

---

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Mandatory Findings of Significance. There are 14 specific environmental issues evaluated in this chapter. Cumulative impacts to these issues are evaluated in Section 4.0. The environmental issues evaluated in this chapter include:

- 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;
- **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant, but the incorporation of mitigation measure(s) would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level; or,
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

### 3.2 INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** Trinity Garden Estates
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova  
2729 Prospect Park Drive  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Hilary Anderson (916) 361-8384
4. **Project Location:** Northwest corner of Coloma Road and Trinity River Drive in the City of Rancho Cordova.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Joseph Martel, M.D.  
11216 Trinity River Drive  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
6. **General Plan Designation(s):** Medium Density Residential

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

---

7. **Current Zoning:** SC (Shopping Center)
8. **General Plan:** Sunrise Boulevard North Planning Area
9. **APN Numbers:** 056-0430-001
10. **Description of the Project:** Refer to Section 2.3 for a detailed description of the project characteristics.
11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Refer to Section 2.2 for a detailed description of surrounding uses
12. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
- 1) County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1)
  - 2) Golden State Water Company (GSWC)
  - 3) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
  - 4) Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB)
  - 5) Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District
  - 6) Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD)

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

---

#### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the project, involving at least one impact that is a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

#### PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

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

#### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

---

- 6) "Reviewed Under Previous Document" applies where the impact has been evaluated and discussed in a previous document. Discussion will include reference to the previous documents. If an impact is reviewed under a previous document, an impact of "Potentially Significant" does not necessarily require an EIR.
- 7) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program Environmental Impact Report, or other CEQA process, an impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.
- 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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/>

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within an urbanized portion of the City of Rancho Cordova. The prevailing visual character of the area includes one- and two-story homes, two-story apartment buildings, and shopping centers.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* There are no scenic vista views available from the proposed project site. The surrounding area consists of developed residential and commercial sites and therefore the proposed project will have *no impact* on scenic vista views.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The nearest highway is U.S. 50 (approximately 1/2 mile to the south), which is not designated as a state scenic highway in the project vicinity. Additionally, the site does not contain any rock outcroppings or historic buildings. On-site trees will remain. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project site is situated in a developed area with a mix of residential and commercial uses. To the north, there is a driveway leading east from Trinity River Drive to the shopping center in the parcel adjacent to the east of the project site. Further north of the driveway, there exists a multi-family condominium complex. To the south of the project and across Coloma Road, there is another commercial center. To the west of the project across Trinity River Drive, there is a single-family residential neighborhood that is zoned RD-5. As proposed, the project site features residential attached homes, which are a suitable use for transitioning between residential and commercial areas, as described in the City's General Plan. As the proposed project includes similar development to that already existing in the vicinity, it will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The site is surrounded by development on all sides and the light or glare from the project would not adversely affect views in the area. Additionally, the proposed project is subject to the City's Lighting Ordinance, further reducing light and glare impacts. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The project area does not contain any prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. Historical uses of the project site included dredge gold mining, not agriculture. As the proposed project would not convert any agricultural land to other uses, the proposed project would have *no impact*.
- b) *No Impact.* The site is not zoned for agricultural use nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project's conflicts and impacts with agricultural zoning, and existing Williamson Act contracts would result in *no impact*.
- c) *No Impact.* See a) and b) above.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

Pollutant emissions modeling for the proposed project was conducted by City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department staff using the URBEMIS 2002 version 8.7.0 software provided by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The results of the model found that the proposed project would result in the emissions shown in **Table 1** below.

**TABLE 1  
ESTIMATED AIR EMISSIONS (POUNDS PER DAY)**

	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM10
Construction Phase	9.13	64.93	72.11	0.00	5.90
Operational Phase	1.35	1.40	14.49	0.01	1.22

Source: URBEMIS2002 v.8.7.0

Notes: ROG = Reactive Organic Gasses, NO<sub>x</sub> = Nitrogen Oxides, CO = Carbon Monoxide, SO<sub>2</sub> = Sulfur Dioxide, PM10 = Particulate Matter, 10 Micron

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* In order to assist local agencies and municipalities with analyzing project-specific impacts to air quality and compliance with local air district attainment plans, SMAQMD has provided a "Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento". This guide includes information on significance and mitigation for common air emissions issues. Additionally, SMAQMD will review all development projects, including the proposed project, to ensure their compliance with local, State, and federal plans. According to the significance standards set by SMAQMD, the proposed project would not result in emissions above the significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would



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

---

not interfere with the Metropolitan Air Quality Attainment Plan and impacts would be *less than significant*.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation*. See discussion a) above. The proposed project would not violate the standards set by SMAQMD and the City of Rancho Cordova for pollutant emissions during both the construction and operational phases of the project. However, as with any construction, the possibility exists that PM10 emissions throughout the grading and building construction phases could result in short-term instances of significant PM10 emissions not anticipated by the air emissions model. The following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce PM10 emissions from the project area:

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 3.1a** The project proponent shall ensure that all exposed surfaces, graded areas, storage piles, and haul roads are watered at least twice daily during construction activities. This requirement shall be included as a note on all improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to issuance of grading permits and/or approval of improvement plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until the completion of construction activities.

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

**MM 3.1b** The project proponent shall ensure that the amount of material actively worked, the amount of disturbed ground, and the amount of material stockpiled is minimized throughout the construction of the project. This requirement shall be included as a note on all improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to issuance of grading permits and/or approval of improvement plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until the completion of construction activities.

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

**MM 3.1c** The project proponent shall require that paved streets adjacent to the project site are washed or swept at least once daily to remove accumulated dust. This requirement shall be included as a note on all improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to issuance of grading permits and/or approval of improvement plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until the completion of construction activities.

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

---

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

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.1a, MM 3.1b, and MM3.1c will ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above. Just as with project-specific impacts, the proposed project is not expected to create any significant emissions that would contribute to the cumulative attainment of the area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) and b) above. The proposed project will not emit significant pollutants that would affect sensitive receptors. Additionally, the proposed project is not located in the vicinity of any acutely sensitive receptors such as hospitals, nursing homes, schools, or child care facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to sensitive receptors.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes uses similar to land uses surrounding the project. Additionally, the project would not create objectionable odors. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* odor impacts.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project site is surrounded by previously developed parcels and has been subject to grading in the past. The parcel is routinely traveled by pedestrians and has several small debris piles onsite from illegal dumping. An earthen berm and a grouping of trees exist on the southern side of the parcel, adjacent to Coloma Road.

Given the previous site disturbance and conditions noted by City staff during site visits in April 2006, it is unlikely that the site would provide suitable habitat for any special status species. Suitable forage for birds of prey was not found on-site as there was no evidence of rodents or other typical food sources. The project site did not exhibit any characteristics that would support wetlands on-site and the site's urban location has disconnected the site from any hydrological circulation. As previously stated, the site does contain some trees. However, these trees are to be preserved in the final project design. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the Rancho Cordova General Plan DEIR do not identify any sensitive species or habitat for sensitive species on the project site.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* The site does not include suitable habitat for any special status species, nor were any species found on-site during site visits conducted by City of Rancho Cordova staff. However, burrowing owls are known to use debris materials for shelter in other portions of the City. Given the fact that raptors are known to be in the area as well, the possibility does exist for the area to be used for nesting.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are included in order to reduce potential impacts to special status species and their habitat:

- MM 4.1a** The project proponent shall ensure that materials or waste are not stockpiled on site for periods of more than seven consecutive days. Construction debris shall be transported to the proper disposal facility in a timely manner to avoid creating shelter for transient burrowing owls. This measure shall be included as a note in all improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Prior to approval of grading and improvement plans and throughout construction activities.

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

- MM 4.1b** Prior to each phase of grading and construction begun between February 1 and September 1, the applicant shall ensure that a preconstruction survey is performed to determine if active raptor nesting is taking place in the area. If nesting is observed, consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) shall occur in order to determine the protective measures which must be implemented for the nesting birds of prey. If nesting is not observed, no further action is required.

If grading or construction occurs between September 2 and January 31, no preconstruction survey is required. However, if a hawk is noticed during construction activities, construction activities will halt and the CDFG and the City shall be notified prior to further actions.

*Timing/Implementation:* Survey shall be conducted prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans. Monitoring for birds of prey shall be conducted throughout construction activities.

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

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1a and 4.1b would reduce impacts to special status species and their habitat to *less than significant*.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above. Mitigation measures included in that discussion would ensure that impacts to habitat and communities would be *less than significant*.

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

---

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The site does not contain any federally protected wetlands. Further, a site inspection by City staff did not give any indication of the existence of any wetland features. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* The area is heavily developed and the project site is not adequate for foraging or shelter of migratory or local species. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1a through 4.1c would ensure that impacts to nesting birds would be *less than significant*. Other impacts to migration routes or movement corridors would be *less than significant*.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* The project is subject to the City's Tree Preservation and Protection ordinance. A group of trees exists on the southern side of the project adjacent to Coloma Road. According to site plans, these trees are to be incorporated into the site design and will not be removed or otherwise impacted. The following mitigation measure will ensure that the existing trees are not removed.

#### Mitigation Measure

**MM 4.2** The project proponent shall ensure that no trees are removed or relocated during construction and operation of the proposed project. If construction activities (including grading) are to occur within 25 feet of the drip line of any existing tree, orange construction fencing shall be placed around the tree at the drip line of the tree in order to prevent accidental damage or removal of the tree. This construction fencing shall not be placed such that it impedes pedestrian traffic on the sidewalk along Coloma Road. Orange fencing may be placed closer than the drip line only in those locations where it is necessary to do so to prevent impacting pedestrian traffic on Coloma Road.

If construction activities are to occur within the drip line of any tree, the project proponent shall submit a tree impact prevention plan to the City for approval prior to operations within that area. The plan shall include an arborist's report identifying all onsite trees and information on their relative health and condition, as well as details on steps to be taken to prevent accidental damage or removal of trees. No construction activities may occur within the drip line of any existing tree without an approved plan.

*Timing/Implementation:* Throughout construction activities. If a tree impact prevention plan is required, one must be submitted to the City and approved by the City Planning Department prior to any work within the drip line of any trees.

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

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.2 would ensure that the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact to trees.

- f) *No impact.* Sacramento County does not currently have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is being prepared by the County and is expected to be adopted within the next few years. However, the SSHCP is still being formulated and no portion of the plan has been adopted. No Natural Community

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

---

Conservation Plans are in effect in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

#### EXISTING SETTING

Preparation of the Rancho Cordova Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report included assessment of possible cultural resources within the Redevelopment Area, including the site of the proposed project. Analysis of the Redevelopment Plan Area did not identify any significant cultural resources (e.g., prehistoric sites, historic sites, or isolated artifacts) within the boundaries of the proposed project site (Pacific Municipal Consultants, 2006).

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* As stated above, the surveys indicated that the proposed project site is free from important cultural/historic resources and it was determined that the sites have a low probability of such resources. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts. However, the following mitigation measures are included in order to ensure that any unexpected cultural resources uncovered on the site will not be significantly impacted.

#### Mitigation Measure

**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 shall be immediately notified. The applicant shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with appropriate specialists, as needed. The applicant 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 remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the NAHC are to be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. This measure shall be included as a note on all project plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Throughout construction activities.

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

---

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

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1 will reduce the project's potential cultural, historic, paleontological, and archeological resource impacts to *less than significant*.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* The implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1 above will ensure that potential adverse changes to cultural, historic, paleontological, and archeological resources will be *less than significant*.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* Investigation into the area has yielded no evidence of unique paleontological resources or geologic features. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1 above will ensure that impacts to any unexpected features will be *less than significant*.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* There are no known cemeteries on the project site. However, due to the large Native American population known to reside in the general area in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked grave sites. The proposed project area is not expected to contain any such sites. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1 above would ensure that any impacts to human remains would be *less than significant*.



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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 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"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a)

- i) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no known active faults exist within the vicinity of the project site. The potential for impacts to public safety resulting from the rupture of a known earthquake fault is not considered to be an issue of significant environmental concern. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- ii) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See response to (a)(i) above. The potential for strong seismic ground shaking is not a significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic activity of the area and the relative distance to active faults. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact from seismic ground shaking.
- iii) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See response to a(i) above. The soils at the project site are classified as Xerorthents, Dredge Tailings. These soils do not constitute a potential impact for ground failure or liquefaction, especially due to the fact that no

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

---

- active faults exist in the area. Therefore, this impact is considered to be *less than significant*.
- iv) *Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is gently sloped downward to the north, toward the direction of the American River. However, the project site does not contain any slopes capable of producing landslides or other earth movement. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with landslides.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact*. As previously stated, the site is surrounded by developed parcels and has already been subject to rough grading. The berm at the southern side of the site is to remain, but is not anticipated to precipitate erosion activities or contribute to the loss of topsoil. Additionally, the project is subject to compliance with 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. Therefore, this project will have a *less than significant* impact.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact*. The proposed project consists of a small residential development. This type of development and the particular project site do not require operations or uses that would substantially change the geologic characteristics of the site. According to information provided under discussion a) above, the site is not currently prone to such hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact*. The project is located on dredge tailings generated by historic gold mining in the region. This gold mining consisted of dredge mining that typically results in large piles of cobbles and aggregate, left behind after gold is extracted. As such, the soil is made up of larger material interspersed with clays and sand and is considered at high risk for soil expansion. Additionally, structures included in the proposed project would be subject to California Building Standards Code, which requires measures to be incorporated into the construction and design of structures that precludes risks from expansive soils. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.
- e) *No Impact*. The project will connect to the local sewer system and will not use a septic system or other alternative wastewater system. Therefore, there will be *no impact*.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b> Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project consists of attached residential units and associated landscaping, and as such does not propose to transport, use, or dispose of any hazardous materials, or to emit any hazardous substances; therefore, this impact is considered to be *less than significant*.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* Construction of the proposed project would include the limited use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials, as is normal for residential construction. This land use would likely not result in significant potential for upset or release. However, as the site has lain vacant for some time, illegally dumped or buried material could be located on-site, causing the potential for significant impacts.

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

---

#### Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are included in order to reduce the impact from any unknown hazardous materials:

**MM 7.1a** The project proponent shall coordinate with the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) to ensure that all transformers on-site or immediately adjacent to the site that 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 according to the requirements of SMUD.

*Timing/Implementation:* Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

**MM 7.1b** As construction occurs, all debris, trash, refuse, and abandoned, discarded, and/or out-of-service items shall be removed from the proposed project sites and deposited off-site in an appropriate disposal facility. This mitigation measure shall be included on all improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Throughout all phases of construction. All such materials shall be completely removed prior to issuance of building permits.

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

**MM 7.1c** 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. This mitigation measure shall be included on all improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* Throughout all phases of construction.

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

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 7.1a through MM 7.1c would ensure that the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact.

- c) *No Impact.* The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; therefore, *no impact* would occur.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located on a site that was included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and *no impact* from a hazardous materials site is expected.
- e) *No Impact.* The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, nor is it within two miles of a public airport. The nearest public airport is Mather Airport, approximately four

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

---

miles to the south of the project area. Therefore, the project will result in *no impact* as a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) *No Impact*. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site – the nearest private airstrip, Rancho Murieta, is located approximately 12 miles to the southeast. Additionally, per the Federal Aviation Administration's requirements, aircraft in the airspace immediately above the project would be under the control of Mather Airport's control tower, not the control of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would have *no impact* related to hazards from nearby private airstrips.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact*. 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, impacts associated with the project would be *less than significant*.
- h) *No Impact*. The proposed project is located in an entirely urbanized area. The project is surrounded by similar development and is not located in the vicinity of any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project is not at risk from wildland fire and *no impact* would result from implementation of the project.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute to the potential for discharge of storm water from material storage areas, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas or loading docks, or other outdoor work areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Create or contribute to the potential for discharge of storm water to impair the beneficial uses of the receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Create or contribute to the potential for the discharge of storm water to cause significant harm on the biological integrity of the waterways and water bodies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

---

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to result in significant short-term surface water quality impacts during the construction period and long-term water quality impacts due to runoff from new impervious surfaces. Unless runoff is controlled, the project could generate new runoff pollutants such as oil, gasoline, and other chemicals with potentially adverse impacts on water quality. Compliance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), best management practices (BMPs), and applicable local ordinances and State requirements, would ensure that the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Sufficient water supply to service the proposed project will be provided by Golden State Water Company. The project falls within an urbanized area for which water supply was previously allocated. As such, significant additional groundwater supplies will not be needed for this project. The site is surrounded by developed parcels consisting largely of impervious surfaces. While the project would increase impervious surfaces, the project area is small and does not contribute significantly to groundwater recharge in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to groundwater quality.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussions a) and b) above. Drainage of the area has already been altered to accommodate surrounding development projects and the impervious surfaces added as part of this project will not significantly alter the existing pattern. There are no stream or river courses on or near the project site. This project is not expected to substantially alter the drainage of the area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact.* See c) above.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above. In addition to compliance with a SWPPP, the use of BMP's listed in **Table 2**, as requested by the City and identified by the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA, January 2003), would further mitigate any operational impacts. This list is representative of recommended BMP's but does not constitute the only practices to be employed. Use of these and other BMP's, as well as adherence to the SWPPP identified in discussion a) above would ensure that impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

**TABLE 2**  
**APPROVED CASQA BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

CASQA Identifier	BMP Name
NS-8	Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning
NS-9	Vehicle and Equipment Fueling
NS-10	Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance
WM-1	Material Delivery and Storage
WM-2	Material Use
WM-3	Stockpile Management
WM-4	Spill Prevention and Control

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

---

CASQA Identifier	BMP Name
WM-5	Solid Waste Management
WM-6	Hazardous Waste Management

Source: CASQA, 2003

Notes: Information on the requirements and execution of these BMP's is found at <http://www.cabmphandbooks.com/> and at the City of Rancho Cordova at 2729 Prospect Park Drive, 95670.

- f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is in a developed area surrounded by urban uses. As such, the project would not result in significant increases in the discharge of stormwater. Also, adherence to a SWPPP and BMP's will help ensure the project's impacts are *less than significant*.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion f) above.
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion f) above.
- i) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussions a), b), and f) above.
- j) *No Impact.* The project site is located outside of the 100-year floodplain; therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- k) *No Impact.* The project site is located outside of the 100-year floodplain; therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- l) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The Rancho Cordova Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report examined the possible effects of local levee and/or dam failures and concluded that the probability of such an event is extremely low in the project area (Pacific Municipal Consultants, 2006). Therefore, the potential impacts to the project would be *less than significant*.
- m) *No Impact.* The project site is not located near the Pacific Ocean, nor is it near any large body of water capable of creating seiche or tsunami. As the project location is generally flat in terrain, landslides are extremely unlikely. The vicinity of the project area is also characterized as flat land that gently slopes towards the American River to the north. Therefore, there would be *no impact* from the proposed project.



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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an existing community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within the Sunrise Boulevard North Planning Area as identified in the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan (2006, p. 75). Within that Planning Area, the project site is identified as a site for medium-density residential (City of Rancho Cordova, 2006, p. 75). The project site is completely surrounded by similar residential development to the north, low density residential to the west, and commercial development to the south and east.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located within a completely urbanized portion of the City of Rancho Cordova. It is located on one of the last vacant parcels in that portion of the City. Thus, the project would not divide an existing community. The proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact.
  
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* Although the project requires a rezone from SC (shopping center) to RD-20 (residential), the rezone will bring the parcel into compliance with the General Plan, which designated this area for medium density residential. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant*.
  
- c) *No Impact.* Sacramento County does not currently have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is being prepared by the County and will be adopted within the next few years. However, the SSHCP is still being formulated and no portion of the plan has been adopted. No Natural Community Conservation Plans are in effect in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* As determined in the Rancho Cordova Redevelopment Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, this area does not show evidence of mineral resources on the project site. Nor is the project located in any Mineral Resource Zones. Therefore, the project would have *no impact* on the availability of local or regional minerals of value.
- b) *No Impact.* See discussion a) above.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XI. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project does not include any noise-generating uses. The project site contains an earthen berm at the southern side adjacent to Coloma Road. Coloma Road would likely be the major source of noise on the project site, but attenuation from the berm will mitigate any substantial noise effects to the project from traffic on Coloma Road. The remaining sides of the project area abut similar land uses to the project and would therefore not create any significant noise. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Construction of the proposed project will not include any practices likely to cause substantial amounts of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (e.g., drilling, jack-and-bore, etc.). Any amounts of groundborne vibration or noise will likely be temporary in nature, ceasing when construction is finished. Therefore, this impact is expected to be *less than significant*.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes only residential land uses, which are associated with lower noise generation levels and would not result in any significant increase in noise. Additionally, the proposed project is surrounded by similar urban development which generates typical noises for that type of area. Any increases in ambient noise from the proposed project would be minor. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* Construction of the proposed project would involve the transport and use of heavy equipment. The use of heavy

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

---

equipment and other construction activities would temporarily increase the ambient noise levels in the project's vicinity above existing levels. These increases would be periodic, temporary in nature, and subject to the City of Rancho Cordova Noise Ordinance regarding construction activities. In order to further reduce any noise impacts associated with construction, the following mitigation measure is included:

#### Mitigation Measure

**MM 11.1** The project applicant shall adhere to the following standard mechanisms for mitigation of construction-related nuisances 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; and,
- City approval of proposed construction storage and staging areas (including employee parking).

These mechanisms shall ensure that noise levels remain below established City of Rancho Cordova General Plan and Noise Ordinance standards. The project applicant 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 number if applicable. These requirements shall be included as a note on all construction plans and in the improvement plan submittal.

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

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

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 11.1 would reduce the project's potential temporary noise impacts to *less than significant*.

- e) *No Impact*. The proposed project is not located within the Mather Airport CLUP, nor is it within two miles of any public airport. Additionally, the proposed project is not located within the noise contours of Mather Airport (Airport Land Use Commission, 1997). Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* from aircraft noise.
- f) *No Impact*. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site – the nearest private airstrip, Rancho Murieta, is located approximately 12 miles to the southeast. Additionally, per the Federal Aviation Administration's requirements, aircraft in the airspace immediately above the project would be under the control of Mather Airport's control tower, not the control of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would have *no impact* from private airports.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within a previously developed portion of the City of Rancho Cordova and is within an area planned for full development by the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan, which currently hold jurisdiction over the project area, as well as the County of Sacramento General Plan and the Cordova Community Plan which held jurisdiction over the project area prior to the incorporation of the City of Rancho Cordova.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project proposes to add 20 residential units in an area designated within the General Plan for medium density residential. Also, the site is adjacent to existing commercial and residential development. The addition of 20 residential units would not constitute substantial population growth and would result in a *less than significant* impact.
- b) *No Impact.* The project site is currently undeveloped. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any displacement of people or housing and there would be *no impact*.
- c) *No Impact.* See discussion b) above.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within the following public service districts:

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be served by the SMFD. The nearest station to the project area is located less than 0.25 miles away on Coloma Road. The addition of the project to the existing service area for SMFD and for the Coloma Road Station #65 would not be significant and no additional stations, equipment, or personnel would be required to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to fire protection.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be served by the RCPD, which is based out of the police station on Rockingham Drive approximately 3.5 miles to the southwest of the project site. The addition of 20 dwelling units would not constitute a significant increase in service requirements for the Police Department. Therefore, no additional stations, equipment, or personnel would be required to serve the project and *less than significant* impacts are expected.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* According to current Folsom Cordova Unified School District student generation rates, a 20-unit development is anticipated to generate approximately eight new grade K-6 students, approximately two new grade 7-8 students, and approximately four new grade 9-12 students. FCUSD schools in the area have sufficient capacity to accommodate the amount of new students generated by the proposed project. Therefore, the project will have a *less than significant* impact.

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

---

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is within an urban area which is adequately serviced by existing park facilities. The addition of 20 residential units to the area would result in a *less than significant* impact.
  
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is within an urban area which is adequately serviced by all necessary public facilities. The proposed project would not result in the need for any additional governmental/public facilities, nor would it significantly increase demand on existing governmental/public facilities. Therefore, the impacts are considered *less than significant*.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XIV. RECREATION</b>					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

#### EXISTING SETTING

Three neighborhood parks and the regional American River Parkway are all located within one mile of the project area. The three neighborhood parks are under the management and maintenance of the Cordova Recreation and Park District. The American River Parkway is managed by Sacramento County.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project could potentially increase use of four facilities through the addition of 20 dwelling units. However, the increase would be insubstantial compared to the general urban nature of the surrounding area and the high number of existing housing in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on parks in the vicinity.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include the construction of any recreational facilities. Further, the project would not require construction or expansion of any recreational facilities; therefore, the impacts are considered *less than significant*.



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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b> Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project has been analyzed by City staff and it has been determined that the traffic volume generated by the project is not large enough to warrant the preparation of a traffic study. According to City of Rancho Cordova Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines, any development that generates less than 1000 trips per day or 100 AM/PM Peak Hour trips would not significant impact traffic. The addition of 20 attached dwelling units would generate an estimated 117 daily trips, 9 AM Peak Hour trips, and 10 PM Peak Hour trips. Therefore, the impact is considered to be *less than significant*.

b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above.

c) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not within the Mather Airport CLUP nor is it under the imaginary surfaces of Mather Airport (Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77). Objects or structures that exceed the imaginary surfaces of an airport are considered to constitute a hazard to aircraft and may result in a change in air traffic patterns. As the proposed project is not located under any such imaginary surfaces and as the project does not proposed any structures taller than two stories, the proposed project is would result in *no impact* to airborne aircraft.

d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The design of the proposed project does not include any features likely to increase hazards (e.g., sharp curves or inadequate visibility). As the project is adjacent to residential uses, the use of the parcel would not be incompatible. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

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

---

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* Comments on the proposed project submitted by Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District cited several areas of concern with regards to emergency access. The following mitigation measure has been included to address these concerns:

#### Mitigation Measure

**MM 15.1** The project shall incorporate the following design features to ensure adequate emergency access:

- Turning radii into the development shall meet the District standard of 25 feet inside and 50 feet outside. The gate at the entrance from the shopping center parking lot shall swing in the direction of egress from the proposed development and shall be on a free-exit loop only.
- The project proponent shall comply with SMFD requirements for access driveway surfaces.
- Vehicle parking shall be prohibited along the entire length of the internal roadway and approved fire lane identification signage/stripping shall be provided.
- All internal roads shall be free of traffic calming measures, speed bumps, humps, etc.
- Sufficient visitor/guest vehicle parking spaces must be provided to prevent vehicle parking in the roadway.

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

*Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and Sacramento Metro Fire District.*

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 15.1 will ensure that project impacts to emergency access would be *less than significant*.

- f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Adherence to the City's parking guidelines will ensure that the project is constructed with adequate parking facilities. Specifically, each residential unit is designed with a 2-car garage and an approximately 20-foot driveway adjacent to the garage. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Sacramento Regional Transit bus line 21 stops at Trinity River Drive and Coloma Road, immediately adjacent to the project. The project has been designed to utilize an existing access road off of Trinity River Drive for ingress and egress from the project site and as such will not interfere with existing bus stops. Therefore, the impact is considered to be *less than significant*.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project is surrounded by residential and commercial developments that are adequately serviced by CSD-1. According to the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Master Plan (2002), each new Equivalent Single-family Dwelling Unit (ESD) is projected to generate 310 gallons per day (gpd) of additional wastewater. The proposed project, as designed with 20 single-family units, would be projected to add 6,200 gpd. This amount is well within the capacity of CSD-1 systems, as identified in the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Master Plan and the Rancho Cordova Redevelopment Plan DEIR. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project site is within an urban area adequately serviced by water facilities and wastewater treatment facilities. According to a Water Supply Evaluation performed by EDAW for the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan, the water supplier for the project area has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project (EDAW, 2006). Wastewater service to the project area was planned for in the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Master Plan (CSD-1, 2002). Further, the proposed development is small and will have access to current facilities, and as such will not require new or expanded facilities. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located on a parcel that has been planned for development for some time. Existing stormwater collection and handling

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

---

infrastructure was planned such that the addition of 20 dwelling units on the property would not result in a lack of capacity in the stormwater system. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Golden State Water Company currently provides water service to the area in which the proposed project will be located. GSWC's water supply is expected to be capable of handling the additional requirements of the proposed project (EDAW, 2006). Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussions a) and b) above.
- f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project will be served by Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI), which collects residential and commercial solid waste and transports any non-recyclable material to the Forward Landfill in Manteca, CA or the Lockwood Regional Landfill in Nevada. Both facilities have adequate capacity to handle the additional generation of waste by the operation of the proposed project. Construction debris will most likely be collected by the contractor and transported to the Kiefer Landfill, south of the City of Rancho Cordova. The Kiefer Landfill also has adequate capacity to accept waste from the proposed project. The addition of 20 residential units would be an insignificant change in daily waste. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion f) above.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* As demonstrated in checklists I through XVI above, the proposed project is not expected to result in any significant impacts related to biological or cultural resources. Further, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this MND would ensure that the project's impacts are *less than significant*.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Incorporation of the mitigation measures for the project would reduce any environmental impacts to less than significant in both the short-term and long-term. The area is designated by the General Plan for Medium Density Residential, with which the proposed project is consistent. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all Rancho Cordova General Plan policies, ensuring that the long-term environmental goals of the City are adhered to. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Section 4.0 of this MND addresses the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts in the cumulative setting. No impacts were found to be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to cumulatively considerable impacts.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above.