
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

INTRODUCTION

This section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, including the CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance. There are 14 specific environmental issues evaluated the Initial Study, including:

- Land Use Planning, Population, and Housing
- Geophysical (Earth)
- Water
- Air Quality
- Transportation/Circulation
- Biological Resources
- Energy and Mineral Resources
- Hazards
- Noise
- Public Services
- Utilities and Services Systems
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

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.
- **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** 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.
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant. If there is one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, and EIR is required.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** Sunridge Park Remainder Lot
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova
3121 Gold Canal Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Hilary Anderson (916) 361-8384
4. **Project Location:** The Sunridge Park Remainder Lot project site is located within the approved Sunridge Park Tentative Map project area. Sunridge Park is part of the SunRidge Specific Plan (SRSP) area, which is located within the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan (SDCP) area. **Figures 1** and **2** illustrate the regional and project site location, respectively. The approved Sunridge Park project is generally bounded by Douglas Road to north, agricultural land to the south, proposed SunRidge Specific Plan projects to the east, and Jaeger Road to west. The Remainder Lot portions of the Sunridge Park project site are displayed in grey in **Figure 3**.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** **Sunridge Park**
Brian Vail
River West Investments
7700 College Town Drive #109
Sacramento CA, 95826
6. **General Plan Designation(s):** Urban Development Area.
7. **Zoning:** RD-4, RD-5, RD-7, LC and Open space
8. **Specific Plan:** The project is located within the approximate 2605.8-acre Sunridge Specific Plan Area. The SDCP/SRSP EIR for the Specific Plan area was certified by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors on July 19, 2002.
9. **APN Number:** Portions of 067-0040-014 and 067-0040-015
10. **Description of the Project:**

The Remainder Lot project is located on a 79.2-acre portion of the approved Sunridge Park project. The Large Lot/Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map for the Sunridge Park project was approved by the City of Rancho Cordova on January 20, 2004. The Remainder Lot contains and connects undisturbed delineated wetlands and vernal pools. It was originally created to connect the open space area throughout the project site. As noted in the Sunridge Village MND, the Remainder Lot portion of the site could be fully developed if the necessary permits, including a 404 permit, were obtained. In the absence of the 404 permit, this Subsequent MND (SMND) addresses the potential impacts associated with grading and site preparation in portions of the Remainder Lot not impacting wetlands or vernal pools. This SMND does not evaluate discharge of dredged or fill material into onsite wetlands or vernal pools, since these activities are not proposed as part of the Remainder Lot project. In addition, this SMND focuses on the project's potential direct and indirect impacts regarding onsite wetland, construction air quality, water quality and cultural resources. The activities

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

associated with the proposed project are described in detail in Section 2.0 (Project Description) and **Appendix B** of this SMND.

- 11. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The Sunridge Park Remainder Lot is located within the approved Tentative Map area of Sunridge Park. The Sunridge Park project site is generally bounded by Douglas Road to the north, agricultural land to the south, proposed SunRidge Specific Plan projects to the east, and the approved Sunridge Park Lot J and Jaeger Road to the west.
- 12. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).**

City of Rancho Cordova

1. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
2. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
3. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
4. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5. California Department of Fish and Game

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation is Incorporated or " potentially significant" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Sunridge Park Remainder Lot project, as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of a Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration. (The discussion demonstrates that there are no potentially significant impacts identified that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, an 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 projects 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 category also applies when the impact has been previously addressed and it has been determined that there are no new impacts created by the project. 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. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" 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.
6. "Reviewed Under Previous Document" applies where the impact has been evaluated and discussed in a previous document. This category could be checked if an impact is either "Potentially Significant" or "Less than Significant". Discussion will include reference to the previous documents.
7. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.
8. Preparers are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individual contacts should be cited in the discussion.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

9. Impacts that were originally classified as potentially significant on previous documents may now be indicated as less than significant. These particular impacts will be marked as "Less than Significant Impact" if the Specific Plan does not create any new impacts for the project area than those previously evaluated.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The visual and aesthetic resource impacts associated with the Sunridge Park project were globally addressed in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan EIR (SDCP/SRSP EIR) and the Sunridge Park and Sunridge Lot J MND. Given that the Remainder Lot is part of the approved tentative map portion of the Sunridge Park project, the potential visual resource impacts were adequately addressed in the previous environmental analysis. In addition, there are no scenic vista views available from the Remainder Lot project site. Mid-range views consist of rural homesteads, limited agriculture operations, and open space. Long-range views generally consist of rural/agricultural land uses, power transmission lines, industrial and aggregate operations and military/airport operations. The proposed grading and site preparation activities would not result in additional visual resource impacts that were not adequately addressed in the previous environmental documents; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
- b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As discussed above in a), both the SDCP/SRSP EIR and the Sunridge Park MND addressed potential damage to scenic resources on the project site and in the Community Plan area. The nearest highways are US 50 and the Jackson Highway (SR 16). SR 16 is not designated as a state scenic highway in the vicinity of the project site. US 50 is located approximately 4 miles north and State Route 16 is approximately 4 miles south of the project site, respectively. The Remainder Lot project would not damage scenic resources views from these highways. Therefore, there is no impact.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The entire Community Plan area is specifically identified in the County General Plan as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Service Boundary. Issues resulting from (i) new growth in this area, (ii) conversion of land to urban uses, (iii) compatibility with the surrounding area, (iv) loss of open space, and (v) increase in nighttime lighting and daytime glare were globally addressed in the General Plan EIR (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, p. 4.32).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The General Plan EIR noted that development of the project area would include various intensities of development, which could substantially alter existing views and conflict with the scale of existing structures and the rural character of these areas. The introduction of urban uses and densities into these areas would substantially alter the nature of existing viewsheds, and therefore result in a significant and unavoidable impact. (Sacramento County General Plan EIR, pp. 4.10-11.)

Because these impacts had been addressed extensively in the General Plan process, the Final EIR for the SRSP/SDCP does not identify the impacts as being significant effects to the SRSP/SDCP (FEIR, p. 4.32), the County Board of Supervisors noted that the project will contribute to the occurrence of these significant General Plan-level impacts, and no further mitigation is feasible given the Board's 1993 decision, as part of the General Plan approval process, to ultimately approve urban development in the project area.

The Sunridge Park Remainder Lot project does not include a residential component or proposed density ranges different from those already analyzed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. The City, therefore, could not identify any significant visual impacts associated with this project and the proposed activities. Notably, the County Board of Supervisors adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for this impact as part of the SDCP/SRSP project approval. (See SDCP/SRSP - CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, July 18, 2002, pp. 154-158 (hereinafter, "Findings").)

The City concludes that the project's aesthetic impacts are *less than significant* even in the absence of prior County determinations considering the aesthetic impacts of the larger land areas to be significant. The Remainder Lot project represents approximately one percent of the overall SDCP area. Given plans to urbanize those areas surrounding the proposed project site, the project's contributions to the previously-disclosed, larger aesthetic impacts would neither be significant at the project level nor cumulatively considerable viewed in the larger context.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See c) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Remainder Lot project site is depicted on Sacramento County General Soils Map as being comprised mostly of Redding-Corning-Red Bluff soils which are "moderately well drained soils that are moderately deep over a cemented hardpan and well drained and moderately well drained soils that are very deep" (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, page 4.30). In addition, the project site is depicted on the CA Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) as Grazing Land (G) and Farmland of Local Importance (L). Grazing Land is suitable for the grazing of livestock and Farmland of Local Importance are generally crop and irrigated pasture lands, which do not qualify as Prime or Unique farmland. As such, implementation of the Remainder Lot project would not convert Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The entire SDCP area, which includes the project site, was specifically identified in the Sacramento County General Plan as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Services Boundary. Issues resulting from (i) new growth in this area, (ii) conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, (iii) compatibility with the surrounding area; and (iv) loss of open space were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. The project area's zoning was changed from AG-80 to AG-20 via the County's adoption of the SDCP/SRSP project in July 2002. In the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR, the County expressly stated that the AG-20 zoning was only temporary, until the 2002 expiration of the Williamson Act contract, and that it was assumed for the purposes of the EIR's analysis that the area would be rezoned and developed consistent with the Specific Plan land use designations, which specify low-density residential uses. (See SDCP/SRSP FEIR, pp. 4.17 (footnote 4), 4.17a (map of SP land use designations).) Furthermore, the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR previously examined the impact of the potential

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

development within the SDCP/SRSP areas on existing and adjacent agricultural uses. (FEIR, pp. 4.19, 4.30–4.31.) The Master EIR concluded that these impacts had been globally addressed in the County's General Plan EIR, which examined the conversion of the area's agricultural uses to urban uses (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, p. 4.31).

The Sunridge Park project site was rezoned by the City to allow for various Low-Density Residential (LDR) densities ranging from RD-4 through RD-7. The activities associated with the Remainder Lot are to allow for the development of the approved residential portion of the Sunridge Park project; therefore, would not conflict with the site's zoning designations. Approximately 244 acres of the SRSP area, which includes portions of the Remainder Lot project site, was under a Williamson Act Contract (Resolution No. 72-AP-008). However, the previous property owner filed a Notice of Non-Renewal and the subject properties Williamson Act contract expired in 2002 (CA Department of Conservation, August 2003). Therefore, the project's conflicts and impacts with existing zoning, nearby agricultural uses, and existing Williamson Act contracts are considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) and b) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------

III. AIR QUALITY. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) has prepared its Air Quality Attainment Plan, which describes local measures, which are planned for implementation to achieve the federal and state air quality standards. The Sunridge Specific Plan, which includes the project site, was developed in collaboration with the SMAQMD's Air Quality Attainment Plan. The project would not conflict or obstruct SMAQMD's Air Quality Attainment Plan; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

The Sunridge Specific Plan proponents have complied with Mitigation Measure AI-5 (SDCP/SRSP EIR) by submitting an approved AQ-15 Air Quality Plan. (May 3, 2002 Staff Report to Board of Supervisors for May 8, 2002). The following mitigation measure would ensure that the Remainder Lot project complies with the SunRidge Specific Plan AQ-15.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure is a revision to the previously adopted Mitigation Measure AI-5 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR.

MM 3.1 The Sunridge Park Remainder Lot project proponents shall participate in a County Service Area (CSA) or an equivalent financing mechanism to the satisfaction of the City Council, for

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

the purpose of funding a variety of transportation demand management strategies, which will contribute to the 15% reduction in emissions mandated by General Plan Policy AQ-15.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to Improvement Plans or Final Map, whichever comes first.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 3.1 would reduce this impact to less than significant.

- b) *Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Sacramento County is a known non-attainment area for State and Federal standards for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10). The SDCP/SRSP EIR determined that construction-related and operational emissions arising from implementation of the SunRidge Specific Plan would result in emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10 that are above the SMAQMD significance thresholds for those pollutants (FEIR, pp. 11.15–11.16, 11.18–11.19.). The Master EIR determined that the buildout of the Specific Plan with projects such as the Remainder Lot project would contribute to a cumulative increase of construction related emissions and exacerbate SMAQMD's non-attainment status for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, and PM10. (*Ibid.*) As discussed in a) above, the project is subject to the Sacramento County General Plan Policy AQ-15, which is designed to reduce by at least 15 percent air pollution emissions resulting from new developments. Additionally, the SMAQMD has an established construction-related emissions reduction program (Category 1: Reducing Nox emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment, and Category 2: Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment) to reduce construction-related air quality impacts. The Master EIR determined that the air quality impacts arising from buildout of the Specific Plan and construction-related activities were significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures (FEIR, pp. 11.15–11.16, 11.18–11.20). Implementation of Mitigation Measure AI-1, proposed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR, SMAQMD's approved construction emissions programs (Findings, p. 101), and a measure substituted by the Board for proposed measure AI-5 (Findings, p. 106) were found by the Board to mitigate, but not entirely avoid, these impacts from air pollutant emissions. The activities associated with the Sunridge Park Remainder Lot project were not addressed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR; therefore, the City proposes the following mitigation measures, which are revisions to those previously adopted measures, to ensure that the Remainder Lot's construction related impacts are reduced to the greatest extent feasible.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are a revision to the previously adopted Mitigation Measure AI-1 for the SDCP/SRSP EIR, and are applicable to the Sunridge Remainder Lot project.

- MM 3.2a** The project applicant shall require that the contractors water all exposed surfaces, graded areas, storage piles and haul roads at least twice daily during construction. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Timing/Implementation: During all grading and construction phases of the project.

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

MM 3.2b The project applicant shall require that the contractor limit vehicle speed for onsite construction vehicles to 15 mph when winds exceed 20 miles per hour. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

Timing/Implementation: During all grading and construction phases of the project.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD.

MM 3.2c The project applicant shall require paved streets adjacent to construction sites to be washed or swept daily to remove accumulated dust. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

Timing/Implementation: During all grading and construction phases of the project.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD.

MM 3.2d The project applicant shall require that, when transporting soil or other materials by truck during construction, two feet of freeboard shall be maintained by the contractor, and that the materials be covered. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

Timing/Implementation: During all grading and construction phases of the project.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD.

MM 3.2e The project applicant shall require contractors to implement ridesharing programs for construction employees traveling to and from the site. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

Timing/Implementation: During all grading and construction phases of the project.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 3.2f Prior to approval of the grading plans for the project, the project proponent shall provide a Construction-Related Emissions Reduction Air Quality Plan which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the SMAQMD how the project will achieve minimum reductions of 20% of NOX and 45% in PM10 construction related equipment emissions. The Construction-Related Emissions Reduction Air Quality Plan shall describe the implementation method(s) to be used (i.e., incorporating Plan provisions as conditions of project approval, and /or through some other method(s) to ensure that the Sunridge Park and the Sunridge Park Remainder Lot projects implement the emission reduction measures set forth in the Construction Related Emissions Reduction Air Quality Plan. In addition, the Construction-Related Reduction Air Quality Plan shall include SMAQMD's **Category 1:** Reducing NO_x emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment and **Category 2:** Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment, to reduce emissions from off- road diesel powered construction vehicles.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to the approval of all grading and improvement plans.

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.2a through 3.2f would reduce the Remainder Lot project's construction and potential air violation related impacts. However, impacts to air quality cannot be fully mitigated. The County adopted a Statement of Overriding consideration for air quality impacts associated with the SDCP/SRSP EIR. This project would not contribute any new impacts above those evaluated in the EIR.

- c) *Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Section 11: Air Quality and discussion a) and b) above. The County adopted a Statement of Overriding consideration for air quality impacts associated with the SDCP/SRSP EIR. This project would not contribute any new impacts above those evaluated in the EIR.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The grading and site preparation activities associated with the Remainder Lot project do not emit substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, standard equipment and best management practices (BMPs) employed during construction activities will ensure that this impact is reduced to *less than significant*.
- e) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento Rendering Plant is located approximately 2 miles southwest of the project site. The SDCP/SRSP Final EIR (page 4.21) evaluated this issue and determined it to be *significant and unavoidable* and identified Mitigation Measure LA-3 to mitigate the impact to a less than significant level. However, the County Board of Supervisors rejected the original version of Mitigation Measure LA-3 as unnecessary, and adopted a revised mitigation measure to condition the issuance of building permits within the SunRidge Specific Plan area on the future implementation of odor control systems at the rendering plant. The proposed project does not include residential development; therefore, would

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

expose not expose sensitive receptors to potential odor impacts associated with the Sacramento Rendering Plant. In addition, no substantial odor concentrations are anticipated to adversely affect construction workers on the Remainder Lot project site; therefore, *less than significant* impacts are expected.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Existing Setting

The Remainder Lot project site is interspersed with seasonal wetlands, which are shallow depressions underlain by slowly permeable soils that support various hydrophytic plant species. These wetlands typically have saturated soil conditions in the winter and early spring and moderately dense vegetation dominated primarily by plant species that occur in both wetland and upland habitat. Plant species include perennial ryegrass, Mediterranean barley, and coyote thistle. The project also contains vernal pools on a variety of soil types. Vernal pools are typically found in depressions where a claypan, hardpan, or impermeable layer causes the water to collect during the wet season. The onsite vernal pools support vernal pool buttercup, manna grass, clover, perennial ryegrass, and coyote thistle. In addition, the non-native grasslands present on the project site support several common wildlife species including, but not limited to, mourning dove, western meadowlark, scrub jay, western kingbird, and lesser

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

goldfinch. The onsite wetlands and vernal pools also support a wide variety of wildlife including mallards, killdeer, song sparrow, black phoebe, and raccoon.

The Sunridge Park MND (November 2003) addressed the potential biological impacts of development on the approved Tentative Map portion of the project site and applied mitigation measures to reduce impacts to onsite biological resources. The mitigation measures required the preparation of a wetland-delineation, site-specific special-status species surveys, and other measures to provide “fair-share” mitigation for known on-site biological impacts. In addition, the mitigation required that the project applicant secure all appropriate state and federal permits associated with biological resources prior to project implementation. This SMND focuses on the Remainder Lot project’s potential impacts to wetlands, special-status species, and impacts not previously addressed in the Sunridge Park/Sunridge Lot J MND.

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts to special-status species for the Community Plan area were globally (non site-specific) evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. (See FEIR, pp. 14.27–14.32.) The potential impact of development within the SDCP/SRSP area on special status species was disclosed in the Master EIR as significant and unavoidable, for the reason that site-specific information for the area was not yet available, and therefore, the analysis in the FEIR assumed that such habitat would not be avoided (FEIR, p. 14.31). Therefore, the FEIR proposed, and the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors adopted, mitigation measures that require future project proponents for development entitlements to conduct determinate surveys for special status species, prepare detailed mitigation plans designed to reduce the impact to such species to a less than significant level, and coordinate with the appropriate agencies to obtain the necessary permits (Findings, pp. 120-121 (mitigation measures BR-6, BR-7)).

There have been various special-status surveys for four federally listed and proposed species in the SDCP area, including the California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma tigrinum*), the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus*), slender Orcutt grass, and Sacramento Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia viscida*). Except for the tiger salamander, these species are identified in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) records as occurring within five miles of the Remainder Lot project site. The nearest CNDDDB occurrence of California tiger salamander is approximately 11.7 miles southeast of the SRSP boundary, where California tiger salamander larvae were located by P. Balfour, with Conservation Resources, LLC in May 1998. The CNDDDB record search for the proposed project is included as Figure 2 in **Appendix C**. Based on the lack of habitat suitability, negative survey results, and the lack of known occurrences in the project vicinity, and dispersal barriers between the nearest known location and the proposed project site, this species is not expected to be present on the Remainder Lot project site. There are five CNDDDB records of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle within five miles of the Remainder Lot project site. However, a 2001 Foothill Associates survey determined that elderberry (*Sambucus* spp.) is not present on the project site, or within 250 feet of the project site boundaries. Since there are no elderberry shrubs onsite or in the immediate vicinity, and the valley elderberry longhorn beetle lifecycle is dependent of elderberry shrubs, this species will not be affected by the proposed project. In addition, there are five

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CNDDDB records for Sacramento Orcutt grass and two records for slender Orcutt grass occurring within the SRSP. Sacramento and slender Orcutt grass were not observed on the project site during focused surveys conducted by Foothill Associates in 2002. These species were not observed on the adjacent project site during this survey. However, a slender Orcutt grass population of approximately 1,000 plants was observed approximately 1.5 miles west of the project site in May, 1993 by Sugnet and Associates. Foothill Associates conducted a Service protocol level survey on July 2, 2003. The wetlands and vernal pools on the project site are small and are not suitable for Orcutt grasses, as the inundation period is too short. The focused survey conducted during the appropriate time of the year did not reveal the species on the project site and the habitat is not suitable for supporting these species. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to affect Sacramento Orcutt or slender Orcutt grass.

A proposed rule to designate critical habitat for federally listed vernal pool species in the Central Valley was published in the Federal Register on September 24, 2002 (USFWS, 2002). However, the final rule excluded Sacramento County and several other counties from the formal critical habitat designation (USFWS, 2003b); therefore, the proposed project would not affect critical habitat for listed vernal pool species. Critical habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle was formally designated on August 8, 1980 (FR 45:52803), but designated critical habitat for this species is not present on the project site or vicinity. Critical habitat has not been formally proposed for California tiger salamander. The project is not expected to result in adverse modification or critical habitat for any federally listed or proposed species.

The site contains suitable habitat for two federally listed vernal pool crustacean species, the threatened vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*) and the endangered vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardii*). The project site has not been surveyed for vernal pool crustaceans; therefore, it is assumed that both species are present in all vernal pools on the Remainder Lot project site and the proposed project grading activities could result in direct and indirect effects to vernal pool crustaceans. There are 166 records of vernal pool shrimp recorded in the CNDDDB as occurring in the entire state of California (CNDDDB, 2003). Of these records, a total of 57 are from within Sacramento County (CNDDDB, 2003). There are two records from within the SRSP boundaries, and another 23 within five miles the SRSP boundaries. The nearest two occurrence (#54 and #23) of this species are from within 1.5 miles of the project site. One of these records (#54), located to the west of the site, was observed in February 1993. The other record (#23) is located to the east of the site and was observed in 1996.

Indirect or secondary impacts to wetlands include: a minor loss and fragmentation of habitat, changes in or loss of hydrology, interference with wildlife movement, and increase in human/wildlife conflicts, impacts to water quality from construction runoff and stormwater, and damage to established native plant communities. Indirect and secondary impacts can be minimized or eliminated by appropriate project design, construction scheduling, and the comprehensive use of best management practices (BMP's). A comprehensive list of appropriate BMP's have been identified and included as mitigation for use during construction of the project to minimize wetland impacts. Typical BMP's are provided in **Appendix C**. Long-term, indirect effect of the proposed grading

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

activities may include added nutrient and water supply to vernal pools from adjacent parcels, which is accelerated the building pads are graded towards the protect wetlands and construction occurs within 40 feet of the protected wetland features. The grading activities in the Remainder Lot parcel would not result in the fill of vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, or intermittent drainages, which provide habitat potentially occupied by vernal pool fairy shrimp or vernal pool tadpole shrimp.

In addition, the project site may contain suitable habitat for the Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), which is state-listed species. To completely fulfill the requirements set forth in SDCP/SRSP EIR, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures BR-6 and BR-7, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. It should be noted that the specific activities associated with the Remainder Lot project were not addressed in SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. The proposed activities may result in new or additional significant special status species impacts that were not identified in the Master EIR for the SRSP area. The City has identified mitigation measures, in addition to previously adopted measures, which will reduce the potentially significant impact to special status species to a less than significant level, and ensure appropriate mitigation as required by SDCP/SRSP EIR Mitigation Measure BR-6 (FEIR, p. 14.31; Findings, p. 120).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures (based on BR-6, BR-7, and BR-8 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to the Remainder Lot project activities.

MM 4.1a If the project would adversely affect or include the taking of federally listed species (e.g, vernal pool fair shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, California tiger salamander, etc.), a Section 10 Incidental Take Permit or a Biological Opinion resulting from Section 7 Consultation with another federal agency shall be obtained from the USFWS and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act.

Timing/Implementation: *Permits and documentation of agency consultation shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department for review and approval prior to site disturbance.*

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

MM 4.1b If the project would adversely affect or include the taking of a listed animal species, a "2081" permit shall be obtained from the CDFG and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act. All required fencing and other physical protective measures must be shown on all grading

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

and improvement plans. All required permits must be secured prior to the approval of any grading or improvement plans.

Timing/Implementation: Permits and documentation of agency consultation shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department for review and approval prior to site disturbance.

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

MM 4.1c

The Remainder Lot project may result in a loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. The project shall mitigate for such loss by implementing one of the following alternatives:

- If the project site is within a one-mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 1.0 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. If the project site is within a one to five mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 0.75 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. If the project site is within a five to ten mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 0.5 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. This land shall be protected through fee title or conservation easement (acceptable to the Department of Fish and Game).
- The project proponents shall, to the satisfaction of the CDFG, prepare and implement a Swainson's hawk mitigation plan that will include preservation of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.
- The project proponents shall submit payment of a Swainson's hawk impact mitigation fee per acre impacted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in the amount set forth in Chapter 16.130 of the Sacramento County Code as such may be amended from time to time and to the extent that said Chapter remains in effect.
- Prior to ground disturbance, a preconstruction survey shall be performed between April 1 and July 31 to determine if active raptor nesting is taking place in the area. If nesting is observed, consultation with the Department of Fish and Game shall occur in order to determine the protective measures which must be implemented for the nesting birds

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

of prey. If nesting is not observed, further action is not required.

Timing/Implementation: *The loss of Swainson Hawk habitat must be fully mitigated prior to any ground disturbance..*

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.1a through 4.1c would reduce project-specific impacts to special-status species to *less than significant*.

b) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document. See a) and c).*

c) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Remainder Lot project site contains federally protected wetlands, consisting of vernal pools, ponds and wet swales. The Remainder Lot was originally created to connect the open space area surrounding onsite wetlands and vernal pools and to protect the delineated wetlands and vernal pools from disturbance; however, the wetlands may be impacted by the proposed grading and site preparation activities. The potential impact of development within the SDCP/SRSP area on wetlands was disclosed in the Master EIR as significant and unavoidable, for the reason that site-specific information for the area was not yet available, and therefore, the analysis in the FEIR assumed that wetland-dependent species such as fairy/tadpole shrimp were present (FEIR, p. 14.22). It was also assumed in the FEIR's analysis that such impacts would be mitigated with off-site compensation, rather than on-site preservation (FEIR, p. 14.23). The FEIR noted that the County's General Plan policy mandating "no net loss" for wetlands acreage is applicable to all development within the SDCP/SRSP area, and that impacts to wetlands are also subject to federal regulation and permitting (FEIR, p.14.23–14.24). The FEIR proposed a mitigation measure requiring future project proponents for development entitlements to place the highest priority on avoiding and preserving on-site wetlands. (FEIR, pp. 14.24–14.25 (mitigation measure BR-1).) The Board rejected this measure as infeasible; however, on the grounds that, due to the area's designation in the General Plan as an Urban Growth Area, the preservation of vast swaths of land upon which diffuse, low quality wetlands may occur was inconsistent with the intent of the General Plan and an inefficient use of this land (Findings, pp. 116-117). The Board determined, instead, to adopt a measure requiring future project proponents to prepare wetland delineations for their project sites and to submit wetland avoidance/mitigation, monitoring and maintenance plans sufficient to comply with the County's "no net loss" wetlands policy and the applicable state and federal agencies' permitting requirements (Findings, pp. 117-118 (mitigation measures BR-2, BR-3, BR-4)). The project applicant has identified the onsite wetlands and vernal pools, which have been U.S. Army Corps of Engineers verified, as displayed in **Figure 3** of this SMND and **Figures 1** and **2** of **Appendix C**. The Board's measures also allowed for flexibility in achieving compliance with the no net loss policy, in order to accommodate future improvements in wetlands mitigation strategies (Findings, pp. 118-119 (mitigation measures BR-3 and SRSP zoning condition No. 62)). To assist in reducing wetland and vernal pool impacts, the applicant has submitted Best Management Practices (BMP's), which will be used during construction activities. Typical BMP's are shown in **Appendix C**.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

It is important to note that the specific activities associated with the Remainder Lot project were not addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. The following mitigation measures are based on the requirements of measures BR-2 and BR-4, adopted by the County Board of Supervisors for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. In addition, the City has identified specific mitigation measures for the Remainder Lot project, when implemented with previously adopted measures, would reduce the Remainder Lot's potentially significant impacts to the on-site wetlands and vernal pools to a less than significant level, as required by the County's and federal government's no net loss policies (FEIR, pp. 14.23–14.24; Findings, pp. 116–119).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures address the Remainder Lot project's potential wetland impacts.

MM 4.2a The project shall comply with Sacramento County's no net loss policies for wetland habitat acreage and values (CO-62, CO-70, CO-83, and CO-96), which establish minimum performance for a wetland avoidance/mitigation strategy. If a Clean Water Act permit is not required, the applicant shall submit the Avoidance/Mitigation Plan to the City of Rancho Cordova for review and approval. This measure must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to ground disturbance.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, USFWS, and CDFG.

MM 4.2b If a Clean Water Act permit is required, then the applicant shall submit a Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan, which describes the specific methods to be implemented to avoid and/or mitigate any project impacts upon wetlands such that no net loss in wetland habitat or acreage and values is achieved. This detailed Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the US Army Corps of Engineers, the USFWS, and the CDFG regulations, and to the satisfaction of the City of Rancho Cordova, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the USFWS, and CDFG. The Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall ensure the following:

- The location of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers verified wetlands and vernal pools on-site and for all offsite properties where grading activities and uses are proposed;
- The location of proposed wetland preservation, acquisition, and creation site(s);
- A detailed map of proposed wetland creation site(s) showing the acreage, distribution, and type of wetlands to be created to ensure no net loss in wetland habitat

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

acreage, values and functions. Compensation wetlands shall be designed to:

- Meet or exceed the hydrophytic conditions and operating functions of the existing wetlands proposed for impact.
- Mitigate the loss of special status species habitat, including fairy/tadpole shrimp, as required by the USFWS and the CDFG;
- A monitoring plan designed to assess whether the compensation wetlands are functioning as intended. Specific performance standards for hydrologic, floral, and faunal parameters shall be proposed to determine success of the created wetlands. The monitoring plan shall specify the corrective measures/modifications to be implemented in the event that monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met. Monitoring shall occur for at least five years and until success criteria are met, and as required by the US Army Corps of Engineers, the USFWS, CDFG, and the City of Rancho Cordova;
- A maintenance plan for the wetland preservation/mitigation areas describing the measures to be implemented to assure that they are maintained as wetland habitat in perpetuity, unless a Cleanwater Act permit (404 permit) is obtained.
- The project applicant shall provide an on-site monitor to ensure compliance with identified mitigation for the duration of all proposed activities. The construction manager shall submit bi-annual compliance reports to City monitor for review for a period of 5 years.
- The applicant shall grant full access to the project site for City of Rancho Cordova environmental staff to monitor construction activities and mitigation compliance. Access shall be granted during all construction activities. In addition, City monitor may issue stop work orders if mitigation non-compliance is identified.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to site disturbance and during all phases of construction. The monitoring plan shall remain in place for a period of five years after construction activities have been completed.*

Enforcement/Monitoring: *City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, USFWS, and CDFG.*

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 4.2c

Silt fencing and construction fencing shall be placed around all affected and buffered wetlands to ensure no encroachment of personnel, equipment or construction activities within 40 feet of all affected wetlands and vernal pools, unless the USFWS agrees to a lesser distance. This shall apply to wetlands and vernal pools that extend onto the adjacent property. The fencing shall be properly maintained and remain in place for the duration of all proposed activities.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to site disturbance and during all phases of construction.*

Enforcement/Monitoring: *City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, USFWS, and CDFG.*

MM 4.2d

The project applicant shall maintain a 40-foot buffer around all affected wetland and vernal pools, unless the USFWS agrees to a lesser distance. The buffer shall include perimeter silt fencing placed at 5 feet from the protected wetland's high water mark and another perimeter silt fence placed at the outer edge of the 40-foot buffer. The silt fencing shall be properly maintained for the duration of all proposed activities. All required buffers must be shown on all grading and improvement plans.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to site disturbance and during all phases of construction.*

Enforcement/Monitoring: *City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, USFWS, and CDFG.*

MM 4.2e

The project applicant shall implement "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) in accordance with Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water guidelines including, but not limited to, the following procedures:

- Construction staging areas and all equipment, construction, waste, and fill material shall be located a minimum 100 feet from the high water mark of any wetland.
- All construction equipment shall be properly maintained to avoid discharge of any fluids and refueling and maintenance shall take place in designated staging areas only. No refueling, storage, servicing, or maintenance of equipment shall not take within 100 feet of any protected wetland or vernal pool or adjacent offsite habitat.
- Temporary fills, such temporary road crossings, shall be constructed from on-site material (i.e., stockpile material).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- Discharge of water directly or indirectly into wetlands or new channel construction is prohibited.
- Install diversion ditches at the back of the lots adjacent to the wetlands to divert surface runoff to proposed basin. This measure shall be included on all grading and improvement plans.
- All practicable efforts shall be taken to avoid in-wetland work. If wetland work is to occur, the City of Rancho Cordova, the USFWS, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers shall be contacted prior to any such activities and appropriate permits shall be obtained.
- The use of soil stabilizers, dust palliatives, herbicides, sterilants, growth inhibitors, fertilizers, deicing salts, etc., during construction and maintenance operations shall be accordance with the manufacturers recommended application rates, frequency, and instructions. These chemicals shall not be used, stored, or stockpiled within 100 horizontal feet of the ordinary high water mark of any state waters, including wetlands and vernal pools except when otherwise specified in the project contract. An independent monitor shall stake the required distances to ensure compliance with this plan.
- Riprap above the ordinary high water line shall be covered with topsoil and revegetated as specified by the consulting landscape architect.
- All disturbed areas above the ordinary high water mark shall be re-vegetated with appropriate native plant species to provide bank stabilization, erosion control, and habitat replacement. These activities shall be conducted according to specifications approved by the consulting landscape architect. Temporary seeding shall be done when necessary and only certified weed-free hay shall be used.
- All practicable effort shall be expanded to avoid destruction of native vegetation in the vicinity of wetland and vernal pool areas. Existing vegetation within the project that is not scheduled for removal shall be cordoned off from construction activity with temporary construction fencing (orange).
- Water quality testing shall be conducted prior to ground disturbance and one day after the conclusion of each rain event until completion of construction activities.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- Long term monitoring of grading activities within the project site will be necessary (at least five years following final construction). Quantitative measurement of vegetation growth on graded slopes pitching towards wetland and vernal pool features shall be performed midway through and near the end of the first and second growing seasons, then annually near the end of each successive growing season for the duration of the required monitoring period. Criteria to measure success shall be established.
- Disturbed soils are subject to colonization by nuisance plant species, which quickly respond to disturbances of soil or water level. The site shall be monitored at least twice annually for five years following construction for nuisance species. All nuisance plants found shall be pulled by hand and disposed or by burial or burning in a non-wetland or vernal pool location.
- Grading activities within or near the project site shall require a construction monitor on site during implementation hours. The monitor shall generate daily log sheet outlining grading activities conducted during the day. At the end of each week, or if a problem arises, the construction monitor shall prepare a letter report outlining the past week's activities, impacts to protected areas, and recommendations for implementing grading activities on subsequent work days.
- Final grading shall be done carefully to avoid ruts or water tracks, which could result in undesirable hydrologic regimes. In some situations, it may be necessary to use hand tools to achieve the desired final grade.
- Stockpiles shall be located outside any wetland, vernal pool, or designated buffer zone and away from other surface water. Erosion control measures may be necessary to prevent erosion of the stockpiled soil.
- Sediment control structures, such as silt fences or straw wattles (see Figure XXXX) to prevent sedimentation into wetlands and vernal pools. These barriers shall be properly installed and maintained during all construction activities.
- Sediments shall be cleaned out when they have reached half the height of the fence or straw wattles and before predicted rainfall events.
- Divert offsite runoff around work zone with a stabilized, vegetated ditch or berm to minimize erosion.
- Exposed soils adjacent to the wetlands and vernal pools shall be seeded and mulched. If vegetation cannot be quickly

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

established, daily mulching shall be conducted. Jute mats, or similar devices, may be used on steep slopes until vegetation has become established to prevent erosion. All temporary erosion control measures must be removed following the successful establishment of vegetation on the project site.

- Certified weed-free straw wattles shall be installed at the base of all slopes adjacent to the open spaces/wetland preserve, along the perimeters of the detention pond, and along the property lines of the Property site. The existing Douglas and Jaeger Roads currently provide additional erosion and sediment control to the north and west. Both road improvement projects are subject to SWPPP and BMP monitoring. Prior to installation of the straw wattles, a concave key trench approximately 2 to 4 inches deep shall be contoured along the proposed installation route. Soil excavated for the trenching shall be placed on the uphill or flow side of the straw wattles to prevent water from undercutting the straw wattles. Stakes shall be driven in on alternating sides of the straw wattles to hold them in place. The straw wattles shall be maintained for a period of time at least until the native grassland vegetation is fully established and the soil is stabilized.
- During construction, all excavated material shall be deposited or stored such that this material cannot be washed into any watercourse, and excess supplies of certified weed-free straw bales and or sedimentation fencing shall be available at the construction site for periodic site-specific use as needed.
- At the conclusion of grading activities, the construction monitor will prepare a compliance report. The report shall be distributed no later than two weeks after grading activities have been concluded.
- Monitoring activities in years subsequent to initial grading activities will be summarized in monitoring reports once per year until success criteria have been met or until the required monitoring period has been satisfied.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to site disturbance and during all construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, USFWS, and CDFG.

MM 4.2f For graded areas where the toe of the slope will be located 40 feet (unless the USFWS agrees to a lesser distance) of wetlands and vernal pools, the following measures shall apply:

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- All disturbed areas and slopes shall be hydro-seeded with a native grassland mix or jute matting installed. The hydroseed mix will be applied with a tackifying agent at a rate of at least 2 tons/acre and based on manufacturers recommendations. The tackifying agent shall be a hydraulic matrix which when applied, and upon drying, adheres to the soil to form a 100% cover which is biodegradable, promotes vegetation, and prevents soil erosion. The hydroseed mix shall not be applied before, during, or immediately after rainfall, so that the matrix will have an opportunity to dry 24-hours after installation;
- Detention basins shall be installed at the end of all dead-end streets;
- Diversion swale shall be installed at the top of lots. The swales shall wrap around the edges of the lots and may include adjacent lots to ensure complete avoidance; and
- Silt fencing shall be installed at the toe to slope.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to site disturbance and during all construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, USFWS, and CDFG.

MM 4.2g

All improved areas and temporary construction features in the Remainder Lot and proposed off-site improvements or features (e.g., roads, ditches, basins, stockpiles, etc.) shall be surrounded by silt fencing, which shall be maintained for the duration of all proposed activities.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to site disturbance and during all construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, US Army Corps of Engineers, USFWS, and CDFG.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.2a through 4.2g would ensure that the project's wetlands impacts are reduced to *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The activities associated with the Remainder Lot project would not interfere with the movement of any fish or wildlife species (i.e., mourning dove, western meadowlark, scrub jay, killdeer, or raccoon) or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites or corridors. No California tiger salamander have been identified in the SRSP area since 1998, when one was identified approximately 11.7 miles from the site. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Remainder Lot project site does not contain any trees. Impacts to native oaks or landmark trees were identified as a potentially significant but mitigable impact in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR (FEIR, p. 14.33). The FEIR proposed, and the Board adopted, a mitigation measure requiring future project proponents to submit an on-site tree survey and a mitigation plan for the loss of large oak or other trees (FEIR, p. 14.33; Findings, p. 122 (mitigation measure BR-9)). Because the site does not contain trees, *less than significant* impacts are expected and not mitigation is necessary.

- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Currently, there is not an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for Sacramento County or the SDCP/SRSP; therefore, the projects would not conflict with such plans and the impact would be *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in " 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 " 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 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"/> |

Existing Setting

Record searches and field examinations were conducted in preparation for the SDCP/SRSP EIR; however, only portions of the Plan area were surveyed. There were two previous surveys that covered the Plan area include: Slaymaker, 1988 and Peak and Associates, Inc. 1989. The most current survey was conducted on May 30, 1997. The surveys concluded that the Plan area was void of any prehistoric resources; however, the survey did identify two historic resources within the area. The most current survey included only portions of the Sunridge Park and Remainder Lot. No historical, archeological, paleontologic, or evidence of human remains were identified during the most recent survey; however, significant resources may be present on the project site and additional surveys would be required or existing surveys updated.

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As indicated above, limited Cultural Resource surveys were conducted and evaluated for the Community Plan area. The surveys indicated that the Sunridge Park project site was most likely free of important cultural/historical resources and it was determined that the site had a low probability of such resources. It should be noted that only portions of the site was included in the surveys conducted for the Community Plan area, but the SDCP/SRSP EIR identified mitigation to reduce potential impacts on cultural and historical resources (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 15.9). Due to the low probability of cultural resources on the Sunridge Park project site, implementation of the Remainder Lot project is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure (based on CR-1 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to Sunridge Park Remainder Lot project.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 5.1 Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during development activities, work shall be suspended and the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department shall be immediately notified at 916-942-0283. At that time, the City will coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with appropriate specialist, as needed. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of the cultural resources. In addition, pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. This measure shall be included in all grading and improvement plans.

Timing/Implementation: *During all phases of ground disturbing activities.*

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 5.1 would reduce the project's potential cultural, historic, paleontologic, and archeological resource impacts to *less than significant*.

- b) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document. See a) above.*
- c) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document. See a) above.*
- d) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document. There are no known cemeteries on the project site, however, due to the large Native American population in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked sites, such as gravesites or areas of spiritual significance, which may not contain any surface evidence of occupancy. As indicated in a) above, the Remainder Lot project site is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.1 would reduce any potential and unknown human remain impacts to less than significant.*

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> |

Existing Setting

The SDCP/SRSP EIR included an evaluation of the soils and geological conditions of the Sunridge Park project site. Design and construction of the proposed Remainder Lot structures in accordance with Title 24, Chapter 23 of the California Code of Regulations (1991 Edition of the California Building Code, with January 1, 1993 supplements) would ensure that significant damage as a result of seismic ground shaking is prevented. In addition, the SDCP/SRSP EIR concluded that the soil types and geologic conditions occurring on the proposed project site are suitable for the proposed activities associated with the Remainder Lot project.

Discussion of Impacts

- a)
- (i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential for impacts to public safety resulting from surface fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or other seismic hazards is not considered to be an issue of significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic history of the area. This issue, along with the issues in items ii, iii, and iv, were previously discussed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR and were determined to be less than significant and did not require mitigation (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, pages 13.18-13.19). Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
 - (ii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See response to (i) above. The potential for strong seismic ground shaking is not a significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic activity of the area; however, any development would be required to comply with any seismic standards enforced by the UBC.
 - (iii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See response to (i) above. The soil types of the Remainder Lot project site consists of fine sandy loams, gravelly loams, Red-Bluff Redding complex and silt loams, which do not constitute a potential impact for ground failure or liquefaction.
 - (iv) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site is characterized by flat terrain and gently sloping topography; as such, the site has very low potential for landslides.
- b) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The grading and site preparation activities associated with the Remainder Lot project would remove vegetative cover and expose soils to wind and surface water runoff. The project is subject to the Sacramento County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, which established administrative procedures, standards of review and enforcement procedures for controlling erosion, sedimentation, and disruption of existing drainage. The project would include a 14-foot trench for the sewer and water pipes. This could result in erosion impacts unless mitigation is incorporated.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measures are applicable to the Remainder Lot project.

- MM 6.1a** Prior to the commencement of grading for the proposed project, a detailed erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared, as required in the City of Rancho Cordova Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. The erosion and sediment control plan shall include measures to minimize soil erosion during and after construction activities and include the following measures:
- Limit ground disturbance to on-site areas identified on the Remainder Lot site plan (Figure 3 of this SMND). Additional review and subsequent environmental document will be necessary for any proposed off-site grading or improvement activities.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- Preservation of existing natural features that provide erosion control.
- Placement of hay bales, silt fences and/or other appropriate erosion control measures to prevent siltation of area tributaries.
- Revegetation of disturbed areas immediately upon completion of construction activities.
- Incorporation of any additional water quality requirements set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as part of the project's Water Certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to ground disturbance.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the CVRWCQB.

MM 6.1b

All grading activities shall be conducted in accordance with City of Rancho Cordova Grading and Erosion Control requirements. These practices shall include, but not limited to:

- Determination of the suitability of excavated material as engineered fill, topsoil, or other type of reuse onsite by an engineering geologist or equivalent professional.
- The height and extent of cuts and fills will be minimized and balanced as nearly as possible.
- Use of engineered retaining walls where necessary.
- There will be no major changes in drainage pattern that would affect the course of streams.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to ground disturbance.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova public Works Department.

MM 6.1c

A determination of the soil's shrink-swell potential shall be conducted. If excessive shrink-swell properties are identified, appropriate engineering mitigation measures shall be conducted as recommended by an engineering geologist or equivalent professional. This may include importation of non-expansive materials, treatment of expansive soils or other appropriate methods consistent with City standards.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to ground disturbance.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova public Works Department.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 6.1d New fill covering previously disrupted soils shall be revegetated to protect the soil from further disturbance or erosion.

Timing/Implementation: During all phases of ground disturbing activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The soil groups present on the project site have high percentages of clay, which expand with wetting and drying conditions. These soils present a mild geologic hazard due to high-shrink swell potential. However, the project is subject to standard construction requirements that mitigate this issue (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, page 13.19); therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See c) above.
- e) *No Impact.* The Remainder Lot project would not generate wastewater and would not require septic tanks or other alternative wastewater systems; therefore, there is no impact.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 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 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Existing Setting

Wallace-Kuhl & Associates prepared an Environmental Site Assessment Update for the Sunridge Park project site by in April 2001. The Assessment identified potential hazardous impacts resulting from including but not limited to: the exposure to off-site groundwater contamination; exposure to residual agricultural chemicals; potential Kiefer Landfill impacts; exposure to toxic air emission sources; exposure to PCB's and radon; and the potential of exposure to asbestos during the construction period.

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* This issue was reviewed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and the Sunridge Specific Plan Areas (see Section 16. Hazardous Materials). The proposed grading and site preparation activities are not associated with the use of large amounts of hazardous materials. In addition, the proposed construction activities are temporary and would not involve the routine transport of hazardous materials; therefore, implementation of the Remainder Lot project is expected to result in *less than significant* hazardous material transportation and disposal related impacts.
- b) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed construction activities would include the use of heavy equipment and the use of oils, fuels and other potentially flammable substances that are typically associated with construction activities. In addition, as noted in the Master EIR, the Remainder Lot project site may contain PCB-containing transformers, underground storage tanks, and/or trash and other debris, which could pose a health and safety risk to construction workers if PCB exposure occurs as a result of leakage or combustion, or if workers come into contact with contaminated or hazardous materials associated with the storage tanks or illegally dumped debris (FEIR, pp. 16.16–16.20). The FEIR determined that these potentially significant impacts could be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures requiring inspection and removal of these hazards (*Ibid*).

The specific activities associated with the Remainder Lot project was not addressed in the SDCPP/SRSP Master EIR or the Sunridge Park MND. However, the Remainder Lot project is not expected to create any new or additional significant impacts arising from hazardous materials that were not already identified in the Master EIR. To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are implemented with the Remainder Lot project, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures TX-3, TX-6, TX-7, and TX-8 adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of these measures will reduce the potentially significant impacts associated with Remainder Lot project activities from hazardous materials to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 16.16–16.20).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures (based on TX-3, TX-6, TX-7, and TX-8 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to Remainder Lot project.

- MM 7.1a** The Remainder Lot applicants shall coordinate with SMUD to ensure that all onsite transformers, which predate 1979/1980, are sampled and analyzed as needed to determine the presence or absence of PCBs. All PCB-containing transformers shall be removed and replaced with PCB-free transformers.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement plans.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department and SMUD.

MM 7.1b Remove all debris, trash, refuse, and abandoned, discarded, and/or out-of-service items from the Remainder Lot project site and dispose of or recycle off-site. This measure shall be included in all grading and improvement plans.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement plans.

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

MM 7.1c The project applicant shall remove all existing debris from the affected portion of Lot J parcel 067-0040-016 (associated with the offsite concrete channel) and dispose of in accordance with MM 7.1b.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

MM 7.1d If any underground storage tanks (UST) are discovered during construction activities, the UST shall be removed as required by the County Environmental Management Department (EMD), Hazardous Materials Division. In addition, groundwater and soil investigation for contamination and remediation in the tank vicinity shall be conducted if required by the EMD.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the Sacramento County Environmental Health Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 7.1a through 7.1d would reduce potential PCB, underground storage tanks, and/or trash and debris impacts to *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR, Section 16: Hazardous Materials and discussions a) and b) above. There are three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school proposed in the SDCP/SRSP areas. The Remainder Lot activities are anticipated for completion prior to the construction of the schools sites; therefore, the project would not result in the release of acute hazardous materials adversely affecting these proposed school sites and this impact is considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- d) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Environmental Site Assessment Update, which included review of the various federal, state, and county databases, indicated sites, which are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 within one-mile of the project area. The sites include, but are not limited to, the former Mather Air Force Base, McDonnell Douglas, Kiefer Landfill, White Rock Road North Dump, Azteca Construction, and Sacramento Salvage Pool. The Site Assessment Update indicated that only one of the above sites (McDonnell Douglas) was identified on the agency contaminated site list within various radii searches for the subject property. Concerning the McDonnell Douglas site, the groundwater contamination plumes have migrated beneath the subject property. However, it is unlikely that the contamination is a result of the past uses associated with the McDonnell Douglas site (Site Assessment Update, page 16). The public record indicates that remediation efforts are being conducted on an on-going basis to monitor groundwater contamination resulting from past McDonnell Douglas/Aerojet operations. The Environmental Site Assessment Update also indicated that the regional groundwater contamination is not an issue for the Sunridge, as water would be supplied by the SCWA facilities from the proposed North Vineyard Well Field, which is approximately 3 miles southwest of the project sites. Additionally, the identified groundwater contamination is unlikely to affect future development within the SDCP/SRSP areas, based on the low to moderate ground water contaminants, the large depth to first ground water beneath the property, the underlying lithography, and the apparent California Department of Toxic Substances Control conclusion of the negligible potential health risk to future occupants resulting from the migrating vapor groundwater contamination. The FEIR determined that the potentially significant impacts arising from potential contamination of groundwater via existing wells could be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures requiring inspection and destruction of these existing wells (FEIR, p. 16.18). Given that the Remainder Lot project would not require potable water supplies for the proposed activities, implementation would not result in any new or additional significant impacts arising from hazardous groundwater contaminants that were not already identified in the Master EIR. To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are implemented, the City is requiring the following mitigation measure, which is based on the requirements of measure TX-5, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of this measure will reduce the potentially significant impacts from hazardous materials to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 16.18).

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure (based on TX-5 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the Remainder Lot project.

- MM 7.2** The Remainder Lot project site shall be specifically inspected for water supply wells, septic tanks, leach lines, and cisterns. All water supply wells shall be properly destroyed via the well abandonment procedures of the County Environmental Health Division. All septic-tanks, leach lines, and cisterns shall be located, removed, and backfilled in accordance with the recommendations of a qualified geotechnical engineer.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the Sacramento County Environmental Health Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 7.2 would reduce any other potential public and environment impacts resulting from the Remainder Lot project to *less than significant*.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Remainder Lot project site is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP) area of the Sacramento Mather Airport, but is within two miles of the facility. Implementation of the project would not adversely affect operations of this facility and is not anticipated to result in safety related hazards or adverse impacts to people residing or working on the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 4.29).
- f) *No Impact.* The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, *no impacts* are anticipated.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the *Sacramento County Multi-hazard Disaster Plan, the Sacramento County Area Plan* or any other adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site is not adjacent to wildlands and is in an area designated for urbanized land uses. Additionally, implementation of the project would not place residences or structure where they are intermixed with wildlands. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater 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"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) 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"/>
h) 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"/>
i) 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"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements were addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. (See, generally, FEIR, section 9.) The Master EIR for the SDCP/SRSP area determined that the Specific Plan has the potential to result in significant short-term surface

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

water quality impacts during the construction period and long-term water quality impacts due to urban runoff and accumulated pollutants after development (FEIR, pp. 1.15, 9.12; Findings, p. 78). Implementation of the Remainder Lot project would include grading and site disturbance, which would create new sources of urban runoff (FEIR, pp. 9.12–9.13). In addition, if the runoff is not controlled, the oil, gasoline, and other chemicals used in the construction activities may adversely impact surface water quality. The FEIR concluded that, through the use of water quality control basins proposed in the SDCP/SRSP Master Drainage Plan, combined with flood control detention facilities, compliance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”) and applicable County ordinances and State requirements, such impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (*Ibid*). A SWPPP is required for the Remainder Lot project to address site-specific erosion control and water quality issues after construction. The applicant has already submitted a copy of the project’s SWPPP to the City. Because the City’s Land Grading and erosion Control Ordinance and State requirements already apply to the project, no further mitigation for water quality impacts is necessary (FEIR, p. 9.13). The Remainder Lot project is a subsequent project and was not addressed in previous environmental documents. However, the proposed activities are not anticipated to create any new or additional significant water quality or waste discharge impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR or the Sunridge Park MND. To ensure that the measures adopted by the County Board of Supervisors are applied to the Remainder Lot project, the City is requiring the following mitigation measure, which is based on the requirements of measure HY-3, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of this measure will reduce the potentially significant water quality impacts to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR. (FEIR, pp. 9.13.).

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure (based on HY-3 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the Remainder Lot project.

MM 8.1 The project applicants shall provide storm water quality source and treatment measures consistent with Volume 5 of the Sacramento County Drainage Manual. The final design of such and treatment control measures shall be subject to the approval of the Sacramento County WRD, and the City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department. This measure must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Sacramento County Water Resources Department.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to the approval of all grading and improvement plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning and Public Works Departments and the Sacramento County Water Resources Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 8.1 would reduce potential water quality standards and waste discharge requirements impacts to *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the Remainder Lot project would not result in any new or additional significant groundwater supply impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR or the Sunridge Park MND; nor would they cause any impacts peculiar to the Remainder portion of the Sunridge Park project site. The proposed rough grading and site preparation activities would not require a permanent water supply; therefore, implementation of the project would not adversely affect groundwater levels. In addition, the potential groundwater impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the proposed project, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. Given the scope of the proposed activities, no depletion of groundwater resources would occur and this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- c) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The grading and conversion of approximately 79.2 acres of agricultural lands to suburban development will substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Sunridge Park and Remainder Lot portion of the site. The grading activities associated with the project would increase drainage rates and may result in on- and off-site flooding and erosion. The Master EIR and the Board determined that drainage and detention facilities that ensure post-development peak flows are reduced to at least pre-development levels will mitigate potential drainage and flooding impacts to a less than significant level (FEIR, p. 9.11; Findings, pp. 76-77). The Board imposed mitigation measures requiring the facilities outlined in the SDCP/SRSP Master Drainage Plan be constructed as development within the planning area occurs (Findings, pp. 77-80 (mitigation measures HY-2, HY-4, HY-5)). No additional on- or off-site siltation or erosion impacts are anticipated beyond those previously identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are applied to the Remainder Lot project, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures HY-2, HY-4, and HY-5, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas (Findings, pp. 76-80). Implementation of these measures will reduce the Remainder Lot's potentially significant drainage impacts to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, p. 9.14).

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measures (based on HY-2, HY-4, and HY-5 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to the Remainder Lot project.

- MM 8.2a** The Remainder Lot project shall implement the improvements described in the "Final Master Drainage Study for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Area" (Final MDS) (Spink Corporation, October 16, 1998) as amended by the "Amendment to the Final Master Drainage Study, Sunrise Community Plan Area" (Amendment (MHM Engineers & Surveyors, October 19, 2001)). Such improvements shall be designed to ensure that baseline flows from the property remain the same and that post-development peak (100-year) flows do not exceed existing peak flows and do not exceed the capacity of the two Folsom South Canal overchutes at Lower Morrison Creek to the satisfaction of the County Water Resources Division (WRD). Construction of the improvements may be phased as described in the Final MDS and subject to the approval of the WRD and the City of Rancho

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Cordova's Public Works Department, so long as the project proponent(s) provide hydrologic/hydraulic analyses which demonstrate that the phased improvements will reduce peak flows or at least pre-development of the two Folsom South Canal overchutes at Lower Morrison Creek to the satisfaction of the WRD and the City's Public Works Department.

- Detailed plans for the design and construction of all proposed drainage, flood control and water quality improvements, consistent with the Final MDS and Amendment, shall be submitted to the County WRD and the City of Rancho Cordova's Public Works Department for review and approval.
- Plans for the design and construction of the realigned channel and detention basin within the Sares-Regis wetland preserve area shall also be subject to the approval of the US Army Corps of Engineers.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the Sacramento County Department of Water Resources.

MM 8.2b

Implementation of the improvements described in the "Final Master Drainage Study for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Area" (Final MDS) (Spink Corporation, October 16, 1998) as amended by the "Amendment to the Final Master Drainage Study, Sunrise Community Plan Area" (Amendment (MHM Engineers & Surveyors, October 19, 2001)) shall not occur until the following items have been submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova for review and approval:

- A wetland delineation for the improvement area verified by the US Army Corps of Engineers.
- A detailed mitigation plan for wetlands to be impacted by the proposed improvements which specifically describes the measures which will be implemented to achieve no net loss in wetland habitat acreage and values.
- Determinate surveys of the improvement area for potentially occurring special status species.
- A detailed mitigation plan developed in cooperation with the regulatory resources agencies. (US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game) which is designed to reduce

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

impacts of the proposed improvements on any special status species identified in the determinate surveys to a less than significant level.

- A vegetation/tree survey for the improvement area, which identifies any existing marsh and riparian habitat.
- A detailed vegetation/tree replacement planting plan which describes the planting/relocation measures to be implemented to provide in-kind replacement plantings on an inch-for-inch basis for any riparian and marsh habitat which will be impacted by the proposed improvements.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to any work associated with the Final Master Drainage Study or approval of Improvement Plans, whichever comes first.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, USFWS, US Army Corps of Engineers, and CDFG.

MM 8.2c

Implementation of the Final MDS and Amendment improvements shall not occur until all necessary permits an/or agreements for the proposed improvements have been obtained from the US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to any work associated with the Final Master Drainage Study or approval of Improvement Plans, whichever comes first.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department USFWS, US Army Corps of Engineers, and CDFG.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 8.2a through 8.2c, Mitigation Measures 4.1a through 4.1c, and Mitigation Measures 4.2a through 4.2g, would reduce the project's potential water quality standards and waste discharge requirement impacts to *less than significant*. In addition, the Reader is referred to Section VI. Geology and Soils, for a further discussion regarding potential siltation and erosion related impacts.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology and discussions c) above and g) below.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology and discussion above in a) and c).
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* According to the SDCP/SRSP EIR and as depicted on current FEMA maps, the entire project site is located outside the 500-year floodplain (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 9.1b). The Remainder Lot project does not include any housing; therefore, it would not 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; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- h) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology and discussion g) above.
- i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology, and discussion g) above.
- j) *No Impact.* The project site is not located near the Pacific Ocean, nor is it near a large water body that would be capable of creating seiches or tsunamis.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Land use related impacts for the Community Plan and Sunridge Specific Plan areas were evaluated in the previous Master EIR (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 4.28). The proposed project's grading and site preparation activities would not result in any additional land use impacts than those identified in previous documents and the Remainder Lot would not divide an established community; therefore, there is *no impact*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR, Section 4: Land Use and a) above. The Board found that the land use designations contained within the SDCP/SRSP project were consistent with the County's General Plan, and that, as a result, this project did not cause any significant impacts with respect to General Plan consistency. (SDCP/SRSP Findings, p. 31.) The proposed Remainder Lot activities would not conflict with the Community Plan and Specific Plan designations for the project site. Development of the Remainder Lot project would not result in any new or significant additional land use impacts beyond those identified in the Master EIR or the Sunridge Park MND (November 2003). Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Currently, there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in Sacramento County; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. 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 Sunridge Park, which includes the Remainder Lot project site, is not identified by the California Division of Mines and Geology or in the Sacramento County General Plan as a high quality resource area. Implementation of Phase I of Sunridge Park and the Remainder Lot project will preclude the mining and recovery of potential mineral resources (such as aggregates) on the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento County General Plan does not designate the Remainder Lot project site as located in a mineral resource zone. This was previously addressed in the SDCP/SRSP FEIR (page 13.19) and the impact is considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------

XI. NOISE. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Existing Setting

Major mobile noise sources in the vicinity of the Remainder Lot project site include vehicular traffic along Sunrise Boulevard, Douglas Road, Grant Line Road, Jackson Highway, and Kiefer Boulevard and daily aircraft noise from nearby Mather Field. Stationary sources of noise in the area include, but are not limited to, the Cordova Shooting Center, the Kiefer Road Landfill, the Sacramento Rendering Company, American River Aggregates and Asphalt, and the Douglas Security Park.

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP Master EIR evaluated noise impacts associated with development of the Community Plan and Specific Plan areas (FEIR, pp. 12.15–12.16). The Master EIR determined that the impacts of traffic noise, proposed commercial, business/professional and school uses were significant, but in most cases, mitigable to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures requiring acoustical analysis and the development of noise attenuation measures as future projects within the SDCP/SRSP areas are proposed (*Ibid.*; Findings, pp. 111-114). The Sunridge Park and Remainder Lot project site is currently adjacent to undeveloped land; therefore, is not in close proximity to any schools, hospitals,

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

residences, or other sensitive noise receptors. In addition, the Remainder Lot project does not include residential development; therefore, it would not place residences in close proximity to roadways or within the 60 to 65 Ldn contour. The proposed project's construction activities would be temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to construction noise impacts in excess of Sacramento County Noise Ordinance standards; therefore, this impact is considered to *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above. Implementation of the Remainder Lot project would not generate excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise sources. The proposed grading, site preparation and other construction activities would temporarily increase groundbourne related impacts; however, the project is subject to standard Sacramento County Noise Ordinance requirements, which would ensure that impacts are *less than significant*.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) and b) above. In addition, the Remainder Lot project generally includes grading and construction activities to facilitate the construction of Phase 1A of the approved Sunridge Park development project. As such, the project would not include permanent stationary or mobile noise sources and would not place residential uses within the future 60 dB noise contours along Jaeger Road or Douglas Roads.
- d) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the project would involve the transport and use of heavy equipment. The use of heavy equipment and other construction activities would temporarily increase the ambient noise levels in projects' vicinity above existing levels. However, these increases would be periodic and subject to Sacramento County Noise Ordinance regarding construction activities. Therefore, the Remainder Lot project would not result in any additional temporary noise increases than those identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR.

The following mitigation measure (based on LA-1 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to Remainder Lot project.

MM 9.2

The Remainder Lot project shall include standard mechanisms for mitigation of construction related nuisances including, restrictions on the hours of construction activities, restrictions on noise levels associated with construction equipment, watering and/or other dust control at all construction sites, City approval of proposed construction storage and staging areas (including employee parking). The project applicants shall continuously post visible signage providing a name, address, and 24-hour phone number for information and/or complaints regarding the construction activities. This may be a City phone number if applicable. This information shall also be included in all construction plans and specifications (including grading and improvement plans).

Timing/Implementation: *During all grading and construction phases of the project.*

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 9.2 would reduce the project's potential temporary noise impacts to *less than significant*.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Remainder Lot project is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Area (CLUP) of the Sacramento Mather Airport, which is approximately 2 miles west of the proposed site. Although, the project is within two miles of the airport, no adverse or excessive noise impacts are anticipated at the proposed site from operation of this facility. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- f) *No Impact.* There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the proposed project site; thus, *no impacts* would occur.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As noted in the Master EIR, buildout of the SDCP area could result in the construction of approximately 22,503 residential units, commercial/business/professional land uses and school and park sites (FEIR, p. 3.5). The project site is located within the SDCP and SRSP areas, which were designated in the Sacramento County General Plan as an Urban Growth Area (FEIR, p. 4.33). Potential impacts relating to population and housing were globally addressed in the General Plan EIR (*Ibid*).

The Remainder Lot project would involve grading, site preparation and drainage improvements to facilitate the development of Phase 1A of the approved Sunridge Park project. Implementation of the project would not create any new or additional significant growth inducement impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would they cause any impacts peculiar to the projects or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project is consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the growth-inducing impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project site, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15183.) Therefore, the Remainder Lot growth inducement impacts are considered *less than significant*.

- b) *No Impact.* The Remainder Lot project is void of any residences; therefore, implementation of the project would not displace existing residences or require the construction of replace housing elsewhere and no impacts would result.
- c) *No Impact.* See b) above, additionally, the project site does not currently contain residential structures, so no displacement of people would occur and *no impacts* are expected.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on fire protection were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to less than significant. The Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD) would provide fire protection and emergency medical response to the Remainder Lot project. The SMFD is in the process of constructing Station 68, which will be located near the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and Douglas Road. Implementation of the Remainder Lot project would not require additional facilities or fire protection services than those identified for the SRSP. In addition, the proposed project is subject to Sacramento Metropolitan Fire codes regarding site access and site design, which would assist in mitigating any potential fire and emergency related impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure (based on PS-5 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the Remainder Lot project.

MM 13.1a The Remainder Lot project shall comply with the following design measure:

- Accessibility for fire control shall meet the specifications of the Fire District and shall be in place for the entirety of the Remainder Lot project.

Timing/Implementation: During all grading and construction phases of the project.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District.

MM 13.1b The project applicants shall pay their fair share of proposed SRSP fire protection facilities.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of the Mitigation Measures MM 13.1a and 13.1b would fully mitigate the Remainder Lot's fire protection service impacts to *less than significant*.

- b) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento County Sheriff's Department will provide law enforcement services to the Remainder Lot project. The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on law enforcement were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure (based on PS-6 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) has been revised to apply to the Remainder Lot project.

MM 13.2 The project applicant shall consult with the City of Rancho Cordova Police Department and implement crime prevention/safety development design measures to the maximum extent feasible. This measure shall be complied with to the satisfaction of the Rancho Cordova Police Department.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the Rancho Cordova Police Department.

Implementation of the Mitigation Measure MM 13.2 would mitigate the proposed project's law enforcement service impacts to *less than significant*.

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Remainder Lot project would involve grading, site preparation, and the construction of drainage improvements. The proposed activities would not generate additional or increase the demand for schools or educational related facilities. The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on public schools were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to less than significant. In addition, it should be noted that California Government Code Sections 65995 (h) and 65996 (b) provide full and complete

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

school facilities mitigation. Therefore, the project's school facility impacts are considered *less than significant*

- d) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the Remainder Lot project would not include residential development; therefore, would not generate the need for additional parkland or recreation related facilities. In addition, the SDCP/SRSP project's effects on parks were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated to reduce subsequent development project's potential recreation related impacts to *less than significant*.
- e) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Section 6: Public Services and a) through d) above. Three new electrical substations will be needed to serve the SRSP area. Natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure will also be extended to serve the proposed land uses within the SRSP area. The Remainder Lot project would not require the construction of electrical, cable, natural gas or other utility related infrastructure or the extension of existing infrastructure. In addition, the SDCP/SRSP project's effects on electrical, natural gas, and cable service were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measures (based on PS-1, PS-2, PS-3, and PS-8 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to the Remainder Lot project.

MM 13.3a The Remainder Lot project applicant shall address and resolve project related electrical facility issues through close coordination with SMUD in project planning and development. The applicant(s) shall grant all necessary right-of-way for installation of electrical facilities. Coordination with SMUD shall occur and any required agreements shall be established prior to issuance of necessary permits or approvals for the project.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to ground disturbance.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department and SMUD.

MM 13.3b To promote the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of utility facilities, the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has mandated specific clearance requirements between facilities and surrounding objects or construction activities. To ensure compliance with these standards, the Remainder Lot project applicant(s) shall coordinate with PG&E early in the development of their plans. Any proposed development plans shall provide unrestricted utility access and prevent easement encroachments that might impair the safe and reliable maintenance of operations of PG&E's facilities.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department and PG&E.

MM 13.3c

The Remainder Lot project applicant shall address and resolve issues related to the provision of telephone and cable television services within the project area through close coordination with the applicable service provider during project planning and development.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 13.3a through 13.3c would reduce potential natural gas, electrical service, phone, and cable impacts to *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

XIV. RECREATION.

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

a-b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Remainder Lot project includes, but is not limited to site preparation, grading and the construction of temporary and permanent drainage improvements. As such, implementation of the project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities or contribute to the deterioration of those facilities. In addition, the potential environmental impacts of park construction and provision were addressed in the appropriate technical sections of the SDCP/SRSP EIR. Therefore, the activities associated with the Remainder Lot project would not result in additional environmental impacts than those identified in the EIR; therefore, these impacts are considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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"/>

Existing Setting

The Traffic and Circulation section of the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR assessed the potential traffic-related impacts resulting from buildout under the SRSP (FEIR, section 10). The analysis examined the project-specific and cumulative effects on the Specific Plan area's roadways, intersections, freeway operations, and proposed transit and bikeway facilities (FEIR, pp. 10.17–10.36). The Remainder Lot project is subject to the applicable adopted mitigation measures. The adopted measures would provide the required improvements for roads that would serve the proposed project site (i.e., Sunrise Boulevard, Douglas Road, Americanos Road, and Pyramid Road, etc.).

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Traffic and Circulation issues were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 10: Traffic and Circulation). The construction activities associated with the Remainder Lot project are not expected to substantially increase the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at affected intersections; however, the project applicants are responsible for their fair share of improvements identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (Mitigation Measures *TC-1 through TC-7* and *TC-9 through TC-31*), which would mitigate this project's potential traffic related impacts to a *less than significant* level.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above. The proposed grading, site preparation and drainage improvements would involve temporary construction activities; therefore, is not expected to contribute to adverse cumulative conditions. In addition, the traffic generated from the construction activities is not expected to cause any affected roadways to exceed Sacramento County standards for daily travel. The Remainder Lot's contribution is anticipated to be *less than significant*.
- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed project does not involve any aviation-related uses but is located within two miles of the Sacramento Mather Airport. The project site is not located within the airport safety zones or within the approach and departure paths for aircraft using the airport and *no impacts* are anticipated.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Access to the Remainder Lot project is subject to design requirement consistent with Sacramento County Department of Transportation Engineering standards and the approved SRSP; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP identified roadway improvements, which will ensure adequate emergency access to the Remainder Lot project site; therefore, *less than significant* impacts are anticipated.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP EIR indicated that all development projects within the SRSP area are subject to parking requirements established in the Sacramento County Zoning Code for the proposed land uses. In addition, the SDCP/SRSP EIR (page 10.36) indicated that parking related impacts are considered *less than significant* and no mitigation measures are necessary.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The grading, site preparation, and drainage improvements associated with the Remainder Lot project would not conflict with the provision of alternative modes of transportation; therefore, *less than significant* impacts are anticipated.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Existing Setting

Utility and service system providers reviewed the Sunridge Park project and returned comments that were translated into project level conditions of approval. The mitigation measures proposed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors outline the processes by which new systems and conveyances must be designed, approved, and implemented within the SDCP and SRSP areas. There were no additional utility or service systems impacts identified for the Sunridge Park projects that are greater than those already acknowledged in the Master EIR and SDCP/SRSP – CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopted by the Board in July 2002.

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Wastewater treatment issues were addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 8: Sewer Service). No wastewater treatment impacts were identified in the EIR that conflicted with applicable Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) requirements or standards. The Remainder Lot project would include the construction of temporary and permanent water quality basins, gravity outfall ditches, stockpiles, and other site preparation activities. The project would

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

include wastewater infrastructure, but it would not generate wastewater, since it would be installed to serve the approved Tentative Map area. Therefore, the project would not exceed Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB) treatment standards for wastewater and no impacts would occur.

- b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As previously discussed, the Remainder Lot project generally includes grading, site preparation and drainage improvements. As such, implementation of the project would not require new water or wastewater facilities treatment or the expansion of existing facilities and less than significant impacts are anticipated.
- c) *Less than Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the Remainder Lot project would include the construction of new storm water facilities and substantial grading and site preparation. The provision of the new storm water and associated grading would increase the rate and volume of drainage runoff from the site. The increased grading may result in erosion and adverse water quality impacts to on-site biological resources. Implementation of *Mitigation Measures 8.1 through 8.2*, identified above in Section VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, would ensure that the project's post-development peak flows are reduced to a least pre-development levels and would mitigate potential storm water drainage and associated environmental impacts to *less than significant*.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See b) above.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) and b) above.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* This issue was globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP Final EIR and indicated that the Kiefer Landfill would have adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed projects under buildout conditions (page 6.21). The Kiefer Landfill expansion was recently approved, which gives the facility a permitted capacity to serve the growth projected in Sacramento County through 2035; therefore, solid waste impacts are considered less than significant.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See f) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	---

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>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, 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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b) 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.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As noted in Sections I through XVI above, the Sunridge Remainder Lot project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to air quality, biological resources (i.e., special-status species, wetlands, and vernal pools), cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality.
- b) *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* There are several proposed and approved developments within the SDCP/SRSP areas (i.e., Anatolia, North Douglas I and II, and Rio Del Oro). The Sunridge Park Remainder Lot project, together with other proposed and planned development in the vicinity could result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The activities associated with the Remainder Lot project may result in temporary construction related impacts; however, direct or indirect human health or safety related impacts are anticipated to be *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

REFERENCES

City of Rancho Cordova. *Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Sunridge Park/Lot J Projects*. November 2003.

Sacramento County. *CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations of the Board of Supervisors of Sacramento County for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan Project*. July 17, 2002.

Sacramento County Department of Environmental Review and Assessment. *Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. March 1999.

Sacramento County Department of Environmental Review and Assessment. *Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. November 2001.

Sacramento County. *Zoning Conditions for the Approval of the SRSP (Sacramento County Zoning Ordinance No. SZC-2002-0015, Section 607-15.)* July 17, 2002.

Sacramento County. *Sacramento County General Plan*. 1993.

Sacramento County. *Sacramento County General Plan EIR*. 1993.

Sacramento County. *Sunridge Specific Plan*. July 17, 2002.

Wallace-Kuhl Associates. *Environmental Site Assessment Update: Ronnenberg Property*. April 13, 2001