This section identifies the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Preserve at Sunridge project. Cumulative impacts are the result of combining the potential effects of the project with other planned developments, as well as foreseeable development projects. The following discussion considers the cumulative impacts of the relevant environmental issue areas.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contain an assessment of the cumulative impacts that could be associated with the proposed project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable". "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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 (as defined by Section 15130). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. A cumulative impact occurs from:

> *... the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.*

In addition, Section 15130(b) identifies that the following three elements are necessary for an adequate cumulative analysis:

1) Either:

   a) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or,

   b) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

2) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and

3) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a) also states the following with regard to cumulative impacts that are not significant,

- An EIR is not required to discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR. (Section 15130(a)[1])

- When the combined cumulative impact associated with the project's incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, the EIR shall briefly indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed in further detail in the EIR. (Section 15130(a)[2])

- An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus is not significant. A project's contribution is less then cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. (Section 15130(a)[3])

5.2 CUMULATIVE SETTING

A general description of the cumulative setting is provided in Section 4.0 (Introduction to the Environmental Analysis and Assumptions Used). In addition, each environmental issue area evaluated in the Draft EIR identifies its own cumulative setting. The cumulative setting for the project is different than that what was analyzed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. This is a result of Rancho Cordova's incorporation in June 2003, the City's Draft General Plan, and projects such as Rio del Oro that were not anticipated in the SDCP/SRSP EIR, which was certified by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors in 2002. It is important to note that this cumulative analysis is substantially guided by conclusions reached in the Master EIR.

The cumulative setting for this EIR assumes that Rancho Cordova builds out in a land use pattern similar to SACOG's Preferred Blueprint Scenario. The Rancho Cordova's Interim General Plan (e.g., Draft Land Use Map Book, Land Use Map and Circulation Plan) are consistent with the basic principles and design strategies of SACOG's Preferred Blueprint Scenario, including increasing compact land use patterns, a mix of residential densities, mixed-use projects, transportation choices, a variety of housing choices and density, encouraging infill, quality design, and natural resource conservation. While the Blueprint Plan would improve the regional transportation system and air quality by reducing the frequency and length of vehicle trips and making efficient use of scarce land resources by providing more dense compact developments, it ultimately would result in greater environmental and cumulatively considerable impacts in many of the technical issue areas than the proposed project (i.e., local transportation impacts, biological resources impacts, loss of farmland, etc.).

5.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Identified below is a compilation of the cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the project and future development in the vicinity. As described above, cumulative impacts are two or more effects, that, when combined, are considerable or compound other environmental effects. Each cumulative impact is determined to have one of the following levels of significance: **less than cumulatively considerable** and **cumulatively considerable**. The cumulative impact discussion for each issue area is provided below and the reader is referred to Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of this EIR for a complete discussion of the project's impacts.

SECTION 4.1 LAND USE

Cumulative Land Use Impacts

Impact 4.1.7 The proposed project would contribute to approved and planned urban development of the southern portion of the City as well as urbanization within the unincorporated portion of Sacramento County that would result in the conversion of open space and agricultural lands. The project's contribution would **less than cumulatively considerable.**

SECTION 4.2 POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

Cumulative Population Housing, and Employment Increases

Impact 4.2.2 Implementation of the proposed project would result in cumulative population and housing unit increases. The project's contribution to cumulative population and housing conditions is **less than cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.3 HUMAN HEALTH/RISK OF UPSET

Cumulative Hazards and Risks

Impact 4.3.8 Implementation of the proposed project would involve potential hazard issues that would be limited to the project site and would not contribute to cumulative hazards in the City or region. The project's contribution would **less than cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.4 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions

Study Roadway Segments

Impact 4.4.12 Implementation of the project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways as well as trigger some roadways to exceed the City's LOS D standards located within the project area under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a **significant** impact.

- Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Zinfandel Drive. This segment of Mather Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.19 and 1.17 without and with the Hazel Avenue Extension, respectively. The addition of project traffic will cause the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.05. This roadway is partially within the City and the unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- Implementation of the project will cause LOS E operations on Mather Field Road between the US-50 Eastbound Ramps and International Drive under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions without the Hazel Avenue Extension. This roadway is within the City.

- Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on Douglas Road between Sunrise Boulevard and Jaeger Road under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. This segment of Douglas Road will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.04 and 1.05 without and with the Hazel Avenue Extension, respectively, under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions. The addition of project traffic will cause the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.05. This roadway is within the City.

- Implementation of the project will cause LOS E operations on Chrysanthy Boulevard between Jaeger Road and Americanos Boulevard under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. This roadway is within the City.

- Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on Sunrise Boulevard between Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. This segment of Sunrise Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.37 and 1.35 without and with the Hazel Avenue Extension, respectively, under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions. The addition of project traffic will cause the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.05. This roadway is partially within the City and the unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- Implementation of the project will cause LOS E operations on Jaeger Road between White Rock Road and Douglas Boulevard under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with the Hazel Avenue Extension scenario. This roadway is within the City.

- Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on Jaeger Road between Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard. This segment of Jaeger Road will operate unacceptably at LOS E with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.98 and at LOS F with a V/C ratio of 1.02 without and with the Hazel Avenue Extension, respectively, under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions. The addition of project traffic will cause the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.05. This roadway is within the City.

Study Intersections

Impact 4.4.13 Implementation of the project will result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel

Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

- Implementation of the project will cause LOS E operations at the SR-16/Excelsior Road intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions without the Hazel Avenue Extension. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- Implementation of the project will cause LOS E operations at the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with the Hazel Avenue Extension. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations at the Grant Line Road/Kiefer Boulevard intersection. The intersection will operate unacceptably at LOS F with delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. The addition of project traffic will increase delay at the intersection by more than 5 seconds during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is located partially within the City and the unincorporated area of Sacramento County.

- Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations at the Douglas Road/Grant Line Road intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. The addition of project traffic will increase delay at the intersection by more than 5 seconds during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is located partially within the City and the unincorporated area of Sacramento County.

- Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations at the Douglas Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions without the Hazel Avenue Extension (PM peak only) and with the Hazel Avenue Extension (AM and PM peak). The addition of project traffic will increase V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the identified analysis periods. This intersection is located within the City.

- Implementation of the project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F operations at the Sunrise Boulevard/International Drive intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. This intersection is located within the City.

- Implementation of the project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F operations at the Douglas Road/Jaeger Road intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. This intersection is located within the City.

- Implementation of the project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F operations at the Douglas Road/Americanos Boulevard intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with the Hazel Avenue Extension. This intersection is located within the City.

- Implementation of the project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS F operations at the Chrysanthy Boulevard/Sunrise Boulevard intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. This intersection is located partially within the City and the unincorporated area of Sacramento County.

- Implementation of the project would cause unacceptable LOS F operations at the Chrysanthy Boulevard/Jaeger Road intersection under Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension scenarios. This intersection is located within the City.

Freeway Segments

Impact 4.4.14 Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US-50 under cumulative conditions. This is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Transit

Impact 4.4.15 Implementation of the project will increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under cumulative conditions. This is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Bicycle & Pedestrian System

Impact 4.4.16 Implementation of the project will increase demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the City of Rancho Cordova under cumulative conditions. This is considered a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

SECTION 4.5 NOISE

Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments

Impact 4.5.6 Cumulative traffic noise levels on the roadways adjacent to or within the project area may adversely impact future noise-sensitive development within the project area. This is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Cumulative Traffic Noise

Impact 4.5.7 Project-related traffic noise level increases under cumulative conditions would not substantially alter projected cumulative conditions. Therefore, this impact is **less than cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.6 AIR QUALITY

Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors

Impact 4.6.6 Existing and future land use conditions in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin would result in cumulative impacts to air quality. The proposed project's contribution to this condition would be **cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Cumulative Water Quality

Impact 4.7.6 The project would contribute to water quality degradation in the watershed in combination with regional development. The project's contribution would be **cumulatively considerable.**

Cumulative Water Supply Impacts

Impact 4.7.7 The project, when considered with other development projects, would increase the demand for surface and groundwater supplies and would contribute to regional water supply impacts. The project's contribution to cumulative water supply impacts would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Drainage Impacts

Impact 4.7.8 Implementation of the proposed project may adversely affect local and regional drainage. The project's contribution to regional drainage impacts is considered **cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.8 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Cumulative Geologic and Soil Impacts

Impact 4.8.3 Implementation of the proposed project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development would not contribute to cumulative geologic and soil impacts, as the impacts would be site-specific and not additive in character. Thus, the project's contribution would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.9 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Cumulative Biological Resources

Impact 4.9.11 Implementation of the project, together with past, present, and probable future projects would result in a cumulatively significant loss of biological resources in the region. The project's incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact is **cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Prehistoric and Historic Resources

Impact 4.10.3 Implementation of the proposed project, along with any foreseeable development in the project vicinity, could result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources. However, surveys of the project area and project site have not identified any significant cultural resources. The project's contribution to cumulative cultural resource impacts is considered to be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Paleontological Resources

Impact 4.10.4 Implementation of the proposed project, along with any foreseeable development in the project vicinity, could result in cumulative impacts to paleontological resources. The project's contribution to this impact could be **cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.11 VISUAL RESOURCES/LIGHT AND GLARE

Cumulative Alteration to Visual Character

Impact 4.11.4 Implementation of the Preserve at Sunridge project in combination with other projects would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare in the area, and contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impact. Thus, the project's contribution to the alteration of the visual character of the area is considered to be **cumulatively considerable**.

SECTION 4.12 PUBLIC RESOURCES

Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Impact 4.12.1.2 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development, would increase the population within the SMFD service area, requiring additional fire and emergency medical services and related facilities. The project's contribution to the need for expanded fire protection services is considered **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Law Enforcement Impacts

Impact 4.12.2.3 The proposed project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development, would increase the population within the City of Rancho Cordova and surrounding areas and would require additional law enforcement services under cumulative conditions. This would be a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Cumulative Public School Impacts

Impact 4.12.3.2 The proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable development proposed in the District, would result in a cumulative increase in student enrollment at the Elk Grove Unified School District's schools which would require the construction of additional schools. The project's contribution to this impact is considered to be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Wastewater Impacts

Impact 4.12.4.2 Implementation of the project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development within SRCSD service area, would result in an increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity. The project's contribution could be **cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Water Service Impacts

Impact 4.12.5.2 The extension of existing water supply infrastructure and new water conveyance facilities would be required to adequately serve the proposed project. The project's contribution is considered to be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Solid Waste Service

Impact 4.12.6.2 The proposed project, in addition to proposed and approved projects in the region area, would generate solid waste that would require expanded collection and disposal services. The project's contribution would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Park and Recreation Demands

Impact 4.12.7.3 The proposed project and other reasonably foreseeable development would require additional park and recreation facilities in the City of Rancho Cordova. This would be a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Cumulative Electrical, Telephone, and Cable Services

Impact 4.12.8.3 Implementation of the proposed project as well as potential development in the surrounding areas would result in cumulative utility service impacts. The project's contribution would be **less than cumulatively considerable.**

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this alternatives analysis is to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Preserve at Sunridge project. This analysis evaluates alternatives that would obtain most of the basic objectives of the project, and the comparative merits of those alternatives (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[a]). In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor is it required to consider alternatives that are clearly infeasible. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) states that an alternatives analysis shall focus on those alternatives that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if they impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly.

CEQA requires an EIR to identify project alternatives and to indicate the manner in which a project's significant effects may be mitigated or avoided, but does not mandate that the EIR itself contain an analysis of the feasibility of the various project alternatives or mitigation measures that it identifies. (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21002.1, subd. (a); 21100, subd. (b)(4); Sierra Club v. County of Napa (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1503, citing San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656, 689-690.) As the lead agency, the City of Rancho Cordova bears the responsibility for the decisions that must be made before a project can go forward, including determinations of feasibility and whether the benefits of a project outweigh the significant effects the project will have on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21002.1, subds. (b) & (c), 21081.) In addition, CEQA specifically provides that in making these determinations, the City shall base its findings on substantial evidence in the record, a provision reflecting an understanding that the City Council will not limit its review to matters set forth in the EIR, but will base its decision on evidence found anywhere in the record. (Sierra Club v. County of Napa, 121 Cal.App.4th at p. 1503; citing Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.5.)

According to the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR need only examine in detail those alternatives that could feasibly meet most of the basic objectives of the project. When addressing feasibility, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to alternative sites." The State CEQA Guidelines also specify that the alternatives discussion should not be remote or speculative; however, they need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed project.

State CEQA Guidelines indicate that several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of analytical detail that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include: (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project; (2) ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. These factors would be unique for each project.

The significant environmental impacts of the project that the alternatives will seek to eliminate or reduce were determined and based upon the findings contained within each technical section evaluated in Section 4.0 of this DEIR.

- Potential exposure to groundwater contamination (Impact 4.3.2);

- Underground storage tank contamination (Impact 4.3.3);
- Traffic impacts to study roadway segments under existing, interim and cumulative year conditions (Impacts 4.4.1, 4.4.3, and 4.4.7);
- Traffic impacts to study intersections under existing, interim and cumulative year conditions (Impact 4.4.2, 4.4.8, and 4.4.13);
- Traffic impacts to freeway facilities under existing, interim and cumulative year conditions (Impact 4.4.4, 4.4.9, and 4.4.14);
- Impacts to the transit system under existing, interim and cumulative year conditions (Impact 4.4.5, 4.4.10, and 4.4.15);
- Impacts to the bicycle and pedestrian system under existing, interim and cumulative year conditions (Impact 4.4.6, 4.4.11, and 4.4.16);
- Noise-producing uses within the project area (Impact 4.5.2);
- Construction noise (Impact 4.5.4);
- Cumulative traffic noise (Impact 4.5.7);
- Construction air emissions (Impact 4.6.1 and 4.6.2);
- Operational air emissions – ozone (Impact 4.6.4);
- Cumulative air impacts (Impact 4.6.5);
- Surface water quality impacts under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.7.2, 4.7.4 and 4.7.6);
- Drainage impacts and realignment of Morrison Creek (Impact 4.7.5);
- Impacts to endangered, threatened or rare species and associated habitats under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.9.1through 4.9.4, 4.9.6 and 4.9.10);
- Loss to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (Impact 4.9.5);
- Impacts to cultural and paleontogical resources under project and cumulative conditions (Impacts 4.10.1 and 4.10.2);
- Impacts associated with light and glare (Impact 4.11.2);
- Impacts to fire protection services under cumulative conditions (Impact 4.12.1.2);
- Impacts associated with design-related safety concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2); and,
- Impacts associated with natural gas and telephone infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2).

6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

Several alternatives were considered but rejected from further analysis because they failed to meet most of the basic project objectives; they were infeasible; or unable to avoid significant environmental effects (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[c]). The following summarizes the alternatives that were considered for evaluation in the EIR but were rejected from detailed consideration.

CHARRETTE MASTER PLAN B

The design charette for the proposed project resulted in the development of several land use plans. One Plan (Charette Master Plan B) was considered by staff as an alternative in this EIR, but was rejected from further analysis because it would not reduce environmental impacts. This alternative would have resulted in the realignment of Morrison Creek into the utility transmission corridor like the proposed project. This alternative included a highly developed grid street network for internal/external connectivity and three entries to the Town Center for increased access. The large community park served as the primary feature, centered on Chrysanthy Boulevard to emphasize its regional role. The park linked the Town Center and the southeastern neighborhood. The elementary school had an east to west orientation to serve as a visual terminus. The parks were within a five-minute walk from every neighborhood combined with a recreational corridor for a larger facility. Both the City and the applicant team rejected this alternative, as it did not meet the design criteria established for the charrette, (which is a key project objective associated with the creation of a community design that meets the goals and objectives of the City of Rancho Cordova "Vision Book"). Additionally, this alternative was developed based on the same land use mix as that of the proposed project. Based on Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of this DEIR, similar significant and cumulative environmental impacts would result if this alternative were selected; therefore, Charette Master Plan B was rejected from further analysis.

OFF-SITE ALTERNATIVES

Off-site alternatives are generally evaluated in environmental documents to avoid, lessen, or eliminate the significant impacts of a project by considering the proposed development in an entirely different location. To be feasible, development of off-site locations must be able to fulfill the project purpose and meet most of the project's basic objectives. The Preserve project site represents one of the only available major undeveloped land areas within the City of Rancho Cordova and the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan area that is 530 contiguous acres and is capable of providing a Town Center, consistent with the Interim General Plan, while fulfilling the applicant's project purpose and attaining most of the basic project objectives. The project site is located within the Suncreek/Preserve Planning Area, as described in the adopted Interim General Plan Land Use Map Book. The Suncreek/Preserve Planning Area makes up approximately 1,847 acres in the southeastern portion of the City and is anticipated to hold approximately 9,830 dwelling units with an estimated residential population of 26,840 and an employment population of approximately 3,170 persons.

There are some potential off-site locations within the current city limits, including: 1) the Westborough Planning Area, encompassing approximately 1,518 acres, north of the proposed Rio Del Oro project and just south of US 50; 2) the Grant Line West Planning Area, which includes approximately 1,306 acres north of the intersection of Grant Line Road and Douglas Road, and 3) the Grant Line North Planning Area, which is south of the SDCP and north of SR 16 and includes 1,847 acres. The Westborough Planning Area is planned for the proposed Westborough project, which has an active application with the City, and the Grant Line North Planning Area is

planned for the proposed Waegell Villages project. The Grant Line West Planning Area contains some surface mining operations. Additionally, portions of the Grant Line West Planning Area are being considered for residential development (the proposed Falls project) and some of the land is under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, these sites would not be feasible alternative locations for the proposed project.

There are also planning areas outside the current city limits but within the City's potential sphere of influence that are of adequate size to accommodate the project. These areas, which are in the City's Draft Land Use Map Book, include portions of the Mather Planning Area, portions of the Jackson Planning Area, the Grant Line South Planning Area, the East Planning Area, and portions of the Aerojet Planning Area. These areas are designated for urbanized uses and are at varying stages of the planning process. Environmental constraints for these areas include, but are not limited to, mine tailings, stream bed alterations, groundwater contamination, Mather Airport safety zones, Mather Airport noise contours, vernal pools, endangered and special-status species, the presence of Sacramento Orcutt Grass, and the 100-year floodplain. Locating the proposed project on one of these offsite locations is considered infeasible due to the above-mentioned environmental constraints and the project's significant impacts would not be reduced as a result of an alternative location. Other impacts associated with these offsite locations would be new impacts associated with extending infrastructure to undeveloped areas. Roads, water, wastewater, and other services and infrastructure are not currently within the Mather, Jackson, Grant Line South, East or Aerojet Planning Areas, nor are these areas planned for development in the near future. Additionally, a portion of the East Planning Area is being considered for estate residential housing (the proposed Cordova Hills project).

There is substantial land within the County's Urban Services Boundary (USB), east to northwest of Grant Line Road, and east of the North Vineyard and Vineyard Springs areas. However, all of these areas are outside of the current Urban Policy Area (UPA) and it is contrary to Sacramento County General Plan policy to assume or approve development beyond its existing UPA boundaries. Development proposals in these areas are subject to Sacramento County Board of Supervisor appeal and approval, based on specific findings set forth in the General Plan and current County General Plan policies do not allow the acceptance of development applications for these areas.

Implementation of an off-site alternative would conflict with planned development pattern of the area and would be inconsistent with several project objectives and proposed land uses policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, the Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan, and the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan. Additionally, an off-site alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

6.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Based on the environmental analysis in Section 4.0 of this DEIR, the project's alternatives were developed to provide decision-makers with a reasonable range of alternatives with which to compare to the proposed project. The following alternative scenarios were selected for evaluation in this analysis.

ALTERNATIVE 1 - No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative

ALTERNATIVE 2 – No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative

ALTERNATIVE 3 – Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative

ALTERNATIVE 4 – Existing Morrison Creek Alternative

ALTERNATIVE 5 – Blueprint Alternative

ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO PROJECT: EXISTING LAND USES ALTERNATIVE

The "No Project" alternative is required by *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(e). A no project alternative is required to examine the impacts which might occur if the site is left in its present condition, as well as what may be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under Alternative 1 - No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative, the project site's existing agricultural designations (AG-80) would remain in place and the site would remain as grazing land with rural residences. Implementation of the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would eliminate the majority of environmental impacts identified in each technical section included in Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of this EIR. There would be fewer environmental impacts resulting from this alternative than from the proposed project. However, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives identified in Section 3.0 (Project Description).

Comparative Analysis

Land Use

As identified in Section 4.1 (Land Use), the proposed project would not result in any significant land use or compatibility related impacts. Implementation of the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would also result in similar less than significant land use impacts.

Population/Housing/Employment

Section 4.2 of the EIR did not contain any significant impacts for population, housing or employment. However, because the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would result in a significant impact on population, housing and employment, a discussion of the impact is provided below.

Population, Housing and Employment Increases (Impact 4.2.1)

Implementation of the Preserve project would not result in population and housing increases that exceed regional population and growth projections (based on Census 2000 and SACOG growth assumptions). This was considered less than significant for the proposed project. However, implementation of the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative may result in a potentially significant effect on regionally projected growth due to the fact that housing and employment growth would have to be provided for elsewhere, and the potential environmental impacts of such growth occurring elsewhere are unknown.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative is provided below for each significant hazards and hazardous materials impact identified in Section 4.3 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials).

Potential Exposure to Groundwater Contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

No existing wells, septic tanks, leach lines, and cisterns would be removed under the No Project – Existing Land Uses alternative. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would leave the area undeveloped and uninhabited; therefore, exposure to groundwater contamination would be unlikely. However, due to the unknown nature and condition of the site, there is the potential of existing on-site tanks, leach-lines, and/or cisterns to result in potentially significant groundwater contamination impacts. This impact is considered potentially significant if this alternative were implemented. This alternative would result in potentially significant groundwater impacts, like the proposed project.

Underground Storage Tank Contamination (Impact 4.3.3)

There may be undiscovered underground storage tanks (USTs) on the project site that have the potential to contaminate soils and/or groundwater. The Phase I indicated that there was no evidence of USTs discovered during the site survey; however, it is possible that USTs are present in the project area and may be encountered during the grading, excavation, and site preparation activities required for project and potentially significant impacts would result. If encountered, these tanks would be removed under the proposed project. Under the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative, any USTs would remain undiscovered and could result in groundwater and/or soil contamination; therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant for this alternative.

Transportation and Circulation

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

Baseline Plus Project Conditions:

Roadway Segment Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.1)

Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on a deficiently operating roadways located within the project area (see Table 4.4-10). This would be a significant impact for the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions will result in the following impacts to study area roadways:

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,000 vehicles per day to Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and would cause the LOS to change from LOS E to LOS F. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.18, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments

operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 1,800 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.09, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not generate additional vehicle trips over baseline conditions; therefore, this alternative would not contribute to already unacceptable conditions at the above study intersections and less than significant impacts would result.

Intersection Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.2)

Implementation of the proposed project would cause in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at study intersections under Baseline conditions resulting in a significant impact (see Table 4.4-11).

The following intersections would be significantly impacted:

- SR 16/Excelsior Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS E with a V/C ratio of 0.99 in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Eagles Nest Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle for the southbound approach in the AM and PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase delay on this approach by more than 5 seconds during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Grant Line Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a V/C ratio of 1.19 in the AM peak hour under Base Year conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the AM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Grant Line Road. Implementation of the proposed project would cause LOS F operations at this intersection with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the AM peak hour and would cause LOS E operations in the PM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Sunrise Boulevard. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F under Baseline conditions during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.18 and 1.09, respectively. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more

than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.33 and 1.43, respectively, under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Grant Line Road/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the delay at the intersection by more than 5 seconds during the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not generate vehicle trips over baseline conditions; therefore, this alternative would not contribute to already unacceptable conditions at the above study intersections and less than significant impacts would result.

Roadway Impacts on Sunrise Boulevard (Impact 4.4.3)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential unit threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan (see **Table 4.4-12**). This is a significant impact. As indicated, the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not generate vehicle trips over baseline conditions. Additionally, this alternative would not contribute to already unacceptable conditions on Sunrise Boulevard and no impacts would result.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under Baseline conditions (see **Table 4.4-13** and **Table 4.4-14**). This is considered a significant impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not generate additional vehicle trips over baseline conditions or contribute to already unacceptable conditions on US 50 under Interim Conditions and no impacts would result.

Transit System Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.5)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not increase the demand for transit service in the City under baseline conditions and no impacts would result.

Interim Year (2014) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.7)

Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable (LOS E and F) operations on Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and on Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The segment of Mather Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.13 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add

2,500 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.14, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Similarly, The segment of Sunrise Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS E with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.98 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add about 2,000 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions (see **Table 4.4-15**). This would be a significant impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not generate additional vehicle trips over baseline conditions or contribute to unacceptable conditions on the above roadway segments under Interim (2014) Conditions and no impacts would result.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.8)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at under Interim Year (2014) conditions resulting in a significant impact (see **Table 4.4-16**). The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not generate additional vehicle trips or contribute to unacceptable conditions at the above study intersections under Interim (2014) Conditions and no impacts would result.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.9)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under Interim Year (2014) conditions (see **Table 4.4-17** and **4.4-18**). This is considered a significant impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not generate additional vehicle trips over baseline conditions or contribute to already unacceptable conditions on US 50 under Interim (2014) Conditions and no impacts would result.

Transit System Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.10)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Interim Year (2014) conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not increase the demand for transit service in the City under Interim (2014) Conditions and no impacts would result.

Cumulative Year (2030) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.12)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways as well as trigger some roadways to exceed the City's LOS D standards located within the project area under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios (see **Table 4.4-19** and **Table 4.4-20**). This is considered a significant impact. No additional vehicle trips would be added to area roadway segments if this alternative were implemented; therefore, no contribution to cumulative related impacts would result and less than cumulatively considerable impacts would be anticipated.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.13)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or

greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios (see Table 4.4-21 and Table 4.4-22). This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project. No additional vehicle trips would be added to area intersections if this alternative were implemented and no contribution to cumulative impacts on those intersections identified above would occur; therefore, less than cumulatively considerable impacts would be anticipated.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.14)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under cumulative conditions. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project (see **Table 4.4-23** through **Table 4.4-24**). Implementation of the No Project - Existing Land Uses would not increase vehicle trips on area roadways, thus, would not contribute or exacerbate unacceptable conditions in either direction on US 50 under cumulative conditions and less than cumulatively considerable impacts would result.

Transit System Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.15)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Baseline conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not increase the demand for transit service in the City under cumulative conditions and less than cumulatively considerable impacts would result.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.5 (Noise).

Noise-Producing Uses Located Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.2)

The proposed project would place residential units adjacent to commercial uses, which could potentially expose the residences to noises exceeding noise level standards set by the City of Rancho Cordova. If this Alternative were implemented, neither the commercial nor the residential units would be built; therefore, no new noise-producing sources would be introduced and no impacts would occur.

Cumulative Noise-Producing Uses Located Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.6)

Cumulative traffic noise levels on the roadways adjacent to or within the project area may adversely impact future noise-sensitive development within the project area. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project. Because this alternative would result in no sensitive land uses, no noise impacts would occur under cumulative conditions and less than cumulatively considerable impacts would result.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.6 (Air Quality).

Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter (Impact 4.6.1)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in temporarily increased Particulate Matter levels in the immediate vicinity during construction. This is considered a significant impact. No construction activities would occur if this alternative were implemented; therefore, no particulate matter impacts would result.

Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide (Impact 4.6.2)

The proposed project would result in 652.67 pounds per day of NOx during construction activities, which exceeds the SMAQMD significance threshold of 85 pounds per day. This is considered a significant impact. No construction activities would occur if the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative were implemented; therefore, no nitrogen oxide related impacts would result.

Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.4)

Operational air quality impacts associated with the project would exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds for both ROG and NOx. The project would generate a total of 352.2 pounds per day of ROG and 262.6 pounds per day of NOx. SMAQMD's thresholds for ROG and NOx are 65 pounds per day. This is considered a significant impact. If this alternative were implemented, no development or project operation would occur; therefore, no ozone precursor impacts would result.

Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.6)

Existing and future land use conditions in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin would result in cumulative impacts to air quality. The proposed project's contribution to this condition would be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not contribute to cumulative air quality; therefore, less than cumulatively considerable impacts would result.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Surface Water Quality (Impact 4.7.2)

The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface in the area and produce urbanized runoff, which may affect surface water quality. This impact was considered potentially significant for the proposed project. If this alternative were implemented, the topography and surface area of the project site would remain unchanged from its current undeveloped state and no surface water quality impacts would be expected.

Construction Impacts (Impact 4.7.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would require extensive grading for site preparation for building pads and trenching for the placement of infrastructure. These construction activities may result in short-term water quality degradation and potentially significant impacts. No

construction activities would occur if this alternative were implemented. The site would remain in its present condition and no impacts would result.

Drainage (Impact 4.7.5)

Development of the proposed project and the proposed realignment of the existing Morrison Creek corridor would increase drainage rates on the project site and may result in on-site and off-site drainage and flooding related impacts. This is considered a potentially significant impact for the proposed project. The project site is located in the center of the SDCP area and is considered in local drainage plans for interim and ultimate conditions for full development of the entire SDCP area. It is likely that at least some of the drainage facilities required for the larger SDCP area would be constructed on the project site if this alternative were implemented. However, this alternative would not change on-site drainage patterns or increase the permeability of the site; therefore, no impacts would occur.

Cumulative Water Quality (Impact 4.7.6)

Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved and proposed development in the area may degrade water quality due to the deposition of pollutants generated from construction and operational activities and result in a potentially significant cumulative impact. If this alternative were implemented, local water quality would still be affected by surrounding projects; however, the total cumulative impact would be reduced and considered less than cumulatively considerable.

Geology and Soils

As identified in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils), the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to geology and soils. Implementation of the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would result in no impacts to geology or soils.

Biological Resources

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

Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.1)

The proposed project would result in the loss of 455 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat. These are considered significant impacts. If this alternative were implemented, these habitats would generally remain in their current undisturbed state and no impacts would occur.

Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.2)

The proposed project would result in potentially significant indirect adverse effects to habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species. This alternative would keep these habitats generally untouched, individual species would not be affected, and no indirect impacts would occur.

Loss of Habitat (Impact 4.9.3)

The proposed project could affect foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife (other than Swainson's hawk), resulting in potentially significant impacts. If this alternative were implemented, these habitats would generally remain in their current undisturbed state and no loss of habitat related impacts would occur.

Loss of Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool Community (Impact 4.9.4)

The proposed project would result significant impacts due to the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools. If this alternative were implemented, the on-site vernal pools would remain intact and undisturbed and no impacts would occur.

Loss of Jurisdictional Waters (Impact 4.9.5)

The proposed project would result in the filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands, which is a significant impact. If this alternative were implemented, the on-site protected waters would remain in their current state and no loss or impacts would occur.

Effect to Movement Corridor (Impact 4.9.6)

The proposed project would interfere with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp, resulting in significant impacts. As previously indicated, if this alternative were implemented, the on-site vernal pools would remain unchanged, the vernal pool tadpole shrimp's movement would not be impeded and no impacts would result.

Cumulative Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.10)

The proposed project, along with proposed and/or approved projects in the area, would result in cumulatively significant losses of biological resources in the area. If this alternative were implemented the biological resource losses would be reduced due the project area remaining undisturbed. However, the adjacent and surrounding properties would still be developed and contribute to cumulative biological resource losses, but this alternative's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Cultural Resources

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

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

The proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts due to the disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric, historic resources and human remains. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would leave the project site undisturbed and in its present condition; therefore, no impacts to unknown or undiscovered resources or remains would occur.

Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.2)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result in potentially significant impacts. As indicated, no disturbance of the land

would occur if the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative were implemented; therefore, no impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources would result.

Visual Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative is provided below for each significant visual impact identified in Section 4.11 (Visual Resources).

Light and Glare (Impact 4.11.2)

The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the area resulting in potentially significant impacts. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not involve the construction of these light sources, the area would remain in its current undeveloped state, and no impacts would occur.

Public Services and Utilities

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative is provided below for each significant public services and utilities impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services and Utilities).

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.1)

The proposed project would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services resulting in potentially significant impacts. This alternative would keep the current land uses intact and would not increase the need for fire protection or emergency related services; therefore, no impacts would result.

Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)

The proposed project, combined with other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. This is considered a potentially significant cumulative impact. If this alternative were implemented, the project site would not be developed. This alternative would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services.

Design-Related Safety Concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2)

The design of land uses in the proposed project could significantly affect the police department's ability to serve the area. If the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative were implemented, the site would remain undeveloped and no safety related impacts would result.

Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2)

The proposed project would require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure. This is considered potentially significant for the project. Implementation of the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not require natural gas, cable or telephone infrastructure and no impacts would occur.

ALTERNATIVE 2 - NO PROJECT: APPROVED SUNRISE DOUGLAS COMMUNITY LAND USE PLAN

The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative reflects the land uses approved by Sacramento County for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan (SDCP) on the project

site. The Sunrise Douglas Community Plan (SDCP) does not assign land uses to individual parcels. Rather, the conceptual land use mix was established in subareas (villages) to evaluate the total environmental effect of developing the entire Community Plan area. The conceptual land uses and associated acreages represent the maximum allowable densities and residential units for each conceptual village. The Preserve at Sunridge falls within portions of Villages C and F in the SDCP. This alternative assumes the remainder of Villages C and F minus the proposed and approved uses in Lot J, Sunridge Park, and a portion of SunCreek Specific Plan.

The boundaries of the SDCP Village C include the proposed Lot J project and the approved Sunridge Park project. Village C (as approved by Sacramento County) included a total of 445.6 acres, including 1,557 low-density residential units on 340 acres, 240 medium-density residential units on 12 acres, and 110 residential units within the commercial/office designation, as well as 60 acres of commercial and office use, 22.6 acres of parks and recreation, and 11.1 acres of elementary school. Together, Lot J and Sunridge Park projects would include 264.5 acres of low-density residential and 1,315 units, 2 acres of commercial, 17.3 acres of parks and recreation and a 10-acre elementary school, as well as a 6.4-acre wetland preserve, a 10-acre SMUD substation, and 14 acres of detention for a total of 324 acres. This would leave 75 acres of low-density residential, 12 acres of medium-density residential, 60 acres of commercial, and 5.3 acres of parks within the Village C boundaries on the Preserve at Sunridge project site (e.g., north of Chrysanthy Boulevard). However, the exact acreages and unit counts are impossible to allocate within this alternative due to the land use changes that have occurred since the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan was approved in 2002.

The boundaries of the SDCP Village F include a portion of the proposed SunCreek Specific Plan. Village F (as approved by Sacramento County) included 540 acres, including 1,756 low-density residential units on 424.2 acres, 216 medium-density residential units on 10.8 acres, 33 acres of commercial and office, 12 acres of parks and recreation, and a 60-acre junior and senior high school site. The portion of the proposed SunCreek Specific Plan that falls within Village F includes approximately 207 low-density residential units on 46 acres, 220 medium-density residential units on 11 acres, 26.6 acres of wetland preserve, and a 77-acre junior and senior high school site. This would leave 334 acres of low-density residential and 12 acres of park in the Village F boundaries on the Preserve at Sunridge project site (e.g., south of Chrysanthy Boulevard). However, as noted below, the exact acreages and unit counts are impossible to allocate within this alternative due to the land use changes that have occurred since the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan was approved in 2002.

The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative includes the remainder of the acreages and unit counts specified by the SDCP for Villages C and F; however, several things have changed since the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors approved the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan in 2002. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has required on-site wetland preserves on Sunridge Park and the proposed SunCreek Specific Plan. SMUD has required a 10-acre substation on the Sunridge Park site. Additionally, the Elk Grove Unified School District has required an 11-acre school on the Preserve at Sunridge project site and an elementary school site on the Sunridge Park site. Therefore, this alternative is not an exact representation of the approved SDCP. As shown in **Table 6.0-1** below, this alternative includes 1,286 low-density residential units on 272 acres, 240 medium-density residential units on 12 acres, 110 residential units within the commercial and offices area, 60 acres of commercial and office uses, 17.3 acres of parks and recreation, 23 acres of detention, an 11-acre elementary school site, 35 acres of utility corridor, and 99.5 acres of roads. This alternative also includes the realignment of Morrison Creek into the utility corridor. A visual representation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is illustrated in **Figure 6.0-1**.

TABLE 6.0-1
NO PROJECT: APPROVED SUNRISE DOUGLAS COMMUNITY PLAN LAND USE ALLOCATIONS

Land Use	Village C		Village F		Combined Villages C & F	
	Acres	Dwellings	Acres	Dwellings	Total Acres	Total Dwellings
Low Density Residential (1-12 du/ac)	75.0	398	197.3	888	272.3	1,286
Medium Density Residential (20 du/ac)	12.0	240	0	0	12.0	240
Commercial and Offices	48.0	110	12.0	0	60.0	110
Recreation (Park)	5.3	-	12.0	-	17.3	-
Drainage Way/ Open Space	0	-	0	-	0	-
Approved Wetland Preserve	0	-	0	-	0	-
Elementary School	11.0	-	0	-	11.0	-
Junior and Senior High School	0	-	0	-	0	-
Roads	42.5	-	57.0	-	99.5	-
Detention	6.0	-	17.0	-	23.0	-
Utility Corridor	14.1	-	20.9	-	35.0	-
Total	**213.9**	**855**	**316.2**	**875**	**530.1**	**1,636**

Note: This alternative is based on Plate PD-16, Conceptual Land Use Allocation Matrix for the Specific Plan and Community Plan Areas (revised 7/23/97) from the adopted Sunrise Douglas Community Plan. The Conceptual Land Use Allocation Matrix for the Specific Plan and Community Plan Areas allocates approximately 134 acres to low-density residential and 47 acres to commercial uses in Village C and approximately 264 acres to low-density residential and 32 acres to commercial uses in Village F. This alternative subtracts the proposed Lot J, approved Sunridge Park, and proposed SunCreek Specific Plan acreages and unit counts. This alternative also includes detention, roads and utility corridors, which were not considered or allocated in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan or Land Use Allocation Matrix. This alternative includes 23 acres of detention and subtracts the 23 acres from the commercial areas. This alternative also includes 70 acres of roads and 35 acres of utility corridor, which are subtracted from the low-density residential acreage.

FIGURE 6.0-1

Comparative Analysis

Land Use

As identified in Section 4.1 (Land Use), the proposed project would not result in any significant land use or compatibility related impacts. Implementation of this alternative may result in a land use plan that conflicts with the requirements of the federal Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and other relevant environmental statutes but similar less than significant land use impacts would be anticipated. Other issue areas and environmental impacts related to this alternative are discussed in the comparative analysis for each technical area below.

Population/Housing/Employment

Section 4.2 of the EIR did not contain any significant impacts for population, housing or employment. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include fewer dwelling units less and subsequent population increases; however, this alternative would increase the commercial acreage and generate more employment opportunities than the proposed project. Considering the dwelling unit totals and population increases associated with this alternative, similar less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment would result relative to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is provided below for each significant hazards and hazardous materials impact identified in Section 4.3 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials).

Potential Exposure to Groundwater Contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Due to past activities in the area, the potential for exposure to contaminated groundwater exists and was considered potentially significant for the proposed project. Implementation of this alternative would include the removal of any existing wells, septic tanks, leach lines, and cisterns that are discovered during construction activities. If not properly handled, the removal of these items could result in groundwater contamination and similar impacts relative to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3.2 ensures that all these potential sources of contamination are removed in accordance with Sacramento County Environmental Health Department Standards and would reduce this impact under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative to less than significant.

Underground Storage Tank Contamination (Impact 4.3.3)

There may be undiscovered underground storage tanks (USTs) on the project site that have the potential to contaminate soils and/or groundwater. The Phase I indicated that there was no evidence of USTs discovered during the site survey; however, it is possible that USTs are present in the project area and may be encountered during the grading, excavation, and site preparation activities required for project and potentially significant impacts would result. If encountered, these tanks would be removed under the proposed project. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would result in similar groundwater and/or soil contamination impacts as those identified for the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3.3 requires the removal of all USTs and would reduce this impact to less than significant for the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative.

Transportation and Circulation

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

Baseline Plus Project Conditions:

Roadway Segment Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.1)

Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on a deficiently operating roadway located within the project area (see Table 4.4-10). This would be a significant impact for the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the following impacts to study area roadways:

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,000 vehicles per day to Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and would cause the LOS to change from LOS E to LOS F. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.18, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 1,800 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.09, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would reduce vehicle trip generation associated with the residential uses by approximately 40 percent; however, this alternative would increase the vehicle trip generation associated with the commercial uses by 63 percent during the AM peak hours and approximately 83 percent during the PM peak hours due to the increase in commercial acreage. Although this alternative would result in fewer residential trips, the substantial increase in commercial acreage associated with this alternative would generate more daily vehicle trips than the proposed project; therefore, the roadway segments would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions and the volume-to-capacity ratios would most likely increase by greater than 0.05 if this alternative were implemented. Although commercial trips would be increased under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative, the improvements associated with mitigation measures MM 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b, and 4.4.1d would reduce roadway segment impacts on Femoyer, Mather Boulevard, Zinfandel Drive, Douglas Road, and Sunrise Boulevard to less than significant

under Baseline Conditions. However, impacts to roadway segments on Sunrise Boulevard (i.e., between White Rock Road and Folsom Boulevard) would remain significant and unavoidable even if mitigation measure MM 4.4.1c were implemented.

Intersection Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.2)

Implementation of the proposed project would cause the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at study intersections under Baseline conditions resulting in a significant impact (see Table 4.4-11).

The following intersections would be significantly impacted:

- SR 16/Excelsior Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS E with a V/C ratio of 0.99 in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Eagles Nest Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle for the southbound approach in the AM and PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase delay on this approach by more than 5 seconds during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Grant Line Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a V/C ratio of 1.19 in the AM peak hour under Base Year conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the AM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Grant Line Road. Implementation of the proposed project would cause LOS F operations at this intersection with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the AM peak hour and would cause LOS E operations in the PM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Sunrise Boulevard. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F under Baseline conditions during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.18 and 1.09, respectively. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.33 and 1.43, respectively, under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Grant Line Road/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the delay at the intersection by more than 5 seconds during the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would reduce vehicle trip generation associated with the residential uses by approximately 40 percent and increase the vehicle trip generation associated with the commercial uses by 63 percent during the AM peak hour and 83 percent during the PM peak hours due to the increase in commercial acreage. This alternative would still generate over 2,400 daily trips during PM peak hours, which would exacerbate unacceptable operations at the study intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-11** and may cause a LOS decrease at other study area intersections. This alternative would generate more daily vehicle trips than the proposed project, and while implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.2a through 4.4.2g, which require fair-share participation for intersection improvements, would assist in reducing unacceptable conditions, impacts to these facilities would remain significant and unavoidable if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented.

Roadway Impacts on Sunrise Boulevard (Impact 4.4.3)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential unit threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan (see **Table 4.4-12**). This is a significant impact. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would reduce vehicle trip generation associated with the residential uses by approximately 40 percent but increase the vehicle trip generation associated with the commercial uses by 63 percent during the AM peak hours and 83 percent during the PM peak hours. This alternative would contribute to already unacceptable conditions on Sunrise Boulevard and result in significant impacts on this facility to an equal or greater degree than the proposed project due to the larger commercial area. Mitigation measure MM 4.4.3 requires the construction of the Sunrise Boulevard reliever and associated interchange with U.S. 50 to relieve unacceptable conditions on Sunrise Boulevard; However, significant and unavoidable impacts would result even if mitigation measures MM 4.4.3 were implemented in association with the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under Baseline conditions (see **Table 4.4-13** and **Table 4.4-14**). This is considered a significant impact. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would reduce vehicle trip generation associated with the residential uses by approximately 40 percent; however, this alternative would increase the vehicle trip generation associated with the commercial uses by 63 percent during the AM peak hours and 83 percent during the PM peak hours. The increase in peak hour trips as a result of this alternative would contribute to already unacceptable conditions on US 50 to an equal or greater degree than the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in relieving unacceptable conditions on U.S. 50 if applied to the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative; however, impacts to this facility would remain significant and unavoidable.

Transit System Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.5)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include the construction of 1,636 low-density and medium-density dwelling units and approximately 60 acres designated for commercial uses. The increase in dwelling units, the proximity of the commercial uses in relation to the overall

SDCP area, and additional employment opportunities generated as a result of this alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the area under Baseline conditions and potentially significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5, which requires fair-share transit contributions, would reduce transit related impacts to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Interim Year (2014) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.7)

Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable (LOS E and F) operations on Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and on Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The segment of Mather Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.13 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add 2,500 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.14, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Similarly, The segment of Sunrise Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS E with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.98 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add about 2,000 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions (see **Table 4.4-15**). This would be a significant impact. As previously indicated, this alternative would reduce the residential trip generation by approximately 40 percent but would increase the commercial by 63 percent when compared with the proposed project. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would generate more vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours than the proposed project and contribute to unacceptable conditions on the above roadway segments under Interim Conditions, resulting in significant impacts to these facilities. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.7, which requires improvements to Sunrise Boulevard and the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road intersection, would reduce impacts to less than significant under interim conditions if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.8)

Implementation of the proposed project in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at under Interim Year (2014) conditions resulting in a significant impact. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would exacerbate unacceptable conditions at the five study intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-16** and would contribute to adverse changes at other intersections under Interim Conditions. Due to the increase in daily traffic from the additional commercial acreage associated with this alternative (approximately 673 daily trips during AM peak hours and approximately 2,443 trips during the PM peak hours over the proposed project totals) the significant impacts to these intersections would be greater than that identified for the proposed project. While the improvements associated with mitigation measures MM 4.4.8a through 4.4.8e would assist in improving conditions at these intersections, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur under this alternative, even if these measures were implemented.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.9)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. This is considered a significant impact. The commercial portion of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would add approximately 673 daily trips during AM peak hours and approximately 2,443 trips during the PM peak hours. This alternative's residential component would also add over 20,000 daily vehicle trips, which would contribute to already unacceptable conditions on US 50 under Interim Conditions and significant impacts would result (see **Table 4.4-17** and **Table 4.4-18**). Due to the larger commercial area associated with this alternative, impacts to this facility would be greater relative to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in reducing impacts to this facility; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.10)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Interim Year (2014) conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under Interim Conditions and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of this alternative would include the construction of 1,636 low-density and medium-density dwelling units and approximately 60 acres designated for commercial uses. The increase in dwelling units, the proximity of the commercial uses in relation to the overall SDCP area, and additional employment opportunities generated as a result of this alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the area and potentially significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would mitigate this impact to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Cumulative Year (2030) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.12)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways as well as trigger some roadways to exceed the City's LOS D standards located within the project area under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact. As indicated above, implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would generate more daily vehicle trips than the proposed project and contribute to greater cumulatively considerable impacts on those study area roadway segments. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.12a, which requires the construction of the Hazel extension to Grant Line Road, would assist in relieving cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would remain on Mather Road if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.12b and 4.4.12c would reduce impacts to Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard (Jaeger Road to Americanos Boulevard) to less than significant if this alternative were implemented. Mitigation measures MM 4.4.12d through 4.4.12f would assist in reducing cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, cumulative impacts to the identified segments would remain significant and unavoidable if this alternative were implemented.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.13)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would contribute to unacceptable operating conditions at the study intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-21** and **Table 4.4-22** and result in greater cumulatively considerable impacts to these facilities relative to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.13a through MM 4.4.13g and MM 4.4.13i would assist improving conditions at affected intersections under cumulative conditions; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur if this alternative were implemented due to the increase in daily traffic volumes when compared to the proposed project. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.13h would reduce cumulative impacts to the intersection at Chrysanthy Boulevard and Jaeger Road to less than significant under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative scenario.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.14)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under cumulative conditions. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project (see **Table 4.4-23** through **Table 4.4-26**). Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would increase vehicle trips on area roadways and contribute to or exacerbate unacceptable conditions in both directions on US 50 to a greater extent than the proposed project and cumulatively considerable impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in minimizing this impact; however, cumulative freeway mainline impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if this alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.15)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Baseline conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under cumulative conditions and cumulatively considerable impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would reduce cumulative transit system impacts to less than significant if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.5 (Noise).

Noise-Producing Uses Located Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.2)

The proposed project would place residential units adjacent to commercial uses, which could potentially expose the residences to noises exceeding noise level standards set by the City of Rancho Cordova. The Town Center and commercial portions of the No Project: Approved

Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would be significantly larger than the proposed project. This alternative would have 72 percent more commercial acreage than the proposed project. Approximately 28 acres would be located at the intersection of Chrysanthy Boulevard and Jaeger Road and another 32 acres would be located along Chrysanthy Boulevard near Americanos Road. This alternative would have more noise producing sources associated with the commercial uses (i.e., dock activities and mechanized equipment) than the proposed project, which would result in significant impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.5.2a through 4.5.2e would reduce the noise-producing uses within the project area associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Construction Noise Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.4)

Project construction activities would generate noise levels in excess of established noise standards. Construction of the proposed project would elevate noise levels within the project area, and would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet, which is considered a potentially significant impact. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would involve construction and site preparation activities, elevating temporary noise levels on the project site. The temporary noise increases may exceed City standards and potentially significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.5.4, which addresses construction related noise impacts, would reduce the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative's construction noise impacts to less than significant.

Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments (Impact 4.5.7)

Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels on the roadways adjacent to or within the Plan Area may adversely impact future noise-sensitive development in the project site. Future traffic noise levels at a distance of 75 feet from the future Jaeger Road are predicted to exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas for the proposed project. In addition, noise levels at residences located adjacent to Chrysanthy Boulevard (the main east west arterial) may exceed the City's noise level standards should future traffic volumes on that roadway exceed 5,000 vehicles per day. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include the construction of residences along Chrysanthy Boulevard and, like the proposed project, may expose residents of these properties to noise levels in excess of established City standards. This alternative would have a reduced number of residential units; however, it would contribute to cumulatively considerable traffic noise impacts in the area. If this alternative were implemented, mitigation measures MM 4.5.7a through 4.5.7c would reduce cumulative traffic noise related impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.6 (Air Quality).

Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter (Impact 4.6.1)

The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in particulate matter, both PM10 and PM2.5. Short-term exposure to diesel particulate is not considered a serious health risk. However, uncontrolled dust emissions during construction have the potential to exceed the local ambient air quality standards and result in nuisance complaints. The proposed project would result in

652.7 pounds per day of particulate matter during construction activities, which exceeds the SMAQMD significance threshold of 85 pounds per day. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include construction activities associated with diesel-powered vehicles and equipment and generate approximately 17 percent more construction emissions due to the lack of a wetland preserve area; therefore, construction PM emission impacts from this alternative would be potentially significant. Mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide (Impact 4.6.2)

The proposed project would result in 652.67 pounds per day of NOx during construction activities, which exceeds the SMAQMD significance threshold of 85 pounds per day. This is considered a significant impact. Construction activities associated with the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would disturb a larger area than the proposed project (approximately 17 percent more) due to the lack of a wetland preserve; therefore, result in the exceedance of SMAQMDs threshold for NO_x from construction vehicles and equipment and potentially significant NO_x construction related impacts. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would reduce this alternative's NOx related construction emissions to less than significant.

Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.4)

Operational air quality impacts associated with the project would exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds for both ROG and NOx. The project would generate a total of 352.2 pounds per day of ROG and 262.6 pounds per day of NOx. SMAQMD's thresholds for ROG and NOx are 65 pounds per day. As indicated, this alternative does not include a wetland preserve area; therefore, would disturb more acreage than the proposed project. Implementation of this alternative would increase ROG and NOx operational related emissions, relative to the proposed project, by approximately 17 percent, due to the increase of developable acreage and result in approximately 292 pounds per day of ROG and approximately 218 pounds per day of NOx, which are both in excess of SMAQMD standards. An air quality plan would be required for the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative, which would reduce estimated project regional emissions but not to levels below the SMAQMD thresholds of significance for ozone precursors; therefore, significant impacts would result. There is no feasible measure to mitigate this impact to acceptable levels and significant and unavoidable operational ozone precursor impacts would result if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented. The Air Quality Impact Evaluation, which includes the URBEMIS modeling of the project's construction and operational emissions, is included as **Appendix 4.4**.

Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.6)

The proposed project would contribute to regional emissions of ozone precursors that could impact air quality attainment efforts for ozone. Existing and future land use conditions in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin would result in cumulative impacts to air quality. The proposed project's contribution to this condition would be cumulatively considerable. As discussed in impacts 4.6.1, 4.6.2, and 4.6.4, implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would exceed SMAQMDs thresholds for both construction and operational emissions and result in cumulatively considerable impacts. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.4 would reduce project impacts by a minimum of 15 percent. This would reduce estimated project regional emissions but not to levels below the SMAQMD

thresholds of significance for ozone precursors. There are no available mitigation measures that could reduce regional emissions required to attain the SMAQMD thresholds or completely off-set this alternative's cumulative contribution to air pollution. This alternatives contribution to regional emissions would remain cumulatively considerable.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Surface Water Quality (Impact 4.7.2)

The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface in the area and produce urbanized runoff, which may affect surface water quality. This impact was considered potentially significant for the proposed project. As indicated, no wetland preserve areas were included in the approved SDCP mix of land uses. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would increase the amount of impervious surfaces when compared to the proposed project. The increased impervious surface areas would generate urbanized runoff, resulting in potentially significant impacts. Mitigation measures 4.7.2a through 4.7.2d, which requires stormwater quality source and treatment measures, would reduce surface water quality impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Construction Impacts (Impact 4.7.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would require extensive grading for site preparation for building pads and trenching for the placement of infrastructure. These construction activities may result in short-term water quality degradation and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would require extensive site preparation activities, which would include the compaction of soils by heavy equipment, reduce the infiltration capacity of the on-site soils, and increase runoff leaving the site. Additionally, this alternative would also require off-site infrastructure improvements to serve the project and potentially significant construction water quality impacts would result. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required as part of Mitigation measure MM 4.7.4, which would reduce the construction water quality impacts associated with the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative to less than significant.

Drainage (Impact 4.7.5)

The proposed project includes changing local drainage patterns as well as moving the Morrison Creek corridor. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include realignment of Morrison Creek into the utility corridor, which would include filling Morrison Creek and conveying stormwater and summer flows in a man-made channel that would connect to the Anatolia detention basin. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would require extensive drainage improvements, which would result in potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.7.5 would ensure that the drainage impacts associated with this alternative are reduced to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Water Quality (Impact 4.7.6)

Pollutants generated by both construction and operation of the proposed project and other planned and/or approved projects in the vicinity would affect water quality. The No Project:

Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would result in similar water quality impacts as the proposed project. There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and implementation of this alternative would contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area.

Geology and Soils

As identified in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils), the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to geology and soils. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts to geology and soils.

Biological Resources

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

Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.1)

The proposed project would result in the loss of 455 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat. These are considered significant impacts. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative does not include a wetland preserve area or natural open space areas. This alternative would result in greater direct impacts to Swainson's hawk (495 acres), vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat (19.4 acres) and vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat (21 acres) than the proposed project, thus resulting in significant impacts. Even with implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented.

Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.2)

The proposed project would result in potentially significant indirect effects to habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species (i.e., Off-site vernal pool branchiopod habitat and on-site vernal pool branchiopod habitat). Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would increase the amount of acreage disturbed when compared to the proposed project (495 acres versus 455 acres). Even if mitigation measures MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, the reduction in preserved acreage associated with this alternative would result in significant indirect impacts to these species.

Loss of Habitat (Impact 4.9.3)

The proposed project could affect foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife (other than Swainson's hawk), resulting in potentially significant impacts. More habitat acreage would be disturbed under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative when compared to the proposed project (495 acres versus 455 acres) because this alternative does not include a wetland preserve or natural open space area; therefore, potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b will reduce the loss of habitat impacts associated with the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative to a less than significant level.

Loss of Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool Community (Impact 4.9.4)

The proposed project would result significant impacts due to the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would result in adverse effect to on-site vernal pools and the loss of 15.39 acres of vernal pool habitat; therefore, significant impacts to this resource would result. Mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.1c and MM 4.9.2a will result in the creation, restoration, and permanent preservation of hardpan vernal pools and ensure there will be no net loss of the resource in the project's vicinity. In addition, mitigation measure MM 4.9.2b will minimize indirect effects to this community during construction and less than significant impacts loss of vernal pool community impacts would result if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented.

Loss of Jurisdictional Waters (Impact 4.9.5)

The proposed project would result in the filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands, which is a significant impact. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative does not include a wetland preserve area. Implementation of this alternative would result in the loss of 5.87 acres of jurisdictional waters, compared to 15.65 for the proposed project, resulting in significant impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce loss of jurisdictional wetlands impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Effect to Movement Corridor (Impact 4.9.6)

The proposed project would interfere with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp, resulting in significant impacts. As previously indicated, if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented, all of the on-site vernal pools would be disturbed, which would impede the movement of the fairy tadpole shrimp and greater significant and unavoidable impacts than those identified for the proposed project would result.

Cumulative Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.10)

The proposed project, along with proposed and/or approved projects in the area, would result in cumulatively significant losses of biological resources in the area. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative does not include a wetland preserve area. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would include the disturbance of the entire 530.1-acre parcel (approximately 14 percent more than the proposed project) and result in significant and cumulative considerable impacts to on-site and regional biological resources. Implementation of the biological resources mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a, MM 4.9.2b, MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce the alternative-specific direct impacts on biological resources to a less than significant level. However, on a cumulative level, the direct and indirect impacts would be considered cumulative considerable, if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented.

Cultural Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is provided below for each significant cultural impact identified in Section 4.10 (Cultural Resources).

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

The proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts due to the disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric, historic resources and human remains. The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include site preparation, which could result in the disturbance of unknown or undiscovered resources. Due to the unknown nature of these resources, the construction activities may adversely affect the integrity of undiscovered prehistoric, historic resources and human remains; therefore, potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.10.1a and MM 4.10.1b would reduce undiscovered cultural resource and human remain impacts associated with the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative to less than significant.

Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.2)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result in potentially significant impacts. The construction activities associated with the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include excavation, adversely affect on-site paleontological resources; therefore, potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.2 would reduce this alternative's potential paleontogical resource impacts to less than significant.

Visual Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is provided below for each significant visual impact identified in Section 4.11 (Visual Resources).

Light and Glare (Impact 4.11.2)

The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the area resulting in potentially significant impacts. Although the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include fewer dwelling units which would reduce light and glare, this alternative would introduce new light and glare sources on a currently undeveloped site and potentially significant impacts would occur. If the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented, Mitigation measures MM 4.11.2a and MM 4.11.2b would reduce potential light and glare impacts to less than significant.

Public Services and Utilities

A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is provided below for each significant public services and utilities impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services and Utilities).

Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)

The proposed project, combined with other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. This is considered a potentially significant cumulative impact. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would contribute to the demand for these services in the SDCP area and result in potentially cumulatively considerable impacts.

Design-Related Safety Concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2)

The design of land uses in the proposed project could significantly affect the police department's ability to serve the area. The layout and acreage of the Town Center under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. The exact layout and location of the residences under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative is not determined; however, the design features of this alternative may impede the sheriff department's ability to serve the project and potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.12.2.2a through MM 4.12.2.2e would reduce this alternative's design related safety impacts to a less than significant level.

Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2)

The proposed project would require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure. This is considered potentially significant for the project. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include the extension of existing natural gas, cable and telephone infrastructure and require new improvements to serve the associated land uses; therefore, potentially significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.12.8a and MM 4.12.8b would ensure compliance with applicable utility standards and coordination with service providers, which would reduce this alternative's potential infrastructure related impacts to less than significant.

ALTERNATIVE 3 – AQUATIC RESOURCE HABITAT ALTERNATIVE

In March through May 2004, representatives of the US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Environmental Protection Agency, and the US Army Corps of Engineers (collectively referred to as the "Agencies") met to formulate a Conceptual-Level Strategy for Avoiding, Minimizing, and Preserving Aquatic Resource Habitat in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Area (Conceptual Level Strategy). A visual representation of the Conceptual Level Strategy and associated preserve areas are illustrated in **Figure 6.0-2**. The intended result of the effort was to achieve reasonable protection and conservation of federally threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act, while taking a regional approach to avoidance and minimization of impacts of the waters of the U.S., including wetlands and vernal pools, in accordance with Section 404 (b)(1) guidelines under the Clean Water Act. (It should be noted that the Conceptual Level Strategy is not an adopted plan, has no regulatory standing and is intended as a planning tool by the participating agencies.) The Conceptual Level Strategy also sought to ensure that a viable South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) could be developed given that a large proportion of vernal pool habitat under consideration by the HCP lies within the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan area. Although Morrison Creek has been modified downstream in the adjacent Anatolia project and further downstream by Tiechert, Inc. mining operations, the portion of Morrison Creek within the project site is considered the headwaters of the system and, therefore, contains unique function and value. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would include a larger wetland preserve area than the proposed project. This alternative would increase the wetland preserve acreage from approximately 92.4 acres (for the proposed project) to approximately 225.0 acres of aquatic resources habitat along the existing Morrison Creek alignment. As indicated in **Table 6.0-2**, this alternative would keep the "Town Center" portion of the site unchanged as compared with the proposed project, remaining at approximately 17 acres. The expanded wetland preservation/open space portion of the site would comprise nearly 42.5 percent of the entire site. The preserve area boundaries roughly follow the watershed of the Morrison Creek tributary. Parks would be expanded to 37.3 acres. The detention basin at the northern corner of the site would be eliminated and the basin to the south of the Town Center would be reduced to approximately six acres. The school site would be 11 acres, like the proposed project; however, as indicated in **Figure 6.0-2**, the site would be constructed south of Chrysanthy Boulevard. The residential dwelling total for this alternative would be

2,003 units on approximately 178.7 acres based on the density ranges in RD-5, RD-7, RD-10, RD-15 and RD-30. There would be one 27-acre neighborhood park and three smaller parks serving the project.

The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would have one roadway crossing (Chrysanthy Boulevard) through the open space/wetland preserve. A small portion of Morrison Creek in the western half of the project site southeast of the commercial center would be realigned to connect with the detention basin and the outfall to the Anatolia development. This alternative would also include a stormwater drainage channel within the utility corridor, which would collect stormwater runoff and summer flows. The channel would convey the project flows and offsite flows from projects north and northeast of the site to the detention basin, where it would be treated in the onsite detention basin before being released into the detention basin in Anatolia. This alternative would require the project to retain the natural flow regime and water quality including not altering baseline flows in the receiving waters, not allowing untreated discharges to occur into existing aquatic resources, and not using aquatic resources for detention or transport of flows above current hydrology, duration, and frequency. All stormwater flows generated on-site and entering preserve boundaries would be pre-treated to reduce urban contaminants.

TABLE 6.0-2
AQUATIC RESOURCE HABITAT LAND USE SUMMARY

Land Use	Acreage (Net)	Unit Count (if applicable)
Residential		
RD-5	25.5	111
RD-7	42.1	257
RD-10	48.2	419
RD-15	52.5	793
RD-30	10.4	423
Non-Residential		
Roads	39.9	-
Commercial	17.0	-
Detention Basin	6.0	-
Wetland Preserve/Open Space	225.0	-
Parks	37.3	-
Power Line Corridor	15.2	-
School	11.0	-
Totals	**530.1**	**2,003**

Note: The unit counts in this alternative are 87 percent of their potential, which reflects a 13 percent reduction in the residential acreage to account for roadways.

Comparative Analysis

Land Use

As identified in Section 4.1 (Land Use), the proposed project would not result in any significant land use or compatibility related impacts; thus, no mitigation is necessary. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also result in similar less than significant land use impacts; however, would not be completely consistent with the land uses designated for the project site in the adopted Sunrise Douglas Community Plan.

Population/Housing/Employment

As identified in Section 4.2 (Population/Housing/Employment), the proposed project would not result in any significant population, housing or employment impacts. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in 700 fewer dwelling units than the proposed project and less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment. No mitigation would be required if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant hazard impact identified in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset).

Potential Exposure to Groundwater Contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Due to past activities in the area, the potential for exposure to contaminated groundwater exists and was considered potentially significant for the proposed project. Implementation of this alternative would include the removal of any existing wells, septic tanks, leach lines, and cisterns that are discovered during construction activities. If not properly handled, the removal of these items could result groundwater contamination; therefore, potentially significant impacts would be expected if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3.2 ensures that all these potential sources of contamination are removed in accordance with Sacramento County Environmental Health Department Standards, which would reduce this impact to less than significant for this alternative.

Underground Storage Tank Contamination (Impact 4.3.3)

There may be undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site that have the potential to contaminate soils and/or groundwater. The Phase I indicated that there was no evidence of USTs discovered during the site survey; however, it is possible that USTs are present in the project area and may be encountered during the grading, excavation, and site preparation activities required for project and potentially significant impacts would result. With the increased wetland preserve area, there is a chance that existing tanks would go undiscovered in these areas. However, if encountered, these tanks would be removed if this alternative were implemented; therefore, the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative UST impacts would also be potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3.3 requires the removal of all USTs and would reduce UST related impact to less than significant if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

FIGURE 6.0-2

Traffic and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant traffic and circulation impact identified in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).

Baseline Plus Project Conditions:

Roadway Segment Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.1)

Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways located within the project area. This would be a significant impact for the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the following impacts to study area roadways:

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,000 vehicles per day to Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and would cause the LOS to change from LOS E to LOS F. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.18, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 1,800 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.09, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would reduce vehicle trip generation by approximately 26 percent when compared to the proposed project, due to fewer dwelling units. The roadway segments identified in **Table 4.4-10** may continue to operate at unacceptable conditions and the volume-to-capacity ratios may increase by greater than 0.05 if this alternative were implemented; therefore, potentially significant impacts would be expected under this alternative. However, impacts to the roadway segments identified as impacted in **Table 4.4.10** would be less under this alternative than those resulting from the proposed project, due to approximately 700 fewer residential dwelling units. Additionally, the improvements associated with mitigation measures MM 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b, and 4.4.1d would reduce roadway segment impacts on Femoyer, Mather Boulevard, Zinfandel Drive, Douglas Road, and Sunrise Boulevard to less than significant under Baseline Conditions. However, impacts to roadway segments on Sunrise Boulevard (i.e., between White Rock Road and Folsom Boulevard)

would remain significant and unavoidable for the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative even if mitigation measure MM 4.4.1c were implemented.

Intersection Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.2)

Implementation of the proposed project would cause in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at study intersections under Baseline conditions resulting in a significant impact.

The following intersections would be significantly impacted:

- SR 16/Excelsior Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS E with a V/C ratio of 0.99 in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Eagles Nest Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle for the southbound approach in the AM and PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase delay on this approach by more than 5 seconds during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Grant Line Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a V/C ratio of 1.19 in the AM peak hour under Base Year conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the AM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Grant Line Road. Implementation of the proposed project would cause LOS F operations at this intersection with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the AM peak hour and would cause LOS E operations in the PM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Sunrise Boulevard. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F under Baseline conditions during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.18 and 1.09, respectively. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.33 and 1.43, respectively, under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Grant Line Road/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the delay at the intersection by more than 5 seconds during the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in an approximately 26 percent reduction in vehicle trips than the proposed project. However, this alternative would still generate approximately 2,000 peak hour vehicle trips, which would exacerbate unacceptable operations at some study intersections and cause potentially significant impacts to other study area intersections, exceeding established thresholds. This alternative would contribute approximately 26 percent or 747 fewer daily trips than the proposed project, which would lessen the impacts to intersections identified in **Table 4.4-11.** However, implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.2a through 4.4.2g, which require fair-share participation for intersection improvements, would assist in reducing unacceptable conditions; but impacts to these intersections would remain significant and unavoidable if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Roadway Impacts on Sunrise Boulevard Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.3)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential unit threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan. This is a significant impact. The addition of vehicle trips generated as a result of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts to this roadway. However, this alternative would generate approximately 26 percent fewer daily trips than the proposed project and result in lesser impacts to Sunrise Boulevard than those associated with the project. Mitigation measure MM 4.4.3 requires the construction of the Sunrise Boulevard reliever and associated interchange with U.S. 50 to relieve unacceptable conditions on Sunrise Boulevard; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would result (see **Table 4.4-12**) even if MM 4.4.3 were implemented in association with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative.

Freeway Mainline Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50. This is considered a potentially significant impact. As indicated above, this alternative would generate more than 2,000 peak hour vehicle trips over existing conditions, but approximately 26 percent less than the proposed project, and would exacerbate the unacceptable conditions and result in significant impacts to this facility. However, this alternative would affect roadways to a lesser degree than the proposed project due to the reduction in dwelling units and daily trip generation. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in relieving unacceptable conditions on U.S. 50 if applied to this alternative; however, impacts to this facility would remain significant and unavoidable if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative was implemented (see **Table 4.4-13** and **Table 4.4-14**).

Transit System Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.5)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under baseline conditions and similar potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5, which requires fair-share transit contributions, would reduce transit related impacts to less than significant for the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative under baseline conditions.

Interim Year (2014) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.7)

Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable (LOS E and F) operations on Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and on Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The segment of Mather Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.13 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add 2,500 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.14, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Similarly, The segment of Sunrise Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS E with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.98 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add about 2,000 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions (see **Table 4.4-15**). The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would generate approximately 26 percent less peak hour trips than the proposed project but would contribute to unacceptable conditions on the impacted roadway segments identified in **Table 4.4-15** under Interim Conditions. However, the impacts to these segments would be reduced when compared to the proposed project, due to an approximately 26 percent (747 vehicle trips) reduction in daily vehicle trips generated as a result of this alternative. Additionally, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.7, which requires improvements to Sunrise Boulevard and the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road intersection, would reduce impacts to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.8)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at under Interim Year (2014) conditions resulting in a significant impact. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also exacerbate unacceptable conditions at the five impacted study intersections (see **Table 4.4-16**) and may contribute to adverse changes at other intersections under Interim Conditions resulting in potentially significant impacts. This alternative, however, would reduce daily traffic volumes by approximately 26 percent when compared with the proposed project and, therefore, result in lesser impacts than the proposed project. Although the improvements associated with mitigation measures MM 4.4.8a through 4.4.8e would assist in improving conditions at these intersections, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative, even if these measures were implemented.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.9)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in approximately 26 percent less peak hour vehicle trips (747) than the proposed project and lesser impacts to this facility. However, implementation would contribute to already unacceptable conditions on US 50 under Interim Conditions and potentially significant impacts would result (see **Table 4.4-17** and **Table 4.4-18**). Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in reducing impacts to this facility; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative.

Transit System Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.10)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Interim Year (2014) conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under Interim Conditions and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of this alternative would include the construction of 2,003 dwelling units and approximately 17 acres designated for commercial uses. The increase in dwelling units and the commercial component of this alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City and result in and potentially significant impacts but to a lesser degree than the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would mitigate this impact to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Cumulative Year (2030) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.12)

Implementation of the proposed project result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways as well as trigger some roadways to exceed the City's LOS D standards located within the project area under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would generate approximately 747 fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project; [need to spell out here that this translates into lesser impacts than the proposed project] however, this alternative would contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts on the impacted roadway segments listed in **Table 4.4-19** and **Table 4.4-20**. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.12a, which requires the construction of the Hazel extension to Grant Line Road, would assist in relieving cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would remain on Mather Road if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.12b and 4.4.12c would reduce impacts to Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard (Jaeger Road to Americanos Boulevard) to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Mitigation measures 4.4.12d through 4.4.12f would assist in reducing cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, cumulative impacts to the identified segments would remain significant and unavoidable if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.13)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also add additional daily vehicle trips and contribute to unacceptable operating conditions to the intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-21** and **Table 4.4-22** and result in cumulatively considerable impacts to these intersections. However, the impacts associated with this alternative would have lesser impacts on these facilities than the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.13a through MM 4.4.13g and MM 4.4.13i would assist improving conditions at affected intersections under cumulative conditions; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur if this alternative were implemented. However, implementation of mitigation measure

MM 4.4.13h would reduce cumulative impacts to the intersection at Chrysanthy Boulevard and Jaeger Road to less than significant under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative scenario.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.14)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under cumulative conditions. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would contribute to or exacerbate unacceptable conditions in both directions on US 50 under cumulative conditions and cumulatively considerable impacts would result. However, due to fewer residential units and less peak hour vehicle trips, this alternative would impact this facility to a lesser degree than the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in minimizing this impact; however, cumulative freeway mainline impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.15)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Baseline conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under cumulative conditions and cumulatively considerable impacts would occur. This alternative would increase the dwelling units, commercial services and employment opportunities in the City and incrementally increase the demand for transit service in the City. The increase demand for transit, as a result of this alternative, would result in cumulatively considerable transit related impacts. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would reduce cumulative transit system impacts to less than significant if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.5 (Noise).

Noise-Producing Uses Located Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.2)

Due to the proximity of proposed commercial uses to proposed residential uses within the project site, noise generated by loading dock activities and mechanical equipment may expose residents to noise levels that exceed the noise level standards of the City of Rancho Cordova. As indicated, the commercial portion of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, the potential noise producing sources associated with the commercial uses (i.e., dock activities and mechanized equipment) in this alternative would generate potentially significant noise impacts. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.5.2a through 4.5.2e would reduce the noise-producing uses within the project area associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Noise Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.4)

Project construction activities would generate noise levels in excess of established noise standards. Construction of the proposed project would elevate noise levels within the project area, and would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet, which is considered a potentially significant impact. The Aquatic Resource

Habitat Alternative would involve construction and site preparation activities that would generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. The reduction in developable acreage would not reduce this impact when compared to the proposed project and potentially significant impacts would be anticipated. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.5.4, which addresses construction related noise impacts, would reduce the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative's construction noise impacts to less than significant.

Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments (Impact 4.5.7)

Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels on the roadways adjacent to or within the Plan Area may adversely impact future noise-sensitive development in the project site. Future traffic noise levels at a distance of 75 feet from the future Jaeger Road are predicted to exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas for the proposed project. In addition, noise levels at residences located adjacent to Chrysanthy Boulevard (the main east west arterial) may exceed the City's noise level standards should future traffic volumes on that roadway exceed 5,000 vehicles per day. As indicated in **Figure 6.0-2**, implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would include the construction of residences along Chrysanthy Boulevard and, like the proposed project, may expose residents of these properties to noise levels in excess of established City standards. The residential units' proximity to Chrysanthy Boulevard for this alternative would be the same distance from Chrysanthy as the proposed project and similar impacts would result. However, because this alternative would have a reduced number of residential units as a result of the enlarged open space/wetland preserve, this alternative would result in less than cumulatively considerable traffic noise impacts. If the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented, mitigation measure MM 4.5.7a through 4.5.7c would reduce its cumulative traffic noise related impacts to less than significant.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.6 (Air Quality).

Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter (Impact 4.6.1)

The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in particulate matter, both PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Short-term exposure to diesel particulate is not considered a serious health risk. Because the developable area associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat is less than the proposed project, the construction emissions of particulate matter associated with this alternative would be less than the proposed project but would remain potentially significant. Mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide (Impact 4.6.2)

The proposed project would result in 652.67 pounds per day of NOx during construction activities, which exceeds the SMAQMD significance threshold of 85 pounds per day. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in less grading activities than the proposed project because the open space/wetland preserve would occupy approximately 100 acres of the site that is proposed for residential development. Assuming only ¾ of the project is constructed if this alternative were implemented (considering the larger wetland preserve site), this alternative would result in 489 pounds per day of NOx and the SMAQMD significance threshold would be exceeded and significant and unavoidable impacts would occur.

Mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would reduce the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative's NOx related construction emissions to less than significant.

Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.4)

Operational air quality impacts associated with the project would exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds for both reactive organic gasses (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx). The proposed project would generate a total of 352.2 pounds per day of ROG and 262.6 pounds per day of NOx. SMAQMD's thresholds for ROG and NOx are 65 pounds per day. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in less operational emissions than the proposed project because it would result in less residential units and less vehicle trips. However, this alternative would also result in ozone precursors that would exceed SMAQMD significance thresholds (approximately 264 pounds per day of ROG and 197 pounds per day of NOx), based on ¾ development of the project site and result in significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality. There is no feasible measure to mitigate this impact to acceptable levels and significant and unavoidable operational ozone precursor impacts would result if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.6)

The proposed project would contribute to regional emissions of ozone precursors that could impact air quality attainment efforts for ozone. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also result in cumulatively considerable impacts on air quality. There are no available mitigation measures that could reduce regional emissions required to attain the SMAQMD thresholds or completely off-set this alternative's cumulative contribution to air pollution. After mitigation, the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would still have a significant cumulative ozone precursor operational air quality impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Surface Water Quality (Impact 4.7.2)

Under the proposed project, the amount of impervious surface in the area would be increased affecting both surface water quality and resulting in potentially significant impacts. Under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative, the impermeable surface area would be reduced as a result of the 225.0-acre preserve. However, implementation of this alternative would result in potentially significant surface water quality impacts. Mitigation measure 4.7.2a through 4.7.2d, which requires stormwater quality source and treatment measures, would reduce surface water quality impacts associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Impacts (Impact 4.7.4)

Grading and other construction activities under the proposed project could affect local water quality, resulting in potentially significant impacts. Under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative, construction activities would be reduced, as the preserve area would be expanded and the residential area reduced. Although water quality impacts associated with this alternative would be reduced, potentially significant impacts would result. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required as part of mitigation measure MM 4.7.4, which

would reduce the construction water quality impacts associated with this alternative to this than significant.

Drainage (Impact 4.7.5)

The proposed project includes changing local drainage patterns as well as moving the Morrison Creek corridor. Under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative, Morrison Creek would remain in its existing alignment, except for a small portion that would be realigned in order to connect it to the Anatolia detention basin. The alternative would include a large buffer area on both sides of the Morrison Creek watershed. Therefore, drainage impacts associated with this alternative would be less than the proposed project and considered less than significant. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.7.5 would ensure that the drainage impacts associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative are reduced to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Water Quality (Impact 4.7.6)

Pollutants generated by both construction and operation of the proposed project and other planned and/or approved projects in the vicinity would affect water quality. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in fewer water quality impacts than the proposed project, and therefore would result in fewer cumulative water quality impacts. Although local water quality would be affected by surrounding projects, the total cumulative impact would be reduced. This alternative would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts on water quality. There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area.

Geology and Soils

As identified in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils), the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to geology and soils. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also not result in any significant impacts to geology and soils.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant biological resources impact identified in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources).

Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.1)

The proposed project would result in the loss of 455 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat. These are considered significant impacts. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would include a wetland preserve area of approximately 225 acres but would still disturb almost 290 acres of Swainson Hawk foraging habitat and result in the direct loss of 5.8 acres of vernal pool habitat and significant impact would result. Even with implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.2)

The proposed project would result in indirect effects to habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species associated with vernal pool habitat. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would disturb approximately 290 acres and require extensive site preparation and construction activities. These activities would result in significant indirect impacts to the above species if this alternative were implemented. Even if mitigation measure MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in significant indirect impacts to these species.

Loss of Habitat (Impact 4.9.3)

The proposed project could affect foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife (other than Swainson's hawk), resulting in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would reduce the amount of foraging habitat lost when compared to the proposed project; however, the loss of approximately 290 acres of habitat and significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b will reduce the loss of habitat impacts associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative to a less than significant level.

Loss of Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool Community (Impact 4.9.4)

The proposed project would result significant impacts due to the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would include roughly 225 acres of wetland preserve, which is considerably higher than the proposed project, and it would result in the direct loss of 5.8 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat. However, implementation of this alternative would still result in significant impacts to the northern hardpan vernal pool community. Mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.1c and MM 4.9.2a will result in the creation, restoration, and permanent preservation of hardpan vernal pools and ensure there will be no net loss of the resource in the project's vicinity. In addition, mitigation measure MM 4.9.2b will minimize indirect effects to this community during construction and less than significant impacts loss of vernal pool community impacts would result if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Loss of Jurisdictional Waters (Impact 4.9.5)

The proposed project would result in the filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands, which is a significant impact. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would preserve 225 acres of wetland habitat onsite, thus resulting in the loss of fewer jurisdictional waters than the proposed project. Although the loss of jurisdictional waters is reduced under this alternative, it would still result in the loss of 1.92 acres of jurisdictional waters and the impact would remain significant. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce loss of jurisdictional wetlands impacts associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative to less than significant.

Effect to Movement Corridor (Impact 4.9.6)

The proposed project would interfere with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would preserve the movement corridor through the preservation of 225 acres. The movement corridor would still be affected by surrounding properties if this alternative were implemented; however, impacts would be considered less than significant for the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative.

Cumulative Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.10)

The proposed project, along with proposed and/or approved projects in the area, would result in cumulative loss of resources in the area. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would contribute to the loss of Swainson's hawk habitat and other biological resources, but the impacts would be less than the proposed project due to the large onsite wetland preserve. However cumulative biological resource impacts would be cumulatively considerable if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of the biological resources mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a, MM 4.9.2b, MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce the direct alternative-specific impacts on biological resources to a less than significant level. However, on a cumulative level the direct and indirect impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant cultural resources and paleontological resources impact identified in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources).

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

The proposed project could result in disturbance to undiscovered prehistoric, historic resources and human remains. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also have the potential to impact undiscovered resources or remains in the areas of the alternative where construction would occur, but the impacts overall would be less than the proposed project due to the larger onsite preserve, which would be largely undisturbed under this alternative. Although, implementation of this alternative would reduce potential impacts to undiscovered prehistoric, historic resources and human remains, potentially significant impact would remain. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.1a and MM 4.10.1b would reduce undiscovered cultural resource and human remain impacts associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative to less than significant.

Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.2)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would have the potential to impact paleontological resources during site preparation and construction activities and potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.2 would reduce this alternative's potential paleontogical resource impacts to less than significant.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource and light and glare impact identified in Section 4.11 (Visual Resources/Light and Glare).

Light and Glare (Impact 4.11.2)

The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the area and result in potentially significant impacts. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also introduce new sources of light and glare into the area, but these sources would be reduced due to less intense development associated with this alternative. However, light and glare impacts would

remain potentially significant if this alternative were implemented. Mitigation measure MM 4.11.2a and MM 4.11.2b would reduce potential light and glare impacts to less than significant for the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

A comparison of the proposed project and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant public services and utilities impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services and Utilities).

Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)

The proposed project, combined with other adjacent projects, would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in cumulatively considerable fire protection and emergency medical services.

Design-Related Safety Concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2)

The proposed project's land use design could affect the ability of the police department to serve the area. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in similar potentially significant design-related safety impacts as those identified for the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.12.2.2a through MM 4.12.2.2e would reduce the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative's design related safety impacts to a less than significant level.

Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2)

The proposed project would require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also require the extension of existing and the construction of new infrastructure to serve the project; therefore, similar potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.12.8a and MM 4.12.8b would ensure compliance with applicable utility standards and coordination with service providers and reduce the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative's potential infrastructure impacts to less than significant.

ALTERNATIVE 4 – EXISTING MORRISON CREEK ALTERNATIVE

The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative features a redesign of land uses to keep the existing Morrison Creek corridor intact within the project site. As illustrated in **Figure 6.0-3**, this alternative would keep the natural regime of the Morrison Creek corridor intact with the creek channel remaining in its existing condition and not being realigned. As indicated above, Morrison Creek has been modified by other projects in the vicinity. However, the project site is considered the headwaters of Morrison Creek. This alternative attempts to protect its unique function and value. **Table 6.0-3** illustrates the land uses, residential densities, acres, and unit counts of residential development associated with this alternative. As indicated in **Table 6.0-3**, the "Town Center" portion and detention basin under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project (i.e., approximately 17 acres and 21 acres, respectively). This alternative would include residential development on approximately 241 acres. The elementary school site would remain 11 acres and parks would represent 36.6 acres of this alternative land plan. The wetland preserve/open space and creek buffer area for this alternative would include 103.9 of preserve area and an additional 22.8 acres of trail corridor, with a 150-foot buffer along the western edge of Morrison Creek

providing a trail and passive recreation area and a 50-foot buffer along the eastern edge of Morrison Creek for a trail corridor.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would include approximately 20 acres of the existing power line corridor. This alternative would also include a stormwater drainage channel within the utility corridor, which would collect stormwater runoff and summer flows. The channel would convey the project flows and offsite flows from projects north and northeast of the site to the detention basin, where it would be conveyed to the onsite detention basin before being released into the detention basin in Anatolia. Because the downstream portion of Morrison Creek currently passes through the Anatolia detention basin before heading downstream, this alternative would require Morrison Creek to convey storm flows to an onsite detention basin located adjacent to the Anatolia project. This alternative would require the project to retain the natural flow regime and water quality including not altering baseline flows in the receiving waters, not allowing untreated discharges to occur into existing aquatic resources, and not using aquatic resources for detention or transport of flows above current hydrology, duration, and frequency. All stormwater flows generated on-site and entering preserve boundaries would be pre-treated to reduce urban contaminants.

TABLE 6.0-3
EXISTING MORRISON CREEK ALTERNATIVE LAND USE SUMMARY

Land Use	Acreage (Net)	Unit Count (if applicable)
Residential		
RD-5	41.0	205
RD-7	33.8	236
RD-10	84.4	844
RD-15	72.4	1,085
RD-30	9.6	289
Non-Residential		
Roads	55.0	-
Commercial	17.0	-
Detention Basin	21.0	-
Wetland Preserve/Open Space	103.9	-
Trail Corridor	22.8	-
Parks	36.6	-
Power Line Corridor	19.6	-
School	11.0	-
Totals	**530.1**	**2,659**

Comparative Analysis

Land Use

As identified in **Section 4.1 (Land Use)**, the proposed project would not result in any significant land use or compatibility related impacts. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would also result in similar less than significant land use impacts. However, it should be noted that this alternative would not result in the same number of residential units or density as the proposed project due to the increase in open space associated with preserving the Morrison Creek corridor and the passive recreation area and trail system through the center of the project site. This increase in open space would reduce vehicular interconnectivity and ease of mobility between the residential areas on either side of the creek and the utility corridor, and reduce the amount of residential acreage surrounding the elementary school site. The land uses associated with this alternative are generally consistent with those included in the SDCP.

Population/Housing/Employment

As identified in Section 4.2 (Population/Housing/Employment), the proposed project would not result in any significant population, housing or employment impacts. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would generate fewer residential and overall population increases than the proposed projects and less than significant population, housing or employment impacts. No mitigation is required.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant hazard impact identified in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset).

Potential Exposure to Groundwater Contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Due to past activities in the area, the potential for exposure to contaminated groundwater exists and was considered potentially significant for the proposed project. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would include the removal of any existing wells, septic tanks, leach lines, and cisterns that are discovered during construction activities. If not properly handled, the removal of these items could result groundwater contamination; therefore, potentially significant would be expected if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure 4.3.2 ensures that all these potential sources of contamination are removed in accordance with Sacramento County Environmental Health Department Standards, which would reduce this impact to less than significant for the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative.

Underground Storage Tank Contamination (Impact 4.3.3)

There may be undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site that have the potential to contaminate soils and/or groundwater. The Phase I indicated that there was no evidence of USTs discovered during the site survey; however, it is possible that USTs are present in the project area and may be encountered during the grading, excavation, and site preparation activities required for project and potentially significant impacts would result. With the increased wetland preserve area, there is a chance that existing tanks would go undiscovered in these areas. However, the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would involve similar site preparation activities and potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3.3 requires the removal of all USTs and would reduce UST related impact to less than significant if the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Traffic and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant traffic and circulation impact identified in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).

Baseline Plus Project Conditions:

Roadway Segment Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.1)

Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on a deficiently operating roadway located within the project area. This would be a significant impact.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,000 vehicles per day to Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and would cause the LOS to change from LOS E to LOS F. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.18, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 1,800 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.09, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

The reduction of 44 dwelling units would reduce the daily vehicle trip generation by approximately 2 percent (approximately 57 daily trips during peak hours) when compared with the proposed project. The reduction in daily trips would lessen the affect to the impacted roadway segments. However, these segments would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions and the volume-to-capacity ratios may increase by greater than 0.05 if this alternative were implemented (see **Table 4.4-10**) and potentially significant impacts would be expected. The improvements associated with mitigation measure MM 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b, and 4.4.1d would reduce roadway segment impacts on Femoyer, Mather Boulevard, Zinfandel Drive, Douglas Road, and Sunrise Boulevard to less than significant under Baseline Conditions. However, impacts to roadway segments on Sunrise Boulevard (i.e., between White Rock Road and Folsom Boulevard) would remain significant and unavoidable even if mitigation measure 4.4.1c and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Figure 6.0-3

Intersection Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.2)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at study intersections under Baseline conditions resulting in a significant impact.

The following intersections would be significantly impacted:

- SR 16/Excelsior Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS E with a V/C ratio of 0.99 in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Eagles Nest Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle for the southbound approach in the AM and PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase delay on this approach by more than 5 seconds during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Grant Line Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a V/C ratio of 1.19 in the AM peak hour under Base Year conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the AM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Grant Line Road. Implementation of the proposed project would cause LOS F operations at this intersection with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the AM peak hour and would cause LOS E operations in the PM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Sunrise Boulevard. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F under Baseline conditions during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.18 and 1.09, respectively. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.33 and 1.43, respectively, under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Grant Line Road/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the delay at the intersection by more than 5 seconds during the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in an approximately 2 percent reduction in peak hour vehicle trips relative to the proposed project. [need to spell out that impacts here would still be significant but less than the proposed project.] However, this alternative would still generate approximately 2,800 trips during both the AM and PM peak

hours, which would exacerbate unacceptable operations at impacted study intersections and potentially significant impacts to other study area intersections listed in **Table 4.4-11**. However, implementation of mitigation measures 4.4.2a through 4.4.2g, which requires fair-share participation for intersection improvements, would assist in reducing unacceptable conditions; but impacts to these intersections would remain significant and unavoidable if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Roadway Impacts on Sunrise Boulevard (Impact 4.4.3)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential unit threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan. This is a significant impact. Although slightly less than the proposed project, the addition of approximately 2,800 daily vehicles trips generated as a result of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would have a potentially significant impact on the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (see **Table 4.4-12**). Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.3 requires the construction of the Sunrise Boulevard reliever and associated interchange with U.S. 50 to relieve unacceptable conditions on Sunrise Boulevard; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would result (see **Table 4.4-12**) even if MM 4.4.3 were implemented in association with the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative.

Freeway Mainline Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50. Implementation of Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would reduce impacts to this facility when compared to the proposed project, due to 44 fewer residential units and less peak hour traffic generation. However, this alternative would exacerbate unacceptable operating conditions and result in significant impacts to this facility (see **Table 4.4-13** and **Table 4.4-14**). Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in relieving unacceptable conditions on U.S. 50 if applied to this alternative; however, impacts to this facility would remain significant and unavoidable if the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.5.5)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under baseline conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under baseline conditions by adding approximately 2,659 dwelling units, commercial services, and associated employment opportunities; therefore, similar potentially significant transit related impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5, which requires fair-share transit contributions, would reduce transit related impacts to less than significant for the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative under baseline conditions.

Interim Year (2014) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.7)

Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable (LOS E and F) operations on Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and on Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The segment of Mather Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.13 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add

2,500 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.14, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Similarly, The segment of Sunrise Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS E with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.98 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add about 2,000 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions (see **Table 4.4-15**). The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would generate approximately 2,800 additional vehicle trips and contribute to unacceptable conditions on the roadway segments impacted in **Table 4.4-15** under Interim Conditions. However, impacts to these segments would be reduced when compared to the proposed project due to fewer dwelling units and fewer daily vehicle trips. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.7, which requires improvements to Sunrise Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road intersection, would reduce impacts to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.8)

Implementation of the proposed project in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at under Interim Year (2014) conditions resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would exacerbate unacceptable conditions at the five impacted study intersections listed in **Table 4.4-16** and may contribute to adverse changes at other intersections under Interim Conditions resulting in potentially significant impacts. This alternative's impacts to the affected intersections would be lesser than the proposed project due to fewer overall peak hour vehicle trips. The improvements associated with mitigation measures MM 4.4.8a through 4.4.8e would assist in improving conditions at these intersections; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur under the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative, even if these measures were implemented.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.9)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in approximately 2 percent less daily vehicle trips than the proposed project but would contribute to already unacceptable conditions on US 50 under Interim Conditions and potentially significant impacts would result (see **Table 4.4-17** and **Table 4.4-18**). However, this alternative's contribution to impacts on this facility would be less than the proposed project due to fewer peak hours trips and residential dwelling units. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in reducing impacts to this facility but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.10)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova. This is considered a potentially significant impact for interim conditions. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under Interim Conditions and result in potentially significant impacts. As indicated, implementation of this alternative would include the construction of 2,659 residential units and approximately 17 acres for commercial and future employment opportunities; therefore, potentially significant transit impacts would occur under Interim conditions.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would mitigate this impact to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Cumulative Year (2030) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.12)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways as well as trigger some roadways to exceed the City's LOS D standards located within the project area under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in approximately 2,800 daily vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours and contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts on each of the impacted study area roadway segments listed in **Table 4.4-19** and **Table 4.4-20**. Cumulative roadway segments impacts would be reduced relative to the proposed project over the short and long-term. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.12a, which requires the construction of the Hazel extension to Grant Line Road, would assist in relieving cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would remain on Mather Road if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.12b and 4.4.12c would reduce impacts to Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard (Jaeger Road to Americanos Boulevard) to less than significant if this alternative were implemented. Mitigation measure 4.4.12d through 4.4.12f would assist in reducing cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, cumulative impacts to the identified segments would remain significant and unavoidable if the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.13)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would contribute to unacceptable operating conditions at the intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-21** and **Table 4.4-22**, resulting in cumulatively considerable impacts. However, due to fewer peak hour vehicle trips and residential dwelling units, this alternative's impacts to these intersections would be less than those identified for the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.13a through MM 4.4.13g and MM 4.4.13i would assist improving conditions at affected intersections under cumulative conditions; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.13h would reduce cumulative impacts to the intersection at Chrysanthy Boulevard and Jaeger Road to less than significant under the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative scenario.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.14)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would increase vehicle trips, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project, on area roadways. Nevertheless, this alternative would contribute to or exacerbate unacceptable conditions in both directions on US 50 and cumulatively considerable impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM

4.4.4 would assist in minimizing this impact; however, cumulative freeway mainline impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if this alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.15)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Baseline conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under cumulative conditions and cumulatively considerable would occur. Implementation of this alternative, along with other planned and approved projects in the city, would incrementally increase the demand for transit services and result in cumulatively considerable impacts to the transit system. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would reduce cumulative transit system impacts to less than significant if the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.5 (Noise).

Noise-Producing Uses Located Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.2)

Due to the proximity of proposed commercial uses to proposed residential uses within the project site, noise generated by loading dock activities and mechanical equipment may exceed the noise level standards of the City of Rancho Cordova. As indicated above, the commercial portion of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, the potential noise producing sources associated with the commercial uses (i.e., dock activities and mechanized equipment) would generate similar noise levels as the proposed project and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.5.2a through 4.5.2e would reduce the noise-producing uses within the project area associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Construction Noise Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.4)

Project construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of established noise standards. Construction of the proposed project would elevate noise levels within the project area, and would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet, which is considered a potentially significant impact. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would involve construction and site preparation activities that would also elevate temporary noise levels on the project site that would generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. The reduction in developable acreage would not reduce this impact substantially when compared to the proposed project and potentially significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.5.4, which addresses construction related noise impacts, would reduce the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative's construction noise impacts to less than significant.

Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments (Impact 4.5.7)

Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels on the roadways adjacent to or within the Plan Area may adversely impact future noise-sensitive development in the project site. Future traffic noise levels at a distance of 75 feet from the future Jaeger Road are predicted to exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas for the proposed

project. In addition, noise levels at residences located adjacent to Chrysanthy Boulevard (the main east west arterial) may exceed the City's noise level standards should future traffic volumes on that roadway exceed 5,000 vehicles per day. As indicated in Figure 6.0-1, the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would include the construction of residences along Chrysanthy Boulevard and like the proposed project, may expose residents of these properties to noise levels in excess of established City standards. The residential units in close proximity to Chrysanthy Boulevard for this alternative would be the same distance from Chrysanthy as the proposed project and cumulatively considerable impacts would result. If the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented, mitigation measure MM 4.5.7a through 4.5.7c would reduce its cumulative traffic noise related impacts to less than significant.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.6 (Air Quality).

Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter (Impact 4.6.1)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in temporarily increased Particulate Matter levels in the immediate vicinity during construction. This is considered a significant impact. Construction activities would temporarily affect local air quality, causing a temporary increase in particulate matter (PM_{10} and PM 2.5) and dust emissions. Uncontrolled dust emissions during construction have the potential to exceed the local ambient air quality standards and result in nuisance complaints. The proposed project would result in 652.7 pounds per day of particulate matter during construction activities, which exceeds the SMAQMD significance threshold of 85 pounds per day. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative includes a larger wetland preserve (approximately 11 acres larger than the proposed project). Implementation of this alternative would reduce the amount of acreage disturbed for construction activities; however, this alternative would generate approximately 580 pounds of particulate matter and exceed SMAQMD's threshold of 85 pounds per day and significant impacts would occur. Mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide (Impact 4.6.2)

The proposed project would result in 652.67 pounds per day of NOx during construction activities, which exceeds the SMAQMD significance threshold of 85 pounds per day. This is considered a significant impact. Although the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would reduce the amount of acreage developed when compared to the proposed project, construction of this alternative would result in the exceedance of SMAQMDs threshold for NO_x from construction vehicles and equipment and significant impacts would result. Mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would reduce the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative's NOx related construction emissions to less than significant.

Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.4)

Operational air quality impacts associated with the project would exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds for both ROG and NOx. The project would generate a total of 352.2 pounds per day of ROG and 262.6 pounds per day of NOx. SMAQMD's thresholds for ROG and NOx are 65 pounds per day. This alternative would reduce the amount of developable acreage and reduce ROG and NOx emissions by approximately 11 percent when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would generate approximately

317 pounds of ROG and approximately 233 pounds of NOx daily. An air quality plan would be required for the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative which would reduce estimated project regional emissions but not to levels below the SMAQMD thresholds of significance for ozone precursors. There are no available mitigation measures that could reduce regional emissions by 75-80 percent or more to attain the SMAQMD thresholds; therefore, similar significant and unavoidable impacts would result. There is no feasible measure to mitigate this impact to acceptable levels and significant and unavoidable operational ozone precursor impacts would result if the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.6)

The proposed project would contribute to regional emissions of ozone precursors that could impact air quality attainment efforts for ozone. Existing and future land use conditions in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin would result in cumulative impacts to air quality. The proposed project's contribution to this condition would be cumulatively considerable. As discussed in impacts 4.6.1, 4.6.2, and 4.6.4, implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would exceed SMAQMDs thresholds for both construction and operational emissions and result in cumulatively considerable impacts. There are no available mitigation measures that could reduce regional emissions required to attain the SMAQMD thresholds or completely off-set the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative's cumulative contribution to air pollution.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Surface Water Quality (Impact 4.7.2)

Under the proposed project the amount of impervious surface in the area would be increased, affecting both surface water quality and runoff. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would preserve Morrison Creek in its current alignment and also include a separate stormwater drainage channel to collect stormwater from the site. This alternative includes a larger wetland preserve and trail corridor along the creek corridor; therefore, the amount of impervious surfaces would be decreased, which would reduce surface water quality impacts. However, like the proposed project, this alternative would include urbanized runoff adversely affecting surface water quality in the area and result in potentially significant impacts. Mitigation measure MM 4.7.2a through 4.7.2d, which requires stormwater quality source and treatment measures, would reduce surface water quality impacts associated with the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Impacts (Impact 4.7.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would require extensive grading for site preparation for building pads and trenching for the placement of infrastructure. These construction activities may result in short-term water quality degradation and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would also require extensive site preparation activities, which would include the compaction of soils by heavy equipment, reduce the infiltration capacity of the on-site soils, and increase runoff leaving the site. Additionally, this alternative would also require off-site infrastructure improvements to serve the project; therefore, potentially significant construction water quality impacts would result. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required as part of mitigation measure MM 4.7.4,

which would reduce the construction water quality impacts associated with this alternative to this than significant.

Drainage (Impact 4.7.5)

The proposed project includes changing local drainage patterns as well as moving the Morrison Creek corridor. Under the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative, Morrison Creek would remain in its existing alignment (except for a small portion that would be realigned in order to connect it to the Anatolia detention basin) and would include a separate drainage channel. Therefore, the drainage impacts associated with this alternative would be less than the proposed project; however, impacts would remain potentially significant. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.7.5 would ensure that the drainage impacts associated with the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative are reduced to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Water Quality (Impact 4.7.6)

Pollutants generated by both construction and operation of the proposed project and other planned and/or approved projects in the vicinity would affect water quality. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in fewer water quality impacts than the proposed project, and therefore would result in fewer cumulative water quality impacts. While local water quality would be affected by surrounding projects, the total cumulative impact would be reduced but cumulatively considerable impacts would occur. There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would also contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area.

Geology and Soils

As identified in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils), the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to geology and soils. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in any significant impacts to geology and soils.

Biological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant biological resources impact identified in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources).

Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.1)

The proposed project would result in the loss of 455 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat. These are considered significant impacts. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in fewer direct impacts to endangered, threatened and rare species, as this alternative would preserve 103.9 acres of wetland habitat onsite as opposed to 89.7 for the proposed project. This alternative would result in the direct loss of 426 acres of Swainson's hawk habitat and the direct loss of approximately 10 acres of vernal pool shrimp habitat. This alternative would result in significant impacts on biological resources. Even with implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if this alternative were implemented.

Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.2)

The proposed project would result in indirect effects to habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species associated with vernal pool habitat (i.e., Off-site vernal pool branchiopod habitat and on-site vernal pool branchiopod habitat). Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in fewer indirect impacts to endangered, threatened and rare species, as this alternative would preserve 103.9 acres of wetland habitat onsite as compared to 89.7 for that of the proposed project; however indirect impacts would remain significant if this alternative were implemented. Even if mitigation measure MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in significant indirect impacts to these species.

Loss of Habitat (Impact 4.9.3)

The proposed project could affect foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife (other than Swainson's hawk), resulting in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would reduce the amount of foraging habitat lost when compared to the proposed project; however, it would result in the loss of approximately 426 acres of habitat, and significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b will reduce the loss of habitat impacts associated with the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative to a less than significant level.

Loss of Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool Community (Impact 4.9.4)

The proposed project would result in significant impacts due to the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in less direct loss of vernal pool habitat, as this alternative would preserve 103.9 acres of wetland habitat onsite; however, implementation of this alternative would result in the loss of 10.2 acres of hardpan vernal pools, which is considered a significant impact. Mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.1c and MM 4.9.2a will result in the creation, restoration, and permanent preservation of hardpan vernal pools and ensure there will be no net loss of the resource in the project's vicinity. In addition, mitigation measure MM 4.9.2b will minimize indirect effects to this community during construction and less than significant impacts loss of vernal pool community impacts would result if the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Loss of Jurisdictional Waters (Impact 4.9.5)

The proposed project would result in the filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands, which is a significant impact. Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would preserve 103.9 acres of wetland habitat onsite but would result in the loss of less jurisdictional waters than the proposed project. Although the loss of jurisdictional waters is reduced under this alternative, it would still result in the loss of approximately 3 acres of these resources and significant impacts would occur. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce loss of jurisdictional wetlands impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Effect to Movement Corridor (Impact 4.9.6)

The proposed project would interfere with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would preserve the movement corridor of the vernal pool tadpole shrimp intact in its current alignment. Therefore, this alternative would result in less than significant impacts to the movement corridor than the proposed project.

Cumulative Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.10)

The proposed project, along with proposed and/or approved projects in the area, would result in cumulative loss of resources in the area. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative could contribute to the loss of Swainson's hawk habitat and other biological resources, but the impacts would be less than the proposed project due to the larger onsite wetland preserve. However, cumulatively considerable biological resource impacts would occur if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of the biological resources mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a, MM 4.9.2b, MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce the direct alternative-specific impacts on biological resources to a less than significant level. However, on a cumulative level the direct and indirect impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable if the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant cultural resources and paleontological resources impact identified in Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources).

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

The proposed project could result in disturbance to these resources. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would also have the potential to impact undiscovered resources or remains would occur, but the impacts would be less than the proposed project due to the larger onsite preserve than that of the proposed project. However, potentially significant impacts would result if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.1a and MM 4.10.1b would reduce undiscovered cultural resource and human remain impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.2)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would have the potential to impact paleontological resources during site preparation activities, but the impacts would be less than the proposed project due to the larger onsite preserve. This alternative would result in similar potentially significant impacts to these resources as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.2 would reduce this alternative's potential paleontogical resource impacts to less than significant.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource and light and glare impact identified in Section 4.11 (Visual Resources/Light and Glare).

Light and Glare (Impact 4.11.2)

The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the area and result in potentially significant impacts. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would introduce new sources of light and glare into the area, but these sources would be reduced due to less intense development. However, light and glare impacts would remain potentially significant if this alternative were implemented. If the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented,

mitigation measure MM 4.11.2a and MM 4.11.2b would reduce potential light and glare impacts to less than significant.

Public Services and Utilities

A comparison of the proposed project and the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is provided below for each significant public services and utilities impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services and Utilities).

Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)

The proposed project and other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in cumulatively considerable impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services.

Design-Related Safety Concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2)

Design of land uses in the proposed project could affect the ability of the police department to serve the area. The design features of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in similar design-related potentially significant safety related impacts as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.12.2.2a through MM 4.12.2.2e would reduce the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative's design related safety impacts to a less than significant level.

Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2)

The proposed project would require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would require the construction of new and the extension of existing infrastructure to serve the project and result in similar potentially significant impacts natural gas and telephone infrastructure impacts as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.12.8a and MM 4.12.8b would ensure compliance with applicable utility standards and coordination with service providers and reduce this alternative's potential infrastructure impacts to less than significant.

ALTERNATIVE 5 – BLUEPRINT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative was designed for consistency with SACOG's "Preferred Blueprint Scenario" which depicts a way for the Sacramento region to grow through the year 2050 based on the "Seven Principles of Smart Growth" – Transportation Choices, Housing Choices, Compact Development, Use of Existing Assets, Mixed Land Uses, Natural Resources Conservation, and Quality Design. SACOG has designated the project site as "medium-density, mixed residential" in the Blueprint. The SACOG Blueprint vision promotes compact mixed-use developments with more transit choices as alternatives to traditional low-density developments. Low-density developments may reduce site-specific environmental impacts; however, they can also be considered an inefficient use of finite land resources. Sacramento County has experienced substantial population and development growth over the past five years. Additional low-density development coupled with increasing market demand can result in development occurring on the urban periphery, with long-term consequence or more overall losses of habitat, open space, and agricultural lands. Under the Smart Growth principles, areas planned for future development are at higher densities. Because this alternative is consistent with SACOG's Preferred Blueprint Scenario, it would result in more environmental impacts within the project site and in Rancho Cordova, including impacts to transportation and biological resources that might be avoided or lessened

with a less compact development. However, this alternative would help to improve the regional transportation system and air quality by reducing the frequency and length of vehicle trips and making efficient use of scarce land resources. Additionally, Smart Growth principles suggest that developing a site with higher densities, while avoiding critical habitat (i.e., wetlands, vernal pools, etc.), would focus market demand for development into areas near existing development, infrastructure systems, and services.

This Blueprint Alternative would be implemented on a similar footprint as that of the proposed project. The assumptions used for this alternative are based on SACOG Places3 land uses assumptions and include approximately 40 percent (212 acres) of the overall acreage being dedicated to roads, infrastructure, schools, parks, and other public and quasi-public uses, which would reduce the developable acreage from 530.1-acres to 225.7 acres. The 212 acres would include an 11-acre elementary school site, 23.2 acres of detention basins, approximately 106 acres of roads (representing 20 percent of the project site), a 26.3-acre community park, 13.5 acres of neighborhood parks, a 20.2-acre utility corridor and 11.5 acres of other public and quasi-public uses. Additionally, due to the biological resources in the Community Plan area, SACOG assumes a 15 percent reduction of total developable acreage for environmental constraints (i.e., vernal pools). However, this alternative assumes a reduction of 17 percent for environmental constraints resulting in a wetland preserve of 92.4 acres, which is the same as the proposed project. Considering these land use assumptions, there would be approximately 225.7 acres of non-dedicated developable land for the implementation of this alternative.

The "medium-density, mixed residential" place type is broken out into 20 percent very-low-density residential (VLDR), 45 percent low-density residential (LDR), 20 percent medium-density residential (MDR), 10 percent medium high-density residential (MHDR), and five percent commercial. It also assumes that five percent of the VLDR and LDR lots would have accessory dwelling units. The total dwelling unit yield for this alternative would be 2,151 units, including 181 units of very low density residential (VLDR), 812 units of low-density residential (LDR), 546 units of medium-density residential (MDR), and 562 units of medium- to high-density residential (MHDR). This alternative also assumes 50 accessory units on the VLDR and LDR lots. The average density for this alternative would be approximately 9.8 du/ac, which is the same as the proposed project. However, this alternative assumes less residential acreage and units than the proposed project. Similarly, the commercial acreage of this alternative would be less than the proposed project at 11.3 acres versus 17 acres.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would include a stormwater drainage channel within the utility corridor to collect and convey stormwater runoff and summer flows. The runoff and summer flows from projects north and northeast would be conveyed through this drainage channel to the on-site retention basin and ultimately be released into the detention basin in the Anatolia development. A summary of the Blueprint Alternative land uses, acreage and unit count is provided in **Table 6.0-4** below. This alternative is visually represented in **Figure 6.0-4**.

TABLE 6.0-4
SUMMARY OF BLUEPRINT ALTERNATIVE

Land Use	Total Acres	Total Dwellings
Very Low Density Residential (4 du/ac)	45.1	181
Low Density Residential (8 du/ac)	101.6	812
Medium Density Residential (12.1 du/ac)	45.1	546
Medium High Density Residential (24.89 du/ac)	22.6	562
Commercial and Office	11.3	
Wetland Preserve	92.4	
Roads, Public/Quasi Public uses[1]	212.0	
Total	**530.1**	**2,101**

[1] This acreage includes approximately 106.2 acres of roads, an 11-acre elementary school site, 23.2 acres of detention, a 26.3-acre community park, 13.5 acres of neighborhood parks, a 20.2-acre utility corridor, and 11.5 acres of other public and quasi-public uses.

Comparative Analysis

Land Use

As identified in Section 4.1 (Land Use), the proposed project would not result in any significant land use or compatibility impacts. While this alternative promotes a mix of housing types and services within walking and biking distance, the alternative's residential unit count, densities and commercial acreage would be less than the proposed project, which would make it more difficult to create a vibrant "Town Center" on the project site. Like the proposed project, implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would also result in less than significant land use related impacts.

Population/Housing/Employment

As identified in Section 4.2 (Population/Housing/Employment), the proposed project would not result in any significant population, housing or employment impacts. This alternative would result in 602 fewer dwelling units but would be consistent SACOG's planned development in the SDCP area. Therefore, implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would also result in less than significant population, housing and employment related impacts.

Human Health/Risk of Upset

A comparison of the proposed project and the Blueprint Alternative is provided below for each significant hazard impact identified in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset).

Potential exposure to groundwater contamination (Impact 4.3.2)

Due to past activities in the area, the potential for exposure to contaminated groundwater exists. The water supply for this alternative would also be provided through SCWA facilities from wells located within the Suncreek Specific Plan area. Given that the Blueprint Alternative would be constructed in the same location and the same footprint as with the proposed project, regional and localized groundwater contamination impacts would be potentially significant and similar to those identified for the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3.2 ensures that all these potential sources of contamination are removed in accordance with Sacramento County Environmental Health Department Standards, which would reduce this impact to less than significant for this alternative.

Underground Storage Tank Contamination (Impact 4.3.3)

There may be undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site that have the potential to contaminate soils and/or groundwater. It is possible that USTs are present in the project area and may be encountered during the grading, excavation, and site preparation activities required for project. As indicated, the Blueprint Alternative would be constructed on the same footprint and require similar excavation and site preparation as the proposed project. Therefore, the threat of discovering USTs would be potentially significant with implementation of this alternative and considered similar to the level of significance identified for the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3.3 requires the removal of all USTs and would reduce UST related impact to less than significant if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Traffic and Circulation

A comparison of the proposed project and the Blueprint Alternative is provided below for each significant traffic and circulation impact identified in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).

Baseline Plus Project Conditions:

Roadway Segment Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.1)

Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on a deficiently operating roadway located within the project area. This would be a significant impact.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,000 vehicles per day to Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and would cause the LOS to change from LOS E to LOS F. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.18, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

Figure 6.0-4

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 1,800 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.09, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would reduce vehicle trip generation by approximately 22 percent during both AM and PM peak hours (approximately 630 fewer trips during peak hours than the proposed project) due to 602 fewer dwelling units. Nevertheless, the roadway segments likely would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions and the volume-to-capacity ratios would likely increase by greater than 0.05 if this alternative were implemented. Potentially significant impacts would still occur with this alternative; however, impacts would be lessened relative to the proposed project. Mitigation measure MM 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b, and 4.4.1d would reduce roadway segment impacts on Femoyer, Mather Boulevard, Zinfandel Drive, Douglas Road, and Sunrise Boulevard to less than significant under Baseline Conditions. However, impacts to roadway segments on Sunrise Boulevard (i.e., between White Rock Road and Folsom Boulevard) would remain significant and unavoidable even if mitigation measure 4.4.1c and the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented (see **Table 4.4-10**).

Intersection Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.2)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at study intersections under Baseline conditions resulting in a significant impact.

The following intersections would be significantly impacted:

- SR 16/Excelsior Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS E with a V/C ratio of 0.99 in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Eagles Nest Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle for the southbound approach in the AM and PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase delay on this approach by more than 5 seconds during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is located outside of the City.

- SR 16/Grant Line Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a V/C ratio of 1.19 in the AM peak hour under Base Year conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 in the AM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Grant Line Road. Implementation of the proposed project would cause LOS F operations at this intersection with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the AM peak hour and would cause LOS E operations in the PM peak hour. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Douglas Road/Sunrise Boulevard. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F under Baseline conditions during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.18 and 1.09, respectively. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours with a V/C ratio of 1.33 and 1.43, respectively, under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 during the AM and PM peak hours. This intersection is partially located within of the City.

- Grant Line Road/White Rock Road. The intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F with a delay greater than 50 seconds per vehicle in the PM peak hour under Baseline conditions. The addition of project traffic would increase the delay at the intersection by more than 5 seconds during the PM peak hour. This intersection is located outside of the City.

As indicated, implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would result in an approximately 22 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips compared to the proposed project. However, this alternative would still generate over 2,000 daily trips during both the AM and PM peak hours, which would exacerbate unacceptable operations at study intersections and result in significant impacts to other study area intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-11**. This alternative may exceed established thresholds and cause a decrease in LOS at impacted intersections identified in **Table 4.4-11**, but to a lesser degree than the proposed project due a substantial reduction in daily vehicle trips. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.2a through 4.4.2g, which requires fair-share participation for intersection improvements, would assist in reducing unacceptable conditions; but impacts to these intersections would remain significant and unavoidable if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Roadway Impacts on Sunrise Boulevard (Impact 4.4.3)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential unit threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan. This is a significant impact. The addition of 2,000 or more daily vehicles trips generated as a result of the Blueprint Alternative would result in significant impacts on Sunrise Boulevard but to a lesser degree relative to the proposed project due to significantly fewer dwelling units. Mitigation measure MM 4.4.3 requires the construction of the Sunrise Boulevard reliever and associated interchange with U.S. 50 to relieve unacceptable conditions on Sunrise Boulevard; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would result (see **Table 4.4-12**) even if MM 4.4.3 were implemented in association with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative.

Freeway Mainline Impacts under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.4.4)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50. Implementation of Blueprint Alternative would exacerbate

these conditions and result in significant impacts to this facility. However, this alternative would reduce the dwelling unit count by approximately 602 units and reduce impacts to this facility relative to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in relieving unacceptable conditions on U.S. 50 if applied to this alternative; however, impacts to this facility would remain significant and unavoidable if this alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Baseline Conditions (Impact 4.5.5)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under baseline conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Blueprint Alternative would reduce the dwellings units and demand for transit service in the City; however, this alternative would result in potentially significant impacts but to a lesser degree than the proposed project. Implementation of the Blueprint alternative would include 2,101 additional residential units and a commercial component, which would provide employment opportunities. These new land uses would increase the demand for transit service and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5, which requires fair-share transit contributions, would reduce transit related impacts to less than significant for the Blueprint alternative under baseline conditions.

Interim Year (2014) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.7)

Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable (LOS E and F) operations on Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and on Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The segment of Mather Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS F with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 1.13 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add 2,500 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.14, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Similarly, the segment of Sunrise Boulevard will operate unacceptably at LOS E with a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.98 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The addition of project traffic will add about 2,000 vehicles per day to this segment and will cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which will exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. As previously indicated, this alternative would include less residential and fewer daily trips than the proposed project and result in lesser impacts to the intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-15**. Additionally, Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.7, which requires improvements to Sunrise Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road intersection, would reduce impacts to less than significant for the Blueprint Alternative.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.8)

Implementation of the proposed project in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at under Interim Year (2014) conditions resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would exacerbate unacceptable conditions at the five impacted study intersections listed in **Table 4.4-16** and may contribute to adverse changes at other intersections under Interim Conditions resulting in potentially significant impacts. This alternative's impacts to the affected intersections would be lesser than the proposed project due to a substantial reduction in residential dwelling units and fewer peak hour vehicle trips. The improvements associated with mitigation measures MM

4.4.8a through 4.4.8e would assist in improving conditions at these intersections; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur under this alternative, even if these measures were implemented.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.9)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. The Blueprint Alternative would result in approximately 22 percent less peak hour vehicle trips than the proposed project but would contribute to already unacceptable conditions on US 50 under Interim Conditions. Impacts to this facility would be lesser under this alternative relative to the proposed project; however, significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in reducing impacts to this facility; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Interim (2014) Conditions (Impact 4.4.10)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova. This is considered a potentially significant impact for interim conditions. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under Interim Conditions, resulting in potentially significant impacts. As indicated, this alternative would result in the construction of 2,101 dwelling units and an increase in population by approximately 5,400 people. This alternative would also include a commercial component with grocery and retail land uses to serve the immediate area. The commercial land uses and population increases would result in greater demand for transit related services and potentially significant impact but to a lesser degree relative to the proposed project. Additionally, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would mitigate this impact to less than significant if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Cumulative Year (2030) Impacts:

Roadway Segment Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.12)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways as well as trigger some roadways to exceed the City's LOS D standards located within the project area under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would result in more than 2,000 additional daily vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours and contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts on the above study area roadway segments (see **Table 4.4-19** and **Table 4.4-20**). The reduction in dwelling units and daily vehicle trips associated with this alternative would result in less cumulative impacts to affected roadway segments than the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.12a, which requires the construction of the Hazel extension to Grant Line Road, would assist in relieving cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would remain on Mather Road if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.12b and 4.4.12c would reduce impacts to Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard (Jaeger Road to Americanos Boulevard) to less than significant if this alternative were implemented. Mitigation measure 4.4.12d through 4.4.12f would assist in reducing cumulative roadway segment impacts; however, cumulative impacts to the identified segments would remain significant and unavoidable if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Impacts to Study Intersections Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.13)

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a significant impact for the proposed project. The Blueprint Alternative would add additional vehicle trips and contribute to unacceptable operating conditions at the intersections identified as impacted in **Table 4.4-21** and **Table 4.4-22**) and result in cumulatively considerable impacts to these intersections. However, as indicated, this alternative includes fewer dwellings units and would generate lower traffic levels than the proposed project; therefore, would affect impacted intersections to a lesser degree than the proposed project under cumulative conditions. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.4.13a through MM 4.4.13g and MM 4.4.13i would assist improving conditions at affected intersections under cumulative conditions; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.13h would reduce cumulative impacts to the intersection at Chrysanthy Boulevard and Jaeger Road to less than significant under the Blueprint Alternative scenario.

Freeway Mainline Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.14)

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US 50. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would increase vehicle trips on area roadways contribute to or exacerbate unacceptable conditions in both directions on US 50 under cumulative conditions; however, impacts to this facility would be lessened relative to the proposed project due to 602 fewer dwellings units and, subsequently, fewer overall peak hour vehicle trips. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.4 would assist in minimizing this impact; however, cumulative freeway mainline impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Transit System Impacts Under Cumulative (2030) Conditions (Impact 4.4.15)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under Baseline conditions. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Blueprint Alternative would increase the demand for transit service in the City under cumulative conditions and cumulatively considerable impacts would occur. The addition of 2,101 dwelling units and increased employment opportunities generated from the commercial portion of this alternative would result in potentially significant cumulative transit related impacts. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.4.5 would reduce cumulative transit system impacts to less than significant if this alternative were implemented.

Noise

A comparison of the proposed project and the Blueprint Alternative is provided below for each significant noise impact identified in Section 4.5 (Noise).

Noise-Producing Uses Located Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.2)

Due to the proximity of proposed commercial uses to proposed residential uses within the project site, noise generated by loading dock activities and mechanical equipment may

exceed the noise level standards of the City of Rancho Cordova. As indicated, the commercial portion of the Blueprint Alternative would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, the potential noise producing sources associated with the commercial uses (i.e., dock activities and mechanized equipment) would generate similar potentially significant noise levels as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.5.2a through 4.5.2e would reduce the noise-producing uses within the project area associated with the Blueprint Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Noise Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.4)

Project construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of established noise standards. Construction of the proposed project would elevate noise levels within the project area, and would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet, which is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would involve construction and site preparation activities that would generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Therefore, similar potentially significant construction noise impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.5.4, which addresses construction related noise impacts, would reduce this alternative's construction noise impacts to less than significant.

Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments (Impact 4.5.7)

Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels on the roadways adjacent to or within the Plan Area may adversely impact future noise-sensitive development in the project site. Future traffic noise levels at a distance of 75 feet from the future Jaeger Road are predicted to exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas for the proposed project. In addition, noise levels at residences located adjacent to Chrysanthy Boulevard (the main east west arterial) may exceed the City's noise level standards should future traffic volumes on that roadway exceed 5,000 vehicles per day. The Blueprint Alternative would place residential dwelling units along Chrysanthy Boulevard and result in cumulatively considerable impacts. If this alternative were implemented, mitigation measure MM 4.5.7a through 4.5.7c would reduce the Blueprint Alternative's cumulative traffic noise related impacts to less than significant.

Air Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Blueprint Alternative is provided below for each significant air quality impact identified in Section 4.6 (Air Quality).

Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter (Impact 4.6.1)

The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in particulate matter, both PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Short-term exposure to diesel particulate is not considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would require site preparation and construction activities, which would temporarily affect local air quality and cause a temporary increase in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions. The construction activities associated with this alternative would result in similar potentially significant particulate matter as those identified for the proposed project (approximately 652.7 pounds per day). Mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide (Impact 4.6.2)

The proposed project would result in 652.67 pounds per day of NOx during construction activities, which exceeds the SMAQMD significance threshold of 85 pounds per day. This was considered potentially significant for the propose project. The Blueprint Alternative would be implemented on the same footprint as the proposed project and include the same size wetland preserve area. Implementation of the this alternative would generate approximately 652 pounds per day of NOx during grading and other site preparation activities and result in significant construction emission impacts. Mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would reduce the Blueprint Alternative's NOx related construction emissions to less than significant.

Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.4)

Operational air quality impacts associated with the project would exceed SMAQMD's significance thresholds for both ROG and NOx. The project would generate a total of 352.20 pounds per day of ROG and 262.64 pounds per day of NOx. SMAQMD's thresholds for ROG and NOx are 65 pounds per day. The Blueprint Alternative would include fewer residential units than the proposed project, which would slightly reduce the amount of vehicular operational emissions by approximately 22 percent and generate 271 pounds of ROG and approximately 202 pounds of operational emissions. Implementation of this alternative would exceed SMAQMD significance thresholds and significant and unavoidable impacts would result. There is no feasible measure to mitigate this impact to acceptable levels and significant and unavoidable operational ozone precursor impacts would result under the Blueprint Alternative scenario.

Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors (Impact 4.6.4)

The proposed project would contribute to regional emissions of ozone precursors that could impact air quality attainment efforts for ozone. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would also result in cumulatively considerable impacts on local and regional air quality. There are no available mitigation measures that could reduce regional emissions required to attain the SMAQMD thresholds or completely off-set the Blueprint Alternative's cumulative contribution to air pollution.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A comparison of the proposed project and the Blueprint Alternative is provided below for each significant hydrology and water quality impact identified in Section 4.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

Surface Water Quality (Impact 4.7.2)

Under the proposed project the amount of impervious surface in the area would be increased, affecting both surface water quality and runoff. The Blueprint Alternative would be implemented on a similar development footprint as the proposed project; therefore, result in similar increases in the amount of impervious surface area. Given that the developable residential acreage and the total acreages of the other land uses associated with this alternative would be very similar to the proposed project, similar potentially significant surface water quality impacts would be anticipated. Mitigation measure MM 4.7.2a through 4.7.2d, which requires stormwater quality source and treatment measures, would reduce surface water quality impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative to less than significant.

Construction Impacts (Impact 4.7.4)

Grading and other construction activities under the proposed project could affect local water quality and result in potentially significant impacts. As indicated, the Blueprint Alternative would involve similar acreage totals as the proposed project and therefore, result in similar potentially significant water quality impacts associated with construction activities as the proposed project. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required as part of mitigation measure MM 4.7.4, which would reduce the construction water quality impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative to this than significant.

Drainage (Impact 4.7.5)

The proposed project includes changing local drainage patterns as well as moving the Morrison Creek corridor. Like the proposed project, the Blueprint Alternative would require extensive drainage improvements in order to realign Morrison Creek in the utility corridor and connect it to the Anatolia detention basin. Therefore, the drainage impacts associated with this alternative are considered potentially significant. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.7.5 would ensure that the drainage impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative are reduced to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Water Quality (Impact 4.7.6)

Pollutants generated by both construction and operation of the proposed project and other planned and/or approved projects in the vicinity would affect water quality. The Blueprint Alternative would result in similar water quality impacts as the proposed project and contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts. There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and the Blueprint Alternative would contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area.

Geology and Soils

As identified **in Section 4.8 (Geology and Soils)**, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to geology and soils. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would also not result in any significant impacts to geology and soils.

Biological Resources

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

Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.1)

The proposed project would result in the loss of 455 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal poll fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat. These are considered significant impacts. The Blueprint Alternative would be implemented on the same project site and include similar wetland preserve acreages (92.4 acres) as that of the proposed project. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would result in the loss of approximately 455 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, 14.1 acres of vernal poll fairy shrimp habitat, 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat significant direct impacts to these species. Direct impacts to these species would be similar under this alternative as those identified for the proposed project.

Even with implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species (Impact 4.9.2)

The proposed project would result in indirect effects to habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species associated with vernal pool habitat (i.e., Off-site vernal pool branchiopod habitat and on-site vernal pool branchiopod habitat). Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would include construction activities resulting in indirect impacts to endangered, threatened, and/or rare species and 530 acres of habitat, thus resulting in significant impacts. Similar indirect impacts would result relative to the proposed project, as this alternative would be implemented on the same footprint. Even if mitigation measure MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, the Blueprint Alternative scenario would result in significant indirect impacts to these species.

Loss of Habitat (Impact 4.9.3)

The proposed project could affect foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife (other than Swainson's hawk), resulting in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would include approximately 92 acres of wetland preserve but would result in the loss of approximately 437 acres of foraging habitat for the above species and potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b will reduce the loss of habitat impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative to a less than significant level.

Loss of Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool Community (Impact 4.9.4)

The proposed project would result significant impacts due to the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would result in the direct loss of vernal pool habitat. This alternative would preserve 92.4 acres of wetland habitat onsite; however, this alternative would also result in the loss of 10.46 vernal pool habitat, which is considered a significant impact. Mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.1c and MM 4.9.2a will result in the creation, restoration, and permanent preservation of hardpan vernal pools and ensure there will be no net loss of the resource in the project's vicinity. In addition, Mitigation measure MM 4.9.2b will minimize indirect effects to this community during construction and less than significant impacts loss of vernal pool community impacts would result if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Loss of Jurisdictional Waters (Impact 4.9.5)

The proposed project would result in the filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands, which is a significant impact. The Blueprint Alternative would preserve 92.4 acres of wetland habitat onsite but would result in the loss of jurisdictional waters. As indicated, this alternative would be implemented on the same footprint; therefore, it would result in the loss of approximately 15 acres jurisdictional waters and similar significant impacts would occur relative to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce loss of jurisdictional wetlands impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant.

Effect to Movement Corridor (Impact 4.9.6)

The proposed project would interfere with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp. If the Blueprint Alternative were implemented, Morrison Creek would be realigned and vernal pool

habitat impacts would occur, which would impede the movement of this species and significant impacts would result. Effects to the movement corridor would be similar to that of the proposed project, due to the similarity in site design associated with this alternative. There is no feasible mitigation other than designing the Blueprint Alternative to keep Morrison Creek intact and significant and unavoidable impact would occur if implemented.

Cumulative Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.10)

The proposed project, along with proposed and/or approved projects in the area, would result in cumulative loss of resources in the area. The Blueprint Alternative would contribute to the loss of Swainson's hawk habitat and other biological resources and contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts on biological resources. As indicated, this alternative would result in similar direct, indirect, loss of habitat impacts etc. relative to the proposed project and equal cumulatively considerable biological resource impacts would result if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented. Implementation of the biological resources mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a, MM 4.9.1b, MM 4.9.2a, MM 4.9.2b, MM 4.9.5a, MM 4.9.5b and MM 4.9.5c would reduce the direct alternative-specific impacts on biological resources to a less than significant level. However, on a cumulative level the direct and indirect impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

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

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

The proposed project could result in potentially significant disturbances to these resources. The Blueprint Alternative would also have the potential to impact undiscovered resources or remains through site preparation and other construction activities and similar potentially significant impacts would be anticipated as those identified for the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation measure MM 4.10.1a and MM 4.10.1b would reduce undiscovered cultural resource and human remain impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative to less than significant.

Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.2)

The proposed project could damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would also have the potential to impact paleontological resources, which may be disturbed or destroyed by grading and excavation activities and similar potentially significant impacts would result relative to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.2 would reduce this alternative's potential paleontogical resource impacts to less than significant.

Visual Resources/Light and Glare

A comparison of the proposed project and the Blueprint Alternative is provided below for each significant visual resource and light and glare impact identified in Section 4.11 (Visual Resources/Light and Glare).

Light and Glare (Impact 4.11.2)

The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the area and result in potentially significant impacts. The Blueprint Alternative would include similar land uses, which would introduce new sources of light and glare onto the existing rural site. This alternative would result in fewer residential units and commercial acreage than the proposed project, which would reduce sources of light and glare; however, potentially significant impacts would be anticipated. Mitigation measure MM 4.11.2a and MM 4.11.2b would reduce potential light and glare impacts to less than significant for the Blueprint Alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

A comparison of the proposed project and the Blueprint Alternative is provided below for each significant public services and utilities impact identified in Section 4.12 (Public Services and Utilities).

Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)

The proposed project and other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. The Blueprint Alternative would result in cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services.

Design-Related Safety Concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2)

Design of land uses in the proposed project could significantly affect the ability of the police department to serve the area. The Blueprint Alternative's site design may impede the police department's ability to serve the site; therefore, would result in similar potentially significant design-related safety concerns as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.12.2.2a through MM 4.12.2.2e would reduce the Blueprint Alternative's design related safety impacts to a less than significant level.

Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2)

The proposed project would require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure and result in potentially significant impacts. Although fewer residential units would be constructed with the Blueprint Alternative, new transmission lines, and other infrastructure, which would require trenching and other site disturbance activities, would be needed to serve the project. Therefore, similar potentially significant impacts associated with the provision of natural gas and telephone infrastructure would be expected. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.12.8a and MM 4.12.8b would ensure compliance with applicable utility standards and coordination with service providers and reduce the Blueprint Alternative's potential infrastructure impacts to less than significant.

6.4 CONSISTENCY WITH PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The applicant has identified the following objectives for the Preserve at Sunridge project:

- Create a community design that, where feasible, meets the Goals and Objectives embodied in the City of Rancho Cordova "Vision Book" (August 2, 2004), and other aspects of the interim General Plan (as described in Section 1.6 of this Draft EIR and is ultimately consistent with the Rancho Cordova General Plan eventually adopted by the City).

- Consistent with the project's location in the center of the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan area, which makes the site uniquely situated to provide needed community services and opportunities, provide a "Town Center" to serve as a vibrant center for public and private interaction and services, including retail services (a "Gathering Place").

- In light of the project's the key location in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan area, provide a community park to serve the recreational needs of the greater Sunrise Douglas Community Plan area.

- Provide residential densities that would, to the extent feasible, maximize the number of residents who can easily walk or bike to nearby facilities and services such as the Town Center, the Community Park, and schools.

Other key objectives of the Preserve project would be to:

- Locate housing in proximity to the intensive job centers along Highway 50, Sunrise Boulevard, and other employment areas within the City.

- Provide housing opportunities affordable to a wide range of income levels.

- Provide a wide range of housing types, including mixed commercial/residential, lofts, attached and traditional single-family.

- Design a project that includes roadway, bike and pedestrian routes and options for connectivity within the project and with the surrounding neighborhoods.

- Provide open space and trails integrated to the extent feasible with existing and future City parks.

- Protect and retain vernal pool and wetland habitat where feasible and provide educational opportunities related to these resources for City residents.

- Develop a land use plan that can be successfully implemented in light of the requirements of the federal Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and other relevant environmental statutes.

ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT: EXISTING LAND USES ALTERNATIVE

The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not be consistent the majority of the project objectives because it would not result in the development of residential units, commercial uses, parks, public open space or other public uses. Implementation of this alternative would not meet the goals or objectives set forth in the City of Rancho Cordova "Vision Book", which contains the conceptual building blocks for the City's General Plan. The project site is located within the Preserve/SunCreek Planning Area in the Interim General Plan. This planning area encompasses approximately 1,762 acres within the SDCP area and is planned for the development of 9,830 dwelling units, a residential population of 26,740 persons, and approximately 3,170 jobs. The City has also identified the project site as a future "Town Center" site, which is designed to meet the needs of approximately 35,000 to 45,000 people and include retail stores, indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, and restaurants and lodging opportunities. This alternative would be inconsistent with the approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan, which designates the site for urbanized uses. This alternative would not result in community parks or recreational facilities, open spaces or trails. Additionally, this alternative

would not provide housing opportunities or assist in reducing vehicle-miles-traveled by placing housing and employment to the city's intensive job center and U.S. 50. This alternative would not provide roadways, bike or pedestrian routes or options for connectivity. The only two policies with which the alternative would be consistent are the policies to protect and retain vernal pool and wetland habitat where feasible and the policy to develop a land use plan that can be successfully implemented in light of the requirements of the Clean Water Act. This alternative would leave the project site in its current undeveloped state with vernal pool and wetland habitat.

ALTERNATIVE 2: NO PROJECT: APPROVED SUNRISE DOUGLAS COMMUNITY PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would be consistent with some of the project objectives identified for the project including, but not limited to, placing housing in close proximity to the City's intensive job centers and creating roadways, bike and pedestrian routes and options for connectivity. This alternative is also consistent with the conceptual land uses and planning efforts identified in the adopted Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and the Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan. However, this alternative would not create a variety of housing types or densities that would maximize the number of residents able to walk or bike to nearby facilities, as this alternative would result in predominately low-density residential uses (272 acres) with a density of 1 to 12 dwelling units per acre and only 12 acres of medium-density residential with a density of 20 dwelling units per acre. This alternative would also not result in an integrated system of trails and open space connected with future City parks. This alternative does not include a wetland preserve area and would conflict with the objective of protecting and retaining vernal pool and wetland habitat where feasible. Additionally, implementation of this alternative may result in a land use plan that conflicts with the requirements of the federal Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and other relevant environmental statutes.

ALTERNATIVE 3: AQUATIC RESOURCE HABITAT ALTERNATIVE

The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would be consistent with some of the project objectives. Implementation of this alternative would provide a community park to serve the recreational needs of the SDCP area and a variety of residential densities, which enable residents to walk or bike to commercial areas, parks and schools. This alternative would also provide extensive open space, which would be integrated with the on-site trail system and future park sites. The land plan associated with this alternative would protect and retain on-site vernal pools and wetland habitat, as it was developed based on guidance from the US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the US Environmental Protection Agency in the "Conceptual-Level Strategy for Avoiding, Minimizing, and Preserving Aquatic Resource Habitat in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Area" (2004). This alternative would not be consistent with the City's Interim General Plan Land Use Map Book and Vision Book and the planning principles designed to located residential uses within walking distance of parks, recreation and services, and to create a more urban "Town Center" on the project site. This alternative's site design may also conflict with the City's vision of providing an integrated bike and pedestrian trial system by restricting public access along the wetland preserve and limiting connectivity with other adjacent planned and approved developments. Additionally, implementation of this alternative would not be consistent with the land uses designated for the project site in the adopted Sunrise Douglas Community Plan.

ALTERNATIVE 4: EXISTING MORRISON CREEK ALTERNATIVE

The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would be consistent with all of the project objectives by providing a mix of land uses and densities that are consistent with the City's Interim General Plan and creating a "Town Center" for public and private interaction and services. This alternative would provide a community park and smaller neighborhood parks to serve the needs of the greater Sunrise Douglas Community Plan area and maximize, to the extent feasible, the number of residents within walking/biking distance of facilities and services. This alternative would also provide a mix of housing types and a variety of residential densities to facilitate efficient bike and pedestrian circulation and connectivity. The open space component associated with this alternative would integrate the on-site parks and trail system along the existing Morrison Creek corridor and provide more of a trail system than the proposed project that would connect to the proposed SunCreek trails to the south and future City parks. This alternative would result in more parkland than the proposed project (59.4 acres versus 49.6 acres). Additionally, implementation of this alternative would protect and retain the on-site vernal pools and wetland habitat by establishing 103.9 acres of wetland preserve area as compared to the proposed project's 92.4 acres of wetland preserve. However, it should be noted that this alternative would not result in the same number of residential units or density as the proposed project due to the increase in open space associated with preserving the Morrison Creek corridor and the passive recreation area and trail system through the center of the project site. This increase in open space would reduce vehicular interconnectivity and ease of mobility between the residential areas on either side of the creek and the utility corridor, and reduce the amount of residential acreage surrounding the elementary school site.

ALTERNATIVE 5: BLUEPRINT ALTERNATIVE

The Blueprint Alternative would meet all of the project objectives. This alternative would provide a wide range of housing opportunities, including mixed-commercial/residential lots and both attached and traditional single-family design, as well as services and public/quasi-public uses. This alternative would locate housing in close proximity to the City's work centers and U.S. 50 and provide residential densities to facilitate efficient bike and pedestrian circulation. The land use plan associated with this alternative would provide an integrated open space and trail system to tie in with city parks and promote neighborhood connectivity. This alternative would protect vernal pools and wetland habitat. Additionally, this alternative is consistent with the City's "Vision Book" (August 2, 2004) and the Land Use Map Book. However it should be noted that while this alternative promotes a mix of housing types and services within walking and biking distance, the alternative's residential unit count, densities and commercial acreage would be less than the proposed project, which would make it more difficult to create a vibrant "Town Center" on the project site.

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15326(d)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that, if the No Project Alternative is the "environmentally superior" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. **Table 6.0-5** provides a comparison of each of the project alternatives on an environmental topic-by-topic basis. Based on the foregoing analysis, Alternative 1 (No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative) is considered the environmentally superior alternative. However, Alternative 1 is not consistent with the majority of the project objectives. As indicated in **Table 6.0-5**, the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative (Alternative 3) is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project, but it also does not meet the majority of the project objectives. Alternative 4: Existing Morrison Creek Alternative is the next most environmentally superior to the proposed project and it meets all of the project objectives.

TABLE 6.0-5
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Population/ Housing/ Employment	*Project Impacts*	W	S	S	S	S
Population, housing and employment increases and significant impacts on regionally projected growth (Impact 4.2.1)	***Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because project would include 2,703 residential units and 17 acres of commercial uses. (LTS)***	Potentially significant impacts on regionally projected growth because Alternative 1 would not include residential units or employment opportunities and growth would occur elsewhere (PS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 2 would provide 1,636 units and 60 acres of commercial uses (LTS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 3 would provide 2,003 units and 17 acres of commercial (LTS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 4 would provide 2,659 units and 17 acres of commercial (LTS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 5 would provide 2,101 units and 11.3 acres of commercial (LTS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	PS	(LTS)	(LTS)	(LTS)	(LTS)
Human Health/Risk of Upset	*Project Impacts*	B	S	S	S	S
Potential exposure to groundwater contamination (Impact 4.3.2)	***Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)***	No potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Underground Storage Tank Contamination (Impact 4.3.3)	***Undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site, potentially contaminating soils and/or groundwater (PS)***	Undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site may result in contamination of soils and/or groundwater (PS)	Undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site may result in contamination of soils and/or groundwater (PS)	Undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site may result in contamination of soils and/or groundwater (PS)	Undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site may result in contamination of soils and/or groundwater (PS)	Undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site may result in contamination of soils and/or groundwater (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Transportation	*Project Impacts*	B	B	B	B	B
Impacts to study area roadway segments under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.1,4.4.3,4.4.7, and 4.4.12)	***Worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on a deficiently operating roadways (S)***	No roadway segment impacts	1,067 fewer dwelling units and approximately 40% reduction in residential trips; however, approximately 63% increase in AM peak hour and 86% increase in PM peak hour trips from larger commercial area (S)	700 fewer dwelling units and approximately 26 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)	44 fewer dwelling units and approximately 2 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)	602 fewer dwelling units and approximately 22 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	*LTS/SU*	N/A	LTS/SU	LTS/SU	LTS/SU	LTS/SU
Impacts to study area intersections under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.2, 4.4.8 and 4.4.13)	***Worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections (S)***	No intersection related impacts	1,067 fewer dwelling units and approximately 40% reduction in residential trips; however, approximately 63% increase in AM peak hour and 86% increase in PM peak hour trips from larger commercial area (S)	700 fewer dwelling units and approximately 26 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)	44 fewer dwelling units and approximately 2 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)	602 fewer dwelling units and approximately 22 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	*SU*	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Impacts to the Sunrise Boulevard Corridor (Impact 4.4.3)	***Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)***	No impacts to the Sunrise Corridor	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	*SU*	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Freeway mainline impacts under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.4, 4.4.9, and 4.4.14)	*Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential unit threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan (S)*	No freeway mainline related impacts	1,067 fewer dwelling units and approximately 40% reduction in residential trips; however, approximately 63% increase in AM peak hour and 86% increase in PM peak hour trips from larger commercial area (S)	700 fewer dwelling units and approximately 26 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)	44 fewer dwelling units and approximately 2 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)	602 fewer dwelling units and approximately 22 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	*SU*	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Transit impacts under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.5, and 4.4.10, and 4.4.15)	*Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova (PS and S)*	No increase in transit demand or impacts to transit facilities	Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova (PS and S)	Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova (PS and S)	Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova (PS and S)	Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova (PS and S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	*LTS*	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Noise	*Project Impacts*	B	S	S	S	S
Noise-producing uses within the project area (Impact 4.5.2)	*Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses (PS)*	No new noise producing sources over existing conditions	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses (PS)	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses (PS)	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses (PS)	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	*LTS*	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Construction noise (Impact 4.5.4)	*Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet.*	No construction noise impacts	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet.	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet.	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet.	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. (PS)

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	(PS)		(PS)	(PS)	(PS)	
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Cumulative traffic noise on future developments (Impact 4.5.6)	***Future traffic noise levels at a distance of 75 feet from the future Jaeger Road are predicted to exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)***	No residences constructed and no cumulative noise impacts	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Air Quality	***Project Impacts***	B	B	B	B	S
Construction air emissions (Impact 4.6.1 and 4.6.2)	***Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (652.7 pounds per day), which exceeds SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85 pounds per day of NOx (S)***	No construction air related emissions	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (541 pounds per day), which exceeds SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85 pounds per day of NOx (S)	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (489 pounds per day), which exceeds SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85 pounds per day of NOx (S)	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (580 pounds per day) and exceed SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85 pounds per day of NOx (S)	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (652.7 pounds per day) and exceed SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85 pounds per day of NOx (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***SU***	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Operational air emissions – ozone (Impact 4.6.4)	***Generate 352.2 pounds of ROG and 262.6 pounds of NOx per day, which exceeds SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day***	No operational emission impacts would occur	Generate 292 pounds of ROG and 218 pounds of NOx per day, which exceeds the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day	Exceed the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)	Exceed the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)	Exceed the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	(S)		(S)			
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***SU***	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Cumulative Operational air impacts (Impact 4.6.6)	***Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)***	No contribution to cumulative operational air impacts	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***SU***	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Hydrology and Water Quality	***Project Impacts***	B	S	S	S	S
Surface Water Quality (Impact 4.7.2)	***Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)***	No surface water quality impacts	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Construction Impacts (Impact 4.7.4)	***Potentially significant construction water quality impacts (PS)***	No construction water quality related impacts	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts (PS)	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts (PS)	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts (PS)	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Drainage (Impact 4.7.5)	***Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)***	No site preparation or drainage impacts	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage Improvements (PS)	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Cumulative Water Quality (Impact 4.7.6)	***Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts***	No contribution to cumulative water quality impacts	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts (PS)

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	(PS)		(PS)	(PS)	(PS)	
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Biological Resources	***Project Impacts***	B	W	B	B	S
Direct Impacts to endangered, threatened, rare species (impact 4.9.1)	***The project would result in the loss of 454.90 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat (S)***	No direct impact to these species	The direct loss of 495 acres of Swainson's hawk habitat and 20 acres of vernal pool shrimp habitat. (S)	The direct loss of 290 acres of Swainson's hawk habitat and 5.8 acres of vernal pool shrimp habitat (S)	The direct loss of 426 acres of Swainson's hawk habitat and 10 acres of vernal pool shrimp habitat (S)	The direct loss of 454.90 acres of Swainson's hawk habitat, 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Indirect Impacts to endangered, threatened, rare species (impact 4.9.2)	***Indirect adverse effects to 455 acres of habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species (S)***	No indirect impact to these species	Convert 495 acres to urbanized uses, resulting in indirect effects to the habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species. (S)	The loss of approximately 290 acres resulting in indirect impacts to these species (S)	The loss of approximately 426 acres resulting in indirect impacts to these species (S)	The loss of approximately 455 acres resulting in indirect impacts to these species (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Loss of Habitat Impacts (Impacts 4.9.3, 4.9.4)	***Loss of foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds and other forms of wildlife other than Swainson's hawk, and the direct loss of 10.46 acres of***	No impacts or loss of habitat	Loss of 495 acres of foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds and other forms of wildlife other than Swainson's hawk, and direct loss of 15.39	The loss of approximately 290 acres of habitat and direct loss of 5.8 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat	The loss of approximately 426 acres of habitat and the direct loss of 10.2 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat	Loss of foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds and other forms of wildlife other than Swainson's hawk, and the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	northern hardpan vernal pools (S)		acres of northern hardpan vernal pools (S)	(S)	(S)	(S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Loss of Jurisdictional Waters (Impact 4.9.5)	***Filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands (S)***	No impacts or loss of jurisdictional waters	Filling of 21.26 acres of jurisdictional wetlands. (S)	Filling of 5.8 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat (S)	Filling of 10.2 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat (S)	Filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impacts to movement corridors (Impact 4.9.6)	***Interfere substantially with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp (S)***	No movement corridor related impacts	Interfere substantially with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp (S)	Would not interfere or impede movement in this corridor (S)	Would not interfere or impede movement in this corridor (S)	Interfere substantially with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***SU***	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.10)	***Result in a cumulatively significant loss of biological resources in the region. (S)***	No cumulative impacts to biological resources	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***SU***	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	***Project Impacts***	B	S	S	S	S

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Undiscovered Prehistoric Resources, Historic Resources, and Human Remains (Impact 4.10.1)	***Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)***	Would not disturb or impact undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.2)	***Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)***	Would not damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Visual Resources/Light and Glare	***Project Impacts***	B	S	S	S	S
Light and Glare (Impact 4.11.2)	***Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)***	No new light and glare sources would be introduced (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Public Services and Utilities	***Project Impacts***	B	S	S	S	S
Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)	***Cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services (PS)***	Would not contribute to cumulative fire protection and emergency medical service impacts	Cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services (PS)	Cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services (PS)	Cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services (PS)	Cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services (PS)

Environmental Categories	*Proposed Project (Impact Significance)*	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Design-Related Safety Concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2)	***Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)***	No effect on police department's service ability	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	***LTS***	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2)	***Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)***	Would not require extension of existing infrastructure	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)
Overall Impact Comparison	***N/A***	**B**	**S**	**B**	**B**	**S**

Notes: *B = Better, S = Same, W = Worse* ( ) = Level of significance without mitigation.
LTS = Less than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable
A quantitative comparison is provided, where available, for impacts that were analyzed in Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of the Draft EIR. No quantitative data was available for Human Health/Risk of Upset, Hydrology and Water Quality, Geology and Soils, and Cultural, Paleontological Resource, Visual Resources, or Public Services. The classifications of B, S and W were based on available quantitative and qualitative information for the proposed project and the four alternatives.

This section discusses the additional topics statutorily required by CEQA. The topics discussed include significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and significant irreversible environmental changes/irretrievable commitment of resources.

7.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Section 15126(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe any unavoidable significant impacts, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. In addition, Section 15093(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines allows the decision-making agency to determine if the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of implementing the project. The City of Rancho Cordova can approve a project with unavoidable adverse impacts if it prepares a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" setting forth the specific reasons for making such a judgment. A list of unavoidable adverse impacts identified in this EIR is provided below.

SDCP/SRSP SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

In approving the SDCP/SRSP project, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors adopted Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for those impacts that could not be mitigated to **less than significant** levels. The SDCP/SRSP FEIR identified eight significant effects associated with implementation of the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and Sunridge Specific Plan, which could not be reduced to a level of insignificance with mitigation (SDCP/SRSP FEIR pp. 17.1-17.4).

- Land Use Incompatibility
- Traffic Impacts;
- Specific Plan and Community Plan construction-related ozone precursor emissions;
- Specific Plan and Community Plan operational emissions of ozone precursors and particulates;
- Community Plan carbon monoxide emissions;
- Traffic noise impacts on existing noise-sensitive receptors;
- Land development impacts upon wetlands; and
- Land development impacts upon special status species.

A comparative discussion of how the significant and unavoidable impacts from the SDCP/SRSP EIR relate to the proposed project is provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of this DEIR.

PROJECT SPECIFIC SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Additional Interim Year (2014) Intersections

Impact 4.4.13 Implementation of the project will result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area

intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Freeway Ramp Merge/Diverge and Weaving Analysis

Impact 4.4.14 Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US-50 under cumulative conditions. This is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Transit System

Impact 4.4.15 Implementation of the project will increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova under cumulative conditions. This is considered a **cumulatively considerable** impact.

Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors

Impact 4.6.6 Existing and future land use conditions in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin would result in cumulative impacts to air quality. The proposed project's contribution to this condition would be **cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Water Quality

Impact 4.7.6 The project would contribute to water quality degradation in the watershed in combination with regional development. The project's contribution would be **cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Drainage Impacts

Impact 4.7.8 Implementation of the proposed project may adversely affect local and regional drainage. The project's contribution to regional drainage impacts is considered **cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Biological Resources

Impact 4.9.11 Implementation of the project, together with past, present, and probable future projects would result in a cumulatively significant loss of biological resources in the region. The project's incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact is **cumulatively considerable**.

Paleontological Resources

Impact 4.10.4 Implementation of the proposed project, along with any foreseeable development in the project vicinity, could result in cumulative impacts to paleontological resources. The project's contribution to this impact could be **cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Alteration to Visual Character

Impact 4.11.4 Implementation of the Preserve at Sunridge project in combination with other projects would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare

in the area, and contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impact. Thus, the project's contribution to the alteration of the visual character of the area is considered to be **cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Wastewater Impacts

Impact 4.12.4.2 Implementation of the project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development within SRCSD service area, would result in an increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity. The project's contribution could be **cumulatively considerable**.

7.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

INTRODUCTION

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action. A "growth-inducing impact" is defined by the State CEQA Guidelines as follows:

> *...the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth...Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also...the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2[d]).*

A project can have direct and/or indirect growth inducement potential. Growth inducement may constitute an adverse impact if the growth is not consistent with or accommodated by the land use plans and growth management plans and policies for the area affected. Local land use plans provide for land use development patterns and growth policies that allow for the orderly expansion of urban development supported by adequate urban public services, such as water supply, roadway infrastructure, sewer service, and solid waste service. A project that would induce "disorderly" growth (growth that conflicts with local land use plans) could indirectly cause additional adverse environmental impacts and other public services impacts. Thus, to assess whether a growth-inducing project will result in significant adverse secondary effects, it is important to assess the degree to which the growth accommodated by the project would or would not be consistent with applicable land use plans.

Direct growth inducement would result if a project, for example, involved construction of new housing. A project would have indirect growth inducement potential if it established substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial or governmental enterprises) or if it would involve a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that would indirectly stimulate the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand. Similarly, a project would indirectly induce growth if it would remove an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as removing a constraint on a required public service. A project providing an increased water supply in an area where water service historically limited growth could be considered growth-inducing.

The State CEQA Guidelines further explain that the environmental effects of induced growth are considered indirect impacts of the proposed action. These indirect impacts or secondary effects of growth may result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. Potential secondary effects of growth include increased demand on other community and public services and infrastructure, increased traffic and noise, and adverse environmental impacts such as degradation of air and water quality, degradation or loss of plant and animal habitat, and conversion of agricultural and open space land to developed uses.

SDCP/SRSP EVALUATION OF GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

The SDCP/SRSP FEIR addressed growth-inducing impacts and concluded:

> *"There is growth inducing potential associated with the project in that the extension and upgrade of urban infrastructure and services could facilitate development of surrounding properties.*
>
> *The Sunrise Douglas planning area was targeted for urbanization with adoption of the 1993 Sacramento County General Plan. As shown on Plate LA-4, the General Plan includes the planning area and lands to the west with the Urban Policy Area, which defines the area expected to receive urban levels of public infrastructure and services within the near-term (20-year) planning period of the General Plan. However, surrounding lands to the north, east and south of the planning area are located outside the Urban Policy Area but within the Urban Services Boundary. The Urban Service Boundary defines the ultimate boundary of the urban area over the long-term (beyond the 20-year planning period), and provides a basis for long-range public infrastructure planning for the preservation of important open space and agricultural lands.*
>
> *The project's growth inducing impacts are of concern are therefore limited to potential impacts on surrounding lands to the north, east, and south since those lands have not been planned for near-term urbanization. By virtue of being outside the Urban Policy Area, General Plan policies would not support the near-term urbanization of those lands."*

The following discussion focuses on the proposed project's specific growth inducing impacts, which were not evaluated in the previous environmental review.

PROJECT SPECIFIC GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Consistency with Relevant Land Use Plans

Sacramento County General Plan

As previously discussed, the entire SDCP area (including the proposed project site) was designated as an UGA in the County's General Plan and that development of the area could support the increased demand for housing and employment, provide adequate public facilities and services, provide public transit, and conserve and/or preserve valuable natural resources (i.e., vernal pools and wetlands). Additionally, the project site is within the County's USB, which are areas in Sacramento County that were designated for Urban Services (i.e., public water and wastewater infrastructure by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors during the current General Plan planning period. This indicates the County's intent to plan for urbanization of the area and the project site within the 20 year planning horizon of the current General Plan. The

urbanization of this area, the associated population increases, and the potential environmental and growth inducing impacts were addressed in the both the General Plan EIR and the SDCP/SRSP EIR. The project requires a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and rezone to allow for the proposed land uses. However, the SDCP/SRSP EIR evaluated conceptual land uses for the Community Plan area and included the project site in Villages "C" and "F." The conceptual villages evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP EIR included Low-density residential, Medium-density residential, Commercial/Office, Recreation, Open Space, Drainage Corridor, and elementary, middle, and high schools, which are generally consistent with the proposed project. Additionally, the project is considered consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan land use designations and corresponding policies. The proposed project is one development project within the 6,015.3 acres Community Plan area, which is intended for urbanization; therefore, the project would not be considered growth inducing and is substantially consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan.

Rancho Cordova General Plan

The project site is located within the Suncreek/Preserve Planning Area in the Interim General Plan Land Map Book. The Suncreek/Preserve Planning Area makes up approximately 1,847 acres in the southeastern portion of the City and is anticipated to hold approximately 9,830 dwelling units with an estimated residential population of 26,840 and an employment population of approximately 3,170 persons. The land uses, residential densities, population increases, and conceptual circulation system proposed as part of the project are generally consistent with those identified on the Draft Land Use Map. Additionally, this area is anticipated for development by 2030.

Sunrise Douglas Community Plan

The proposed project is located within the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan (SDCP) area. The SDCP established the policy framework (including both guiding principles and policies, land use holding capacity and acreage estimates, and a basic infrastructure framework. The SDCP does not grant land use entitlements. Entitlements to develop sub-areas (including the proposed project site) within the SDCP area will be granted through the adoption of specific plans, use permits, subdivision maps and related entitlements. The proposed project contains the same general land use concepts, residential densities, and population increases as those evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP EIR for the proposed project site. Both the SDCP and the Preserve at Sunridge propose the same land use designation including: low density; medium density; commercial; recreation; open space; wetland preserve; and elementary school (refer to Table 3.0-1, Figure 4.1-2 and Figure 4.1-3). The project is generally consistent with the SDCP and would not be considered growth inducing when evaluated in accordance with the adopted SDCP (see Section 4.1 Land Use, Impact 4.1.1).

Metropolitan Transportation Plan

SACOG has updated the Metropolitan Transportation Program (MTP), which is the long-range transportation plan for the Sacramento region (covering Sacramento, Yolo, Sutter, Yuba, Placer and El Dorado Counties, except for the Tahoe Basin). The plan uses the transportation plans and land use plans of local cities and counties as its primary building blocks, providing coordination between them and focusing on transportation strategies that link different locations in the region -- such as highways, rail, bus services and bikeways. Roadway extensions and improvements can be considered growth inducing; however, the programmed improvements identified for the City of Rancho Cordova were assumed in the MTP 2025 roadway network. The MTP identified several roadway improvements in the City, particularly in the SDCP area. The MTP identified 28

specific projects, all within the Sunrise Capital Improvement Project (CIP), to accommodate the anticipated growth in area. Due to air quality compliance issues, SACOG has indicated that no Tier 1 roadway improvements would be implemented until January 2006. SACOG is updating its roadway improvement portion of the MTP to address air quality issues and anticipates it will be completed by December 2005. Given that the proposed project is one project within the SDCP, implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in growth inducement not already been considered in the MTP.

Zone 40

Currently there is no public water service available at the project site. The project would be served by Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) facilities, for both short-term and long-term water supplies. The SCWA has prepared the Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan (Master Plan) that identifies a conjunctive use approach, which includes the use of groundwater, surface water, and recycled wastewater to meet the ultimate water demand in the Zone 40 service area. The extension of public infrastructure is considered a growth inducing impact. However, the potential water demands associated with the SDCP and the project site were considered in preparation of the SCWA Zone Master Plan EIR, which was certified by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors. The Master Plan and related EIR identified sustainable groundwater yields, recycled water from the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant Tertiary facility (SRWWTP), and various surface water supply sources to meet the projected demand in Zone 40. The SCWA approved the Water Supply Assessment for the project in December 2004; therefore, the project is consistent with the agency's Master Plan (see Section 4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality for a complete discussion on Water Supply). Infrastructure necessary to convey water to the project site would be sized to serve the project and possible adjacent projects in the SDCP area, which were previously analyzed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR.

SRCSD and CSD-1

The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and the County Sanitation District-1 (CSD-1) would provide sanitary sewer service for the proposed project. The rate of growth in various CSD-1 service areas and the anticipated timing of large-scale developments define the scheduling and construction of sewerage system improvements. CSD-1 uses SACOG population, employment, and housing projections along with local city and Sacramento County Planning Department projections to determine when major projects are anticipated or approved for development. Land use estimates from land use plans from the various jurisdictions in Sacramento County form the basis for quantifying future wastewater flows and the timing of sewerage improvements and expansion projects. The CSD-1 prepared its Sewerage Facilities Expansion Master Plan (SFEMP) in October 2000. The SFEMP translates existing land use projections into wastewater flow estimates and identifies trunk relief and expansion projects to meet the projected increased service demand. The entire SDCP area and associated land uses were included in the land use projections in preparation of the October 2000 SFEMP. This development potential was analyzed in the SFEMP and is consistent with the proposed project.

The SRCSD Interceptor System Master Plan (2002) focused solely on the regional interceptor conveyance facilities. The Interceptor Master Plan included the conceptual land uses of SDCP area and recommended the construction of new interceptors as well as several improvements to the existing system to accommodate the projected growth in the SDCP area. The project would not require the extension of sewer infrastructure or result in sewer demands not anticipated in these wastewater related master plans; therefore, the project would not be considered growth inducing.

Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for infrastructure and public services (i.e., roadways, water, sewer etc.). The potential environmental effects associated with the expansion of facilities SRCSD and CSD-1 facilities were addressed in the Regional Interceptor Master Plan and EIR, the SRCSD Master Plan and EIR, and the Sewerage Facilities Expansion Master Plan and the associated EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in the removal of a development obstacle or result in a grow-inducing impact.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

A project would have indirect growth inducement potential if it established substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial or governmental enterprises) or if it would involve a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that would indirectly stimulate the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand. New employment opportunities and employees typically induce growth in two ways: (1) through their spending on goods and services; and (2) through their need for housing.

The proposed project would include commercial/office, retail and shopping center land uses located in a 17-acre "Town Center" setting. The project includes approximately 147,000 square feet of commercial square footage for the first floor uses and an additional 18,000 square feet for the proposed second floor "live-work" residential/office uses, bringing the total commercial square footage to approximately 165,000 square feet. The proposed commercial center is designed to serve the SDCP and would not be considered a regional market. The project would provide some long-term employment from the proposed commercial, office, and retail uses. In addition, the construction phase of the project would produce some short-term, non-permanent employment opportunities.

The proposed project is an individual development project within the SDCP area, which was intended to provide a new location for housing to meet the demand generated by existing, planned, and approved employment in Rancho Cordova and along the US-50 corridor. Rancho Cordova currently has a jobs/housing ratio of 3:1, which means 3 jobs to every 1 household. There is an existing demand for new homes in Rancho Cordova and the greater Sacramento area.

In addition, a balance of jobs and housing and a reduction in vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) is an important consideration in the Sacramento region to improve overall air quality and reduce traffic congestion. Furthermore, an adequate supply of affordable housing to employees is a significant factor in the location decision of large-scale employers and contributes to the economic sustainability in the region. Some employees would purchase new housing in the area; others would rent housing.

Due to the limited amount of commercial development proposed and small number of anticipated employees, it is unlikely the project would generate demand for housing elsewhere (to purchase or rent), or that the project would accelerate the construction of housing in areas already planned for development.

The proposed 288 multi-family residential units could accommodate some of the housing demand of project employees and other employees in the area. The project would include a wide variety of housing choices, including cottages and live-work units, which would help to absorb population growth resulting from new commercial and retail uses and thereby reducing the project's growth-inducing potential on surrounding areas. The proposed project is primarily a residential development with limited commercial uses; therefore, the project would more than

accommodate the housing needs generated by the commercial uses and would not induce growth from an economic stand point.

In addition, the project site is within the County's USB, which indicates the County's intent to plan for urbanization of the area and the project site within the 20 year planning horizon of the current General Plan. The project site is also located within the Suncreek/Preserve Planning Area in the Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan, which is anticipated to hold approximately 9,830 dwelling units with an estimated residential population of 26,840 and an employment population of approximately 3,170 persons. Approval of the proposed project would not result in the urbanization of the surrounding vicinity or cause other properties to develop resulting in additional housing/population increases; therefore, the project is not considered growth-inducing from an economic standpoint.

PRECEDENT-SETTING ACTION

General Plan amendments, zoning changes, and/or general plan text or approval of exceptions to regulations may be considered precedent-setting actions, which could have implications for other properties or make it easier for other properties in the vicinity to develop.

The Sacramento County General Plan Urban Growth Area (UGA) designation applies to land that is intended for future urban development. The project is located within the USB as defined in the current Sacramento County General Plan. The project would not require an amendment to the current USB, given that the project site is located entirely within the city limits of Rancho Cordova. The project is generally consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan, as it relates to the USB; therefore, is would not be considered a precedent-setting action. Additionally, the entire SDCP area was designated as a UGA; therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not ease the process for other properties in the vicinity to develop. The project would involve changing the General Plan Land Use designations and a rezoning from (AG-80) to Special Planning Area (SPA) to allow for the proposed land uses. The rezoning of proposed project to allow for urban development is not anticipated to encourage other requests for rezoning of agriculturally-zoned parcels in the vicinity, given that the entire SDCP area is designated for urbanized development. Additionally, the City evaluates all rezone requests on a project-by-project basis; therefore, the project would not be considered a precedent-setting action.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF GROWTH

Because the proposed project would support planned growth as allowed for by the Sacramento County General Plan, it could indirectly result in some secondary environmental effects of growth associated with the adopted General Plan. The section entitled "Summary of Impacts and Their Disposition," beginning on page 17.1of the SDCP/SRSP EIR, provided a summary of the findings leading to the conclusions of significance for each significant and unavoidable impact. The County General Plan EIR addressed significant environmental impacts associated with the General Plan adoption and implementation. Further discussion of these secondary effects of planned growth associated with this project are addressed in Section 4.0 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures) of this EIR, as well as the Sacramento County General Plan and its associated environmental review document.

7.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

INTRODUCTION

Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(2), a part of CEQA, requires that certain EIRs must include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes of project implementation. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) describes irreversible environmental changes as follows:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

SDCP/SRSP EIR AND SIGNIFICANT AND IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

The SDCP/SRSP EIR addressed irreversible environmental changes impacts associated with development of the Community Plan area and concluded:

> *"Urbanization of the Sunrise Douglas planning area will require irretrievable commitments of a variety of natural resources including aggregates, petrochemicals, for fuels and asphaltic products and metals. In addition, the visual character of the site will be permanently changed from a rural setting to an urban developed setting." (SDCP/SRSP FEIR p. 17.8)*

The following discussion focuses on the project-specific significant irreversible impacts not evaluated in the previous EIR.

DISCUSSION

As previously discussed, buildout of the SDCP area would include urbanized and more intensive development than exists in the area. Implementation of the project would include the use of substantial amounts of non-renewable resources during the construction and operation phases in the form of refined petroleum-based fuels, natural gas and mineral resources used in construction materials. Once transformed into fuel or other energy forms, or into construction materials, these resources cannot be recovered. Some reuse or recycling of the construction materials may be possible after completion of the proposed project. Other non-reversible impacts of the project would include the conversion of agricultural land to urbanized uses, an irreversible loss of open space visual resources, and the irreversible change to the Morrison Creek corridor from the proposed realignment, which would also result in the loss of habitat for an endangered species and other impacts identified as significant and unavoidable in Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of this DEIR. The SDCP/SRSP EIR did not anticipate the loss of endangered species habitat associated with Morrison Creek.

The CEQA Guidelines also requires the disclosure and discussion of potential environmental damage caused by an accident associated with a project. There are no unique hazards associated with the proposed project site or in the immediate vicinity. As indicated in Section 4.3 Human Health/Risk of Upset, the project site is not within the comprehensive planning boundaries area of the Mather Airport, which is approximately three miles west of the site.

Conformance with the regulatory provisions of the Uniform Building Code would minimize the potential of injuries and structural damage in the event of an accident during construction or a geologic related event. Potential geotechnical hazards can be mitigated by compliance with standard engineering and geotechnical practices, and significant impacts on the site are not expected. The proposed project would include the use and storage of chemicals and/or substances typically associated with large-scale project development. Mandatory compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations would lessen the potential environmental damage or risks to public health to less than significant levels.

The activities and land uses associated with the proposed project would not result in any additional significant and Irreversible Environmental Changes that were not already identified in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR.

7.4 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15065 identifies four mandatory findings of significance that must be considered as part of the environmental review process of a project. These findings are identified below with an analysis of the project's relationship to these findings.

1) The project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause of 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 an endangered, rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory."

The project's impacts on biological resource impacts and cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.9 (Biological Resources) and Section 4.10 (Cultural and Paleontological Resources) of this DEIR, respectively. Section 4.9 identifies mitigation measures to reduce impacts to biological resources.

2) The project has potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals."

The project would result in near-term impacts on traffic and air quality; however, the project site is located in the SDCP area, which is designated as an urban growth area and approved for urbanized development. This indicates the County's intent to plan for urbanization of this area within the current General Plan horizon. Urbanized development in the Community Plan area would provide additional housing in the City of Rancho Cordova and along the US-50 corridor. The additional housing provided by the project and associated commercial development would improve long-term regional traffic congestion, reduce cumulative and regional air quality impacts, and result in long-term environmental benefits related to these resources. However, development in the SDCP, including the proposed project, may result in disadvantages to long-term preservation goals for important biological resources, such as vernal pools and wetlands.

3) The project has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects."

The project's potential cumulative impacts are discussed and evaluated in Section 5.0 of this DEIR. Sections 4.1 through 4.12 evaluate cumulative impacts related to each technical discussion area and identify mitigation measures for each cumulatively significant impact. When applicable, mitigation measures are identified to lessen cumulative impacts; however, the project may result in **significant and unavoidable** impacts on air quality, biological resources and traffic.

4) The environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly."

Potential human related impacts are discussed and evaluated in Section 4.3 (Human Health/Risk of Upset), Section 4.5 (Noise), and Section 4.6 (Air Quality). Each section identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts associated with these resource areas.

8.1 PREPARERS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA

Planning Director:	Paul Junker, AICP
Project Planner:	William Campbell
Environmental Coordinator:	Hilary Anderson
Senior Environmental Review:	Patrick Angell, AICP
Environmental Project Manager:	David Young
Biological Resources:	Joyce Hunting
Cultural & Paleontological Resources:	John Nadolski
Environmental Planners:	Brett Bollinger Kevin Freibott
Graphics:	John DeMartino Catherine Lee Roxanne Perry Louis Lillegard
Document Production:	Jolene Miller Shonda Furr

CONSULTANTS

Transportation & Circulation	FEHR & PEERS – David Robinson
Noise	BOLLARD ACOUSTICAL CONSULTANTS – Paul Bollard
Air Quality	Don Ballanti