
6.0 – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an environmental impact report shall describe and analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to a project. These alternatives should feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor is it required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The discussion of alternatives shall focus on those which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if they impede the attainment of the project objectives to some degree or would be more costly [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)].

In accordance with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the following alternatives are evaluated at a qualitative level of detail:

- Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2 - Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative

6.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following are the overall objectives of the Redevelopment Plan:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- Retain existing businesses and attract new businesses to Project Area locations designated for business activity; promote economic development of environmentally sound, light industrial and commercial uses.
- Increase employment opportunities and job training.
- Assist neighborhood commercial revitalization, and attract more uses that serve the local community including neighborhood-serving retail.
- Promote historical and cultural programs, improvements, amenities, and other development to revitalize the Project Area.

BUILDING REHABILITATION

- Stimulate opportunities for adaptive re-use and preservation of existing building stock in the Project Area.
- Facilitate economic development by improving and rehabilitating substandard buildings and targeting infill on vacant lots on commercial corridors in the Project Area.
- Encourage and assist the rehabilitation of historically significant properties to avoid demolition or replacement.
- Provide opportunities for participation by owners and tenants in the revitalization of their properties.
- Site Preparation and Development, Transportation, and Circulation

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

- Stimulate in-fill development and land assembly opportunities on obsolete, underutilized, incompatible and vacant property in the Project Area.
- Redesign and redevelop areas that are stagnant or improperly utilized.
- Improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area through the assembly of land into parcels suitable for modern, integrated development.
- Develop a transportation system integrated with the pattern of residential, commercial and shopping areas to provide safe, convenient and efficient movement within the City to other parts of the region.
- Mitigate and reduce conflicts between residential and industrial uses in the Project Area.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND FACILITIES

- Provide the framework and infrastructure for restoring economic health to the Project Area.
- Provide streetscape improvements, utility undergrounding, open space, and community facilities to enhance neighborhood quality and foster economic and neighborhood vitality.
- Develop adequate civic, recreational, educational and cultural centers in locations for the best service to the community and in ways that will promote a sense of community and civic pride.
- Improve public safety for people living and working in the Project Area.
- Minimize/eliminate environmental hazards within the Project Area.

HOUSING

- Improve the quality of housing by assisting new construction, rehabilitation, and conservation of single- and multi-family homes.
- Expand, improve, and preserve the City's supply of housing affordable to persons and families with low- and moderate-incomes.
- Stimulate home ownership opportunities in the Project Area and city-wide.

6.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

ALTERNATIVE SITES

The potential for the Redevelopment Project Area to be located in an entirely different area of Rancho Cordova was examined. However, the boundaries of the proposed Redevelopment Project Area were precisely established based on the maximum area within which identified blighted conditions currently occur, in combination with other urbanization parameters set forth in state redevelopment law. No alternative site locations within the City of Rancho Cordova appear to meet full redevelopment law criteria for blight. The fundamental purpose of the Rancho Cordova Redevelopment Plan is to authorize activities and financing to enable the

Agency to eliminate blighted conditions in the Project Area. Agency establishment of an alternate site elsewhere in the City for activities pursuant to the Redevelopment Plan would fail to attain the basic objectives of the proposed project and, therefore, this alternative was not considered to be feasible.

EXPANDED PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of allocation of funding and the types of redevelopment activities undertaken, but would involve an expanded Redevelopment Project Area boundary.

The proposed boundaries of the Project Area were carefully selected by the Agency based on identification of areas within which blighted conditions occur that could benefit from redevelopment activities and could meet certain other redevelopment law parameters with respect to the extent of existing urbanization (must be 80 percent urbanized), etc. The Agency's objective has been to include only "blighted" areas in the Project Area boundary. Because such a combination of blight and general urbanization conditions has not been identified outside of the proposed Project Area at the present time, adding more acreage to the proposed Project Area boundary would not be a viable alternative under state redevelopment law. Therefore, this alternative has not been given any further consideration in this EIR.

6.4 ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Under the No Project Alternative, the Redevelopment Plan would not be adopted. No actions would be taken by the Agency to remove blighting conditions and stimulate additional private investment in the proposed Redevelopment Project Area. No Agency action would be taken to fund infrastructure and facility improvements, or to redevelop property in the Project Area. Under the No Project Alternative, the Agency would have no power of eminent domain to acquire and assemble non-residential property for redevelopment purposes.

As a result of the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that no Agency-facilitated improvements would occur within the Project Area and there would be a reduced rate of improvement, and perhaps some decline, in current economic conditions and trends in the proposed Project Area. It is not possible to quantify the exact level of public and private development that would occur in the proposed expansion area under the No Project Alternative. However, it is reasonable to assume that with no Redevelopment Agency activity in the Project Area to fund public improvements and to attract an increased level of private investment in the Project Area, existing blighting conditions in the Project Area would remain or worsen. The rate of residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational rehabilitation and development in the Project Area would be lower than it would be with the proposed project.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant land use impact identified in Section 4.1 (Land Use).

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Cumulative Land Use Effects (Impact 4.1.5)

Impact 4.1.5 identifies that the proposed project would facilitate buildout of the Project Area consistent with the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan. Buildout of the proposed General Plan would lead to cumulative land use impacts associated with further urbanization throughout the region. Land uses within the City of Rancho Cordova, including the Project Area, are guided by the policies established in the proposed General Plan. Given that the No Project Alternative would have the same land use pattern as the proposed project, it would have similar land use impacts as the proposed project.

New development and redevelopment within the Project Area would occur at a slower rate under the No Project Alternative, as there would not be redevelopment funds available to assist with public and private improvements. However, under the No Project Alternative, the City of Rancho Cordova would continue to experience an increase in urbanization as the proposed General Plan is implemented. Cumulative land use impacts would be reduced under the No Project Alternative, but would remain significant and unavoidable.

Population/Housing/Employment

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant population and housing impact identified in Section 4.2 (Population, Housing and Employment).

Cumulative Population and Housing Increases (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 identifies that the proposed project would facilitate buildout of the Project Area consistent with the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan, which would lead to cumulative population growth throughout the region. Increased regional population growth would lead to physical effects on the environment such as increases in traffic, noise and the need for additional public services and utilities.

The No Project Alternative would allow for the same intensity of development as allowed under the Redevelopment Plan, and would have similar impacts as the proposed project. It is assumed however, that implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would accelerate the population growth in the Project Area, and buildout of the proposed General Plan would be reached sooner with financial assistance for redevelopment activities that would not be available under the No Project Alternative. Increases in population and housing would occur more slowly under the No Project Alternative, but this cumulative impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Hazards and Human Health

As noted in Section 4.3 (Hazards and Human Health), the proposed Redevelopment Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with hazards and human health. The No Project Alternative would have similar risk-levels associated with hazards and human health. Impacts related to hazards and human health would remain less than significant under the No Project Alternative.

Transportation and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant transportation and circulation impact identified in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).

Deficient Roadway Levels of Service (Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.6)

Impacts 4.4.1 and **4.4.6** identify roadway segments in and around the Project Area that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service by 2030 and regional roadways that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service under cumulative conditions. These are considered significant and unavoidable impacts.

Under the No Project Alternative there would be no redevelopment funds available to finance roadway improvements within the Project Area. Implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would facilitate and speed the pace of development within the Project Area, which would lead to increases in traffic on Project Area roadways. The roadway segments projected to operate at deficient levels of service after implementation of the proposed project are also anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service without implementation of the proposed project. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the No Project Alternative.

Unacceptable Levels of Service on Freeway Segments (Impact 4.3.2)

Impact 4.3.2 identifies segments of US 50 within the Project Area that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service under 2030 conditions. The proposed project's contribution to freeway level of service deficiencies is negligible, and these impacts would remain the same, or perhaps even worsen, under the No Project Alternative. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the No Project Alternative.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.5 (Air Quality).

Conflict with the SMAQMD Regional Ozone Attainment Plan (Impact 4.5.1)

Impact 4.5.1 indicates that buildout of the Redevelopment Project Area would result in air quality impacts greater than those assumed in the 1994 SMAQMD Regional Ozone Attainment Plan. This conflict with the Attainment Plan would be the result of Project Area buildout consistent with the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan. The Redevelopment Plan is an implementation tool of the proposed General Plan, and would facilitate buildout of the Project Area.

Implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would speed the rate of development and redevelopment within the Project Area, however it would not be the cause of the conflict with the Attainment Plan, as the entire region is currently in non-attainment status for ozone precursors. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the No Project Alternative.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Operational Emissions Impacts (Impact 4.5.3)

Impact 4.5.3 indicates that implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate already deficient air quality levels in the Project Area. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has designated the Greater Sacramento Air Area as an ozone non-attainment area (ROG and NOx). The principal sources of ozone precursors are vehicles emissions and emissions from existing land uses.

Implementation of the proposed project would not add a significant number of vehicles to area roadways, and would not allow for land uses beyond what is identified in the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the No Project Alternative.

Sources of Toxic Air Contaminants (Impact 4.5.4)

Impact 4.5.4 indicates that implementation of the proposed project would facilitate land uses that are potential sources of mobile and stationary Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs). The Redevelopment Plan does not allow for any uses that are not allowed under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not increase the risk of exposure to sources of TACs beyond what is allowed under the proposed General Plan. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the No Project Alternative.

Regional Air Plan Impacts (Impact 4.5.6)

Impact 4.5.6 indicates that implementation of the proposed project along with potential development of the surrounding area would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter. Impacts to regional air plans would be the result of buildout of the region under the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan, the Sacramento County General Plan, the Elk Grove General Plan and the Folsom General Plan. The project's contribution to regional air quality impacts is negligible, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the No Project Alternative.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.6 (Noise).

Traffic Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.2 and 4.6.6)

Impacts 4.6.2 and **4.6.6** indicate that implementation of the proposed Redevelopment Plan would result in increases in traffic noise levels that would be in excess of adopted City of Rancho Cordova noise standards. The increases in traffic within the Redevelopment Project Area would result from buildout of the Project Area under the proposed General Plan.

The Redevelopment Plan would facilitate buildout of the General Plan, but implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would not directly result in traffic noise increases. Traffic volumes, and thus traffic noise impacts, are anticipated to increase throughout the City and the Project Area without implementation of the Redevelopment Plan. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the No Project Alternative.

Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources

As noted in Section 4.7 (Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources), the proposed Redevelopment Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with geology, soils or mineral resources. The entire Project Area is urbanized and impacts related to geology, soils and mineral resources would remain less than significant under the No Project Alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Indirect Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.5)

Impact 4.8.5 indicates that the proposed project would be served by water supplies provided by SCWA Zone 40. Collection, treatment, and conveyance of this water to the Project Area would result in impacts on the environment. Regardless of whether or not the Redevelopment Plan is implemented, there will still be significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the provision of water from SCWA Zone 40 to the City of Rancho Cordova. The No Project Alternative would not reduce the need for regional water infrastructure, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant biological resources impact identified in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources).

Cumulative Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.7)

Impact 4.9.7 indicates that implementation of the proposed project may result in cumulatively considerable indirect impacts to biological resources as a result of continued urbanization throughout the region. There are no specific development activities proposed as part of the Redevelopment Plan at this time. The region around the Project Area will continue to urbanize under the proposed General Plan, however it is anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would speed the rate of development within the Project Area. Cumulative indirect impacts to biological resources would be reduced, but remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the No Project Alternative.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant cultural resources impact identified in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources).

Prehistoric Resources, Historic Resources, and Human Remains (Impact 4.10.1 and 4.10.3)

Impacts 4.10.1 and **4.10.3** indicate that implementation of the proposed project could result in the potential disturbance of cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) and human remains. Under the No Project Alternative, funding for redevelopment activities would not be available, and the rate of construction and ground-disturbing activities that may impact cultural resources would be reduced. While there would

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

still be the potential for impacts to cultural resources under the No Project Alternative, this impact would be less than under the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant public service/utility impact identified in Section 4.11 (Public Services and Utilities).

Cumulative Water Service Impacts (Impact 4.11.3.2)

Impact 4.11.3.2 indicates that the Project Area would be served by infrastructure identified in the Water Forum Agreement EIR and the Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan EIR, both of which would have significant and unavoidable impacts.

Under the No Project Alternative the Project Area would continue to utilize water infrastructure identified in the Water Forum Agreement EIR and the Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan EIR, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment Infrastructure Impacts (Impact 4.11.4.3)

Impact 4.11.4.3 indicates that the Project Area would be served by facilities and infrastructure identified in the CSD-1 Master Plan EIR and the SRWTP EIR, both of which have significant and unavoidable impacts.

Under the No Project Alternative the Project Area would continued to be served by facilities and infrastructure identified in the CSD-1 Master Plan EIR and the SRWTP EIR, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource impact identified in Section 4.12 (Visual Resources).

Alteration of Visual Character (Impact 4.12.3 and 4.12.5)

Impacts 4.12.3 and **4.12.5** indicate that implementation of the Redevelopment Plan will encourage new development and redevelopment activities that could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project Area. Implementation of the proposed project would assist with the alleviation of blight within the Project Area, however the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan allows for high-rise development in the downtown area, a land use that was not allowed under the previous General Plan. The development of high-rise structures could result in a significant alteration of the existing visual character of the Project Area.

The availability of redevelopment funds would increase the likelihood that a high-rise building would be constructed in the Project Area, however the potential for this type of development still exists under the No Project Alternative. Aside from the potential construction of a high-rise building, the Redevelopment Plan would assist the Agency in alleviating blighted conditions throughout the Project Area. Under the No Project Alternative, funds for the alleviation of blight would not be available, and the visual quality of the Project Area is not likely to improve, and may even continue to deteriorate. This impact may worsen under the No Project Alternative and would significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable.

6.5 ALTERNATIVE 2 – REDUCED PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative the Project Area boundary would be reduced in size by approximately 50% to exclude portions of the currently proposed Project Area. However, as originally established in the Feasibility Report, blighting conditions do exist throughout the currently proposed Project Area, and failure to treat these conditions by excluding portions of the Project Area from redevelopment actions could reduce the overall effectiveness of the redevelopment efforts.

With a boundary contraction, the overall effectiveness of the comprehensive redevelopment program would be lessened, since selected activities would have to be reduced or eliminated to compensate for the reduced tax increment revenues accruable to the Rancho Cordova Redevelopment Agency. With a smaller redevelopment area and less tax increment revenue, opportunities to finance economic development, affordable housing and public facilities improvements needed in the Redevelopment Project Area would be reduced.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant land use impact identified in Section 4.1 (Land Use).

Cumulative Land Use Effects (Impact 4.1.5)

Impact 4.1.5 identifies that the proposed project would facilitate buildout of the Project Area consistent with the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan. Buildout of the proposed General Plan would lead to cumulative land use impacts associated with further urbanization throughout the region. Given that the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would have the same land use pattern as the proposed project, it would have similar cumulative land use impacts as the proposed project. However, the designation of a smaller Project Area would not allow the Agency to collect as much tax increment financing as would be available under the proposed project, which would result in fewer redevelopment funds available to assist with redevelopment activities. Under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative this impact would be reduced, but would remain significant and unavoidable.

Population/Housing/Employment

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant population and housing impact identified in Section 4.2 (Population, Housing and Employment).

Cumulative Population and Housing Increases (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 identifies that the proposed project would facilitate buildout of the Project Area consistent with the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan, which would lead to cumulative population growth throughout the region. Population growth would lead to physical effects on the environment. Given that the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would allow for the same intensity of development as allowed under the proposed project, it would have similar

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

impacts as the proposed project. It is assumed however, that implementation of the proposed project would accelerate the population growth in the currently proposed Project Area, and buildout would be reached sooner than if the proposed project were not implemented. If the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative were implemented, there would be fewer redevelopment funds available to the Agency, and buildout conditions would take longer to reach. This impact would be reduced under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative, but would remain significant and unavoidable.

Hazards and Human Health

As noted in Section 4.3 (Hazards and Human Health), the proposed Redevelopment Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with hazards and human health. The Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would have similar risk-levels associated with hazards and human health. Impacts related to hazards and human health would remain less than significant under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Transportation and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant transportation and circulation impact identified in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).

Deficient Roadway Levels of Service (Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.6)

Impact 4.3.1 identifies roadway segments in and around the Project Area that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service by 2030 and regional roadways that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service under cumulative conditions. The proposed project's contribution to roadway level of service deficiencies is negligible, and these impacts would remain the same, or perhaps even worsen, under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative, as there would be fewer redevelopment funds available to finance roadway improvements within the Reduced Project Area Boundary.

While the proposed project may speed the pace of development and redevelopment within the Project Area, which would lead to increases in traffic, the roadway segments projected to operate at deficient levels of service after implementation of the proposed project are also anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service without implementation of the proposed project. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Unacceptable Levels of Service on Freeway Segments (Impact 4.3.2)

Impact 4.3.2 identifies segments of US 50 within the Project Area that are anticipated to operate at deficient levels of service under 2030 conditions. The proposed project's contribution to freeway level of service deficiencies is negligible, and these impacts would remain the same, or perhaps even worsen, under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative, as there would be fewer redevelopment funds available to finance roadway improvements. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.5 (Air Quality).

Conflict with the SMAQMD Regional Ozone Attainment Plan (Impact 4.5.1)

Impact 4.5.1 indicates that buildout of the Redevelopment Project Area would result in air quality impacts greater than those assumed in the 1994 SMAQMD Regional Ozone Attainment Plan. The conflict with the Attainment Plan would be the result of Project Area buildout consistent with the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan. The Redevelopment Plan is an implementation tool of the proposed General Plan, and would facilitate buildout of the General Plan.

Implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would speed the rate of development within the Project Area, however it would not be the cause of the conflict with the Attainment Plan, as the entire region is currently in non-attainment status for ozone precursors. Even if the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative were implemented, the City of Rancho Cordova would still reach buildout condition, although perhaps at a slower rate, as there would be fewer redevelopment funds available. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Operational Emissions Impacts (Impact 4.5.3)

Impact 4.5.3 indicates that implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate already deficient air quality levels in the Project Area. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has designated the Greater Sacramento Air Area as an ozone non-attainment area (ROG and NOx). The principal sources of the ozone precursors are vehicles emissions and emissions from existing land uses. Implementation of the proposed project would not add a significant number of vehicle trips to area roadways, and would not allow for land uses beyond what are identified in the proposed General Plan.

Land uses and vehicle emissions impacts under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would be very similar to those under the proposed project. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Sources of Toxic Air Contaminants (Impact 4.5.4)

Impact 4.5.4 indicates that implementation of the proposed project would facilitate land uses that are potential sources of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs). The Redevelopment Plan does not allow for any uses that are not allowed under the proposed General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not increase the risk of exposure to sources of TACs beyond what is allowed under the proposed General Plan. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Regional Air Plan Impacts (Impact 4.5.6)

Impact 4.5.6 indicates that implementation of the proposed project along with potential development of the surrounding area would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter. Impacts to regional air plans would be the result of buildout of the region under the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan, the Sacramento County General Plan, the Elk Grove General Plan and the Folsom General Plan. The project's contribution to regional air quality impacts is negligible, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.6 (Noise).

Traffic Noise Impacts (Impact 4.6.2 and 4.6.6)

Impacts 4.6.2 and **4.6.6** indicate that implementation of the proposed Redevelopment Plan would result in increases in traffic noise levels that would be in excess of City of Rancho Cordova noise standards. The increases in traffic within the Redevelopment Project Area would be the result of buildout of the Project Area under the proposed General Plan. The Redevelopment Plan would facilitate buildout of the General Plan, but implementation of the Redevelopment Plan would not directly result in traffic noise increases. Traffic volumes, and thus traffic noise impacts, are anticipated to increase throughout the City and the Project Area without implementation of the Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would not reduce traffic noise levels within the City. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources

As noted in Section 4.7 (Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources), the proposed Redevelopment Plan would not result in any significant impacts associated with geology, soils or mineral resources. The entire Project Area is urbanized and impacts related to geology, soils and mineral resources would remain less than significant under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Indirect Water Supply Impacts (Impact 4.8.5)

Impact 4.8.5 indicates that the proposed project would be served by water supplies provided by SCWA Zone 40. Collection, treatment, and conveyance of this water to the Project Area would result in impacts to the environment. Regardless of whether or not the Redevelopment Plan is implemented, or if a smaller Project Area boundary is adopted, there will still be significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the provision of water from SCWA Zone 40 to the City of Rancho Cordova. The Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would not reduce the need for regional water infrastructure, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant biological resources impact identified in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources).

Cumulative Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.7)

Impact 4.9.7 indicates that implementation of the proposed project may result in cumulatively considerable indirect impacts to biological resources as a result of continued urbanization throughout the region. There are no specific development activities proposed as part of the Redevelopment Plan at this time. The region around the Project Area will continue to urbanize under the proposed General Plan, however it is anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would speed the rate of development within the Project Area. Implementation of the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would reduce the area in which redevelopment activity could occur, and would reduce the amount of redevelopment funds available for improvements. However, buildout of the entire City of Rancho Cordova is still anticipated to occur, even if a smaller Project Area were established. Cumulative indirect impacts to biological resources would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant cultural resources impact identified in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources).

Prehistoric Resources, Historic Resources, and Human Remains (Impact 4.10.1 and 4.10.3)

Impacts 4.10.1 and **4.10.3** indicate that implementation of the proposed project could result in the potential disturbance of cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) and human remains. Under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative, funding for redevelopment activities would be reduced and the rate of construction and ground-disturbing activities that may impact cultural resources would be confined to a smaller area. The Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative would provide funding for redevelopment projects within the reduced Project Area boundary, which could result in impacts to cultural and historical resources. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative is provided below for each significant public service/utility impact identified in Section 4.11 (Public Services and Utilities).

Cumulative Water Service Impacts (Impact 4.11.3.2)

Impact 4.11.3.2 indicates that the Project Area would be served by infrastructure identified in the Water Forum Agreement EIR and the Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan EIR, both of which would have significant and unavoidable impacts.

Under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative the Project Area would continue to utilize water infrastructure identified in the Water Forum Agreement EIR and the Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan EIR, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Cumulative Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment Infrastructure Impacts (Impact 4.11.4.3)

Impact 4.11.4.3 indicates that the Project Area would be served by facilities and infrastructure identified in the CSD-1 Master Plan EIR and the SRWTP EIR, both of which have significant and unavoidable impacts.

Under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative the Project Area would continued to be served by facilities and infrastructure identified in the CSD-1 Master Plan EIR and the SRWTP EIR, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

A comparison of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource impact identified in Section 4.12 (Visual Resources).

Alteration of Visual Character (Impact 4.12.3 and 4.12.5)

Impacts 4.12.3 and **4.12.5** indicate that implementation of the Redevelopment Plan will encourage new development and redevelopment activities that could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project Area. Implementation of the proposed project would assist with the alleviation of blight within the Project Area, however the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan allows for high-rise development in the downtown area, a land use that was not allowed under the previous General Plan. The development of high-rise structures would result in a significant alteration of the existing visual character of the Project Area. While redevelopment funds may increase the likelihood that a high-rise would be built in the Project Area, the potential for this type of development still exists under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable under the Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative.

6.6 CONCLUSIONS

Table 6.0-5 provides a summary of the potential impacts of the alternatives evaluated in this section, as compared with the potential impacts of the proposed Redevelopment Plan.

Based upon the evaluation described in this section, the No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, it should be noted that this alternative would not meet any of the stated goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan, and funding for future redevelopment projects and the removal of blighting conditions within the City of Rancho Cordova would not be available.

TABLE 6.0-5
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Environmental Categories	Proposed Redevelopment Plan (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative- Alternative 1 (Impact Significance)	Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)
Land Use	Project Impacts	B	B
Impact 4.1.5- Cumulative Land Use Effects	Cumulative land use impacts associated with further urbanization throughout the region. (S)	Alternative 1 would result in less urbanization and slower redevelopment and growth, which would reduce this significant impact. (LTS)	Alternative 2 would provide few redevelopment funds for redevelopment activities and urbanization would occur more slowly. (LTS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	LTS	LTS
Pop/Housing	Project Impacts	B	B
Impact 4.2.3- Cumulative Population and Housing Increases	Population, housing and employment increases under cumulative conditions (S)	Population, housing and employment increases would be reduced under the No Project Alternative. (LTS)	Population, housing and employment increases would be reduced under the No Project Alternative. (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	LTS	SUI
Traffic	Project Impacts	S	S
Impact 4.4.1 and 4.4.6- Impacts to roadway segments under project and cumulative conditions	Impacts to roadway segments under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Impacts to roadway segments under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Impacts to roadway segments under project and cumulative conditions (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Impact 4.3.2- Impacts to freeway segments under project and cumulative conditions	Impacts to freeway segments under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Impacts to freeway segments under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Impacts to freeway segments under project and cumulative conditions (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Air Quality	Project Impacts	S	S
Impacts 4.5.1 4.5.3 and 4.5.6- Air quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions	Air quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions	Air quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions	Air quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Categories	Proposed Redevelopment Plan (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative- Alternative 1 (Impact Significance)	Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)
	(S)	(S)	(S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Impact 4.5.4 - Air toxic contaminant exposure under project and cumulative conditions	Air toxic contaminant exposure under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Air toxic contaminant exposure under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Air toxic contaminant exposure under project and cumulative conditions (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Noise	Project Impacts	S	S
Impact 4.6.2 and 4.6.6- Traffic noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions	Traffic noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Traffic noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Traffic noise impacts under project and cumulative conditions (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Hydrology and Water Quality	Project Impacts	S	S
Impact 4.8.5- Indirect Water Supply Impacts under cumulative conditions	Indirect Water Supply Impacts under cumulative conditions (S)	Indirect Water Supply Impacts under cumulative conditions (S)	Indirect Water Supply Impacts under cumulative conditions (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Biological Resources	Project Impacts	B	S
Impact 4.9.7- Cumulative Indirect Biological Resources Impacts	Increased urbanization resulting in biological resource impacts (S)	Reduced funding for redevelopment will slow urbanization and reduce this impact (S)	Increased urbanization resulting in biological resource impacts (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI

Environmental Categories	Proposed Redevelopment Plan (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative- Alternative 1 (Impact Significance)	Reduced Project Area Boundary Alternative - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Project Impacts	B	S
Impact 4.10.1 and 4.10.3- Impacts to prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains under project and cumulative conditions	Impacts to prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Impacts to prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains under project and cumulative conditions. Reduced redevelopment funds will reduce construction activities (S)	Impacts to prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains under project and cumulative conditions (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Public Services and Utilities	Project Impacts	S	S
Impact 4.11.3.2- Water supply infrastructure under cumulative conditions	Impacts from the use of SCWA Zone 40 water supplies are cumulatively considerable (S)	Impacts from the use of SCWA Zone 40 water supplies are cumulatively considerable. Alternative 1 would use water from the same source (S)	Impacts from the use of SCWA Zone 40 water supplies are cumulatively considerable. Alternative 2 would use water from the same source (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Impact 4.12.4.3- Wastewater conveyance and treatment under cumulative conditions	Regional expansion of WTP facilities is significant and unavoidable (S)	Regional expansion of WTP facilities is significant and unavoidable (S)	Regional expansion of WTP facilities is significant and unavoidable (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI
Visual Resources	Project Impacts	W	B
Alteration of visual character under project and cumulative conditions (Impact 4.12.3 and 4.12.5)	Alteration of visual character under project and cumulative conditions (S)	Alteration of visual character under project and cumulative conditions Less funding for blight elimination (S)	Alteration of visual character under project and cumulative conditions (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SUI	SUI	SUI

Notes: B = Better, S = Same, W = Worse
(LTS = Less than Significant) (S = Significant Impact) (SUI = Significant and Unavoidable Impact)