development component or action plan targeting short-term environmental goals that may risk achieving long-term environmental goals. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all Rancho Cordova General Plan policies, ensuring that the long-term environmental goals of the City are adhered to. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Section 4.0 of this MND addresses the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts in the cumulative setting. See Section 4.4 for the project's contribution to cumulative impacts. The proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts over those identified in the GP-EIR. Therefore, cumulative impacts are *less than significant*.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed project does create potential for future projects to create significant impacts. However, any impacts to humans created from the proposed project were previously analyzed in the GP-EIR. The

### **3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

proposed project would not create additional impacts over what was previously analyzed in the GP-EIR. Therefore, impacts to humans are considered *less than significant*.