

---

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

- **No Impact:** No project-related impact to the environment would occur with project development;
- **Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed projects would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures;
- **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation:** The proposed projects would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant, but the incorporation of mitigation measure(s) would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level; or,
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed projects would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- **Reviewed Under Previous Document:** The impact has been adequately addressed in previous environmental documents, and further analysis is not required. The discussion will include reference to the previous documents.

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

---

#### 3.2 INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** North Douglas II
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova  
2729 Prospect Park Place  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ben Ritchie (916) 361-8384
4. **Project Location:** Approximately 0.8 miles north of Douglas Road and 0.6 miles west of Grant Line Road, immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the North Douglas I project. The project is located entirely within the City of Rancho Cordova.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Bruce Houdesheldt, Lennar Communities  
1075 Creekside Ridge Drive, Suite 110  
Roseville, CA 95678
6. **Current Zoning:** AG-80 – Permanent Agriculture
7. **General Plan and Planning Area:** City of Rancho Cordova General Plan  
Grant Line West Planning Area  
Designated for Mixed Density Residential
8. **APN Number(s):** 072-0300-005
9. **Description of the Project:** See Section 2.3 of this MND.
10. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** See Section 2.2 of this MND.
11. **Other public agencies whose approval may be required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)
  - 1) California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
  - 2) Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB)
  - 3) County Sanitation District (CSD-1)
  - 4) Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) Zone 40
  - 5) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
  - 6) Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD)
  - 7) Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)
  - 8) Sacramento Resource Conservation District (SRCD)
  - 9) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
  - 10) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

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

#### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

#### PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

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

#### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

---

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

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project site is largely undeveloped. The majority of the site consists of pasture with non-native grasses and some bushes and small trees on-site. The site is characterized by gently rolling terrain and does not include any rocky outcroppings or large trees. Site visits by City of Rancho Cordova Staff found some rolling terrain with limited aesthetic value in the northern portion of the project site. One rural residence is located on-site with three outbuildings and some landscaping.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

Secondary scenic vistas exist within the northeast of the City Planning Area and consist of diffuse and partially obstructed views of the Sierras (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-7). These views are sporadic and only occur on exceptionally clear days. Partial obscuration of these views already exists due to air quality in the region and existing trees and development to the east of the City. Due to existing trees and development to the east of the project site, views of the Sierra are obstructed and would not be further impacted by the proposed project. The proposed project is not located within sight of any scenic vista identified in the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on scenic vistas.

b) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR found that there were no highways within the Planning Area that were designated by State or local agencies as “scenic highways” (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-6). According to a Cultural Resources Inventory performed for the site by ECORP Consulting, Inc., the project site is characterized by gentle rolling and flat terrain and soil depth on-site is such that the bedrock is not

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

---

exposed (see **Appendix A**, p. 3). Therefore, rock outcroppings do not occur on site. The Cultural Resources Inventory did not find any evidence, either physical or historical, that any historic buildings were located on-site. There are no on-site trees of significant aesthetic value. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings and *no impact* is expected.

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

The proposed project is located in a currently undeveloped/rural portion of the City and would result in the urbanization of the southern portion of the project site, resulting in significant alteration of the existing visual character of the site. The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the GP-EIR. Urbanization of the proposed project site would not result in any project-specific impacts to scenic resources that were not identified in the Program EIR. As the GP-EIR found that aesthetic impacts to scenic resources were significant and unavoidable and because the proposed project is consistent with and described in the Program EIR, no further environmental analysis is required pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3.

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

The proposed project would result in urban development of a previously rural/undeveloped site. Construction of homes would result in a significant increase in reflective surfaces (e.g. windows) and sources of nighttime lighting normally associated with residential structures. However, the proposed project would be required to be consistent with the City's Design Guidelines, adopted July 8, 2005. Specific requirements for lighting on structures to be built in the City are included on pages 2:66 through 2:68 of the Design Guidelines. Adherence to City guidelines and requirements for lighting and glare, enforced during the Design Review process, would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with light and glare.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is not located on any active agricultural land. According to the California State Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map (2000), the proposed project includes both Grazing Land and Farmland of Local Importance. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program defines these types of agricultural land as:

- Grazing Land – Land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock.
- Farmland of Local Importance – Land of importance to the local agricultural economy, as determined by each county’s Board of Supervisors and a local advisory committee.

The majority of the project site is characterized as Grazing Land. However, no evidence was found on site of any cattle grazing activities (either current or past) during the survey performed for the Cultural Resources Inventory (**Appendix A**) or during site visits by City staff. No evidence of active farming on the portions of the site characterized as Farmland of Local Importance was found either.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The project area does not include any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the California Department of Conservation Important

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

---

Farmland Map. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to these types of farmland.

- b) *Potentially Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Just as with other types of farmland, the GP-EIR identified impacts to farmland currently under Williamson Act Contracts (GP-DEIR, pp. 4.2-22 through 4.2-23). Impacts of the General Plan to Williamson Act land were found to be significant and unavoidable due to the significant loss of such land at buildout of the General Plan.

The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. The nearest land still under Williamson Act contract is located within one mile of the project to the east. Implementation of the proposed project would not impact that area. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* to Williamson Act Contract farmland.

The proposed project is currently zoned AG-80, which establishes permanent agricultural uses on parcels of no less than 80 acres. The GP-EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts relating to the loss of such farmland due to urbanization of the rural portions of the City, including the project area (GP-DEIR, pp. 4.2-17 through 4.2-20). The proposed project would convert the entirety of the project area from AG-80 to zoning designations of a non-agricultural nature resulting in a significant impact. The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the GP-EIR. Urbanization of the proposed project site would not result in any project-specific impacts to agricultural zoning that was not identified in the Program EIR. As the GP-EIR found that impacts to agricultural resources were significant and unavoidable and because the proposed project is consistent with and described in the Program EIR, no further environmental analysis is required pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact/Review Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR stated that impacts could occur to agricultural land uses as a result of urbanization of adjacent areas to operating agricultural operations (GP DEIR, p. 4.2-20). Placing urban development immediately adjacent to agricultural uses can potentially result in interface conflicts between the uses, which could ultimately result in cessation of agricultural uses in those locations (GP DEIR, pp. 4.2-20 through 4.2-21). Impacts to agriculture as a result of these interface conflicts of the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable.

According to the GP-EIR, impacts within City limits would be limited to those areas that contain active agricultural operations (p. 4.2-21). Land to the west and north, as well as a portion of the land immediately east of the project are currently zoned for agricultural uses. However, the only active agricultural operations occur in the parcel immediately north of the project and are limited to non-commercial operations related to a rural residence located on that parcel. The remainder of agriculturally zoned land surrounding the project is not currently utilized for agricultural uses. Therefore, interface conflicts are unlikely. Additionally, the land to the west, north, and south is designated in the General Plan for urban development. Applications for development of these parcels have been received by the City and the entitlement process is ongoing. Therefore, there are currently no significant agricultural operations directly adjacent to the proposed project and land surrounding the project will be rezoned for urban development (as part of a separate process from the proposed project). The proposed project would have *less than significant* impact on the agricultural zoning or use of adjacent properties.



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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

Pollutant emissions modeling for the proposed project was conducted by the Hoyt Company on April 24, 2006. Modeling was performed using the URBEMIS 2002 version 8.7.0 software provided by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The results of this modeling are included in **Appendix B**. The results of the model found that the proposed project would result in the emissions shown in **Table 2** below.

**TABLE 2  
ESTIMATED AIR EMISSIONS (POUNDS PER DAY)**

	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM10
Construction Phase (2006)	12.29	83.23	100.36	0	47.60
Construction Phase (2007)	575.49	32.16	44.06	0.01	1.47
Operational Phase	25.41	14.24	137.47	0.18	10.74

Source: URBEMIS2002 v.8.7.0

Notes: ROG = Reactive Organic Gasses, NO<sub>x</sub> = Nitrogen Oxides, CO = Carbon Monoxide, SO<sub>2</sub> = Sulfur Dioxide, PM10 = Particulate Matter, 10 Micron. Operational Phase emissions include both area source emissions and operational (vehicle) emission estimates.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Potentially Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento area is currently out of compliance with federal requirements for 8-hour ozone air quality standards and 1-hour ozone air quality standards. The region is in compliance with all other emissions standards. SMAQMD released the final "Sacramento Regional Nonattainment Area 8-Hour Ozone Rate-of-Progress Plan" (Ozone Plan) in February 2006. According to

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

the GP-EIR, projected buildout of the General Plan Planning Area would be consistent with the assumptions used during preparation of the Ozone Plan (GP FEIR, pp. 4.0-5 through 4.0-6). However, because there currently exist no feasible methods to completely offset air pollutant emission increases from land uses under the General Plan, the impact of the General Plan was considered to be significant and unavoidable (GP FEIR, pp. 4.0-6).

The proposed project would construct single-family homes in a currently undeveloped area. Therefore, the proposed project would have similar effects to implementation of the Ozone Plan as the General Plan. The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the General Plan Program EIR. Construction of the proposed project in this portion of the City would not create any new or additional impacts to the Ozone Plan that were not already identified in the Program EIR; nor would the project result in any new impacts peculiar to the project or parcel. As the GP-EIR found that impacts to the Ozone Plan were significant and unavoidable and because the proposed project is consistent with and described in the Program EIR, no further environmental analysis is required pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3.

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

In order to assist local agencies and municipalities with analyzing project-specific impacts to air quality and compliance with local air district attainment plans, SMAQMD has provided a "Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento" (2004). The Air Quality Guide includes information on significance and mitigation for common air emissions issues with the goal of reducing emissions from development projects and providing information and standards useful in CEQA analysis of such projects. The Air Quality Guide includes thresholds of significance for ozone precursors, shown in **Table 3** below.

**TABLE 3**  
**CURRENT SMAQMD EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS (POUNDS PER DAY)**

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

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

The proposed project is expected to result in a maximum of 83.23 pounds per day of NO<sub>x</sub> during construction and 14.24 pounds per day during operation of the proposed project (see **Appendix B**). Both estimates are below established thresholds. Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG) produced during operation of the project is expected to be 25.41 pounds per day, also below established thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project will not produce significant quantities of any pollutant currently tracked by SMAQMD.

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

---

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

#### Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

- c) *Potentially Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified that increases in Ozone precursors (NOx and ROG) would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on the region's status of nonattainment (GP DEIR, pp. 4.6-17 through 4.6-26). See discussions a) and b) above for more information on the GP-EIR findings related to ozone precursors.

As described in discussion b) above, the proposed project would result in less than significant increases in ozone precursors. However, when considered with planned development within the City and the air basin, the proposed project would contribute to what is a significant cumulative increase in ozone precursors. The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the General Plan Program EIR. Construction of the proposed project in this portion of the City would not create any new or additional impacts to the Ozone Plan that were not already identified in the Program EIR; nor would the project result in any new impacts peculiar to the project or parcel. As the GP-EIR found that impacts to the Ozone Plan were significant and unavoidable and because the proposed project is consistent with and described in the Program EIR, no further environmental analysis is required pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3.

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

The proposed project would construct only low-density residential land uses, parks, and open space. Primarily, emissions of TACs generated by the proposed project are expected to occur during the construction phase and are related to diesel exhaust from construction equipment. No existing land uses that serve or house sensitive receptors are located within two miles of the proposed project. While schools are planned in the vicinity of the project, in the project, in the Sunridge Specific Plan to the south and the Rio del Oro Special Planning Area to the west, no such schools have been constructed. As the primary source of TACs resulting from the proposed project is construction related, the generation of TACs will be greatly reduced by the time that uses utilized by sensitive receptors are constructed and in operation.

Some minor emissions of TACs are expected during operation of the proposed project, primarily due to diesel school busses and trash collection vehicles in use on the property. These emissions will be slight in quantity and intermittent in timing. Residential uses were not included in a list of TAC generating operations compiled by the California Air Resources Board (ARB). Residential uses are also not expected to generate noxious odors. Some odors associated with food preparation and waste handling are expected, but these do not constitute significant sources of odor and are unlikely to affect adjacent properties.

The proposed project does not propose to construct any land uses that would be utilized by sensitive receptors. No such land uses are located within two miles of the project. Future land uses that may house or serve sensitive uses in the area will be required to comply with Rancho Cordova Policy AQ.1.5, which requires analysis of odor emissions from future

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

---

development projects and mitigation of any significant emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact related to air quality impacts to sensitive receptors.

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion d) above. The proposed project does not propose to construct any uses that would generate significant objectionable odors. Nor would construction of the proposed project place people in the vicinity of any significant source of odors. The Sacramento Rendering Plant is located approximately four miles to the southwest of the proposed project. However, in response to the Master EIR for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan EIR, certified by the County Board of Supervisors on July 17, 2002 (State Clearinghouse Number 97022055), the Sacramento Rendering Plant instituted odor control measures that have reduced their emissions to a less than significant level. Given the distance to the proposed project and the measures implemented at the plant, the Sacramento Rendering Plant is not expected to generate significant odors at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with noxious odors.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The project proponent has applied for a Section 404 Individual Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The application for this permit, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. in April, 2006, is included as **Appendix C1**. Also prepared by ECORP Consulting for the proposed project were a Wetland Delineation (**Appendix C2**), a Special-Status Plant Survey Report (**Appendix C3**), and Section 7 Consultation Information (**Appendix C4**). Information provided in these four sources, as well as information provided in the GP-EIR was utilized in the following analysis.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential direct and indirect impacts to special-status species (those species identified in the checklist above) as a result of the implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48). While City Policies and Action Items would mitigate much of the impact of the General Plan, widespread development of undeveloped portions of the General Plan Planning Area as well as construction of the

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

Circulation Plan would result in a net loss of biological resources. Therefore, the General Plan was found to result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-43 and 4.10-48).

The Section 404 Individual Permit for the proposed project indicates that the project could potentially impact vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*) and vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardii*), both of which are federally listed special-status species (see **Appendix C1**). The Special-Status Plant Survey conducted for the property included a search for federal and State listed plant species as well as species identified by the California Native Plant Society as List 1B, 2,3, or 4. Site surveys were conducted in both April and June of 2005 and no special-status plants were found on-site (see **Appendix C3** for details). A search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) found no past occurrences of special-status species on site.

The proposed project includes the construction of homes, streets, and parks on a portion of the site that currently contains vernal pools. As the only special-status species found on-site reside in vernal pools and similar Jurisdictional Waters, construction of the proposed project could result in direct impacts to those species and their associated habitats.

According to the General Plan EIR, the proposed project site contains three cover types. Cover types are categories of typical land covers which identify potential plant communities and wildlife habitats that are commonly found in the associated land covers (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-3). The proposed project includes the vernal pool grassland, vernal pools, and streams cover types. The special status species commonly associated with these cover types is shown in **Table 4** below.

**TABLE 4**  
**COVER TYPES AND ASSOCIATED SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE**

Cover Type	Special Status Species Commonly Found Within (Common Name)	Directly Impacted by Proposed Project?
Vernal Pool Grassland	Ahart's dwarf rush Swainson's hawk Valley elderberry longhorn beetle	Yes
Vernal Pool	Boggs lake hedge-hyssop Ahart's dwarf rush Legenere Pincushion navarretia Slender orcutt grass Sacramento orcutt grass Sanford's arrowhead Swainson's hawk Vernal pool fairy shrimp Vernal pool tadpole shrimp California linderiella	Yes
Streams	Northwestern pond turtle	No

Source: GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-5; 4.10-21; 4.10-35

As shown in **Table 4** above, several special status species could potentially exist within the cover types located on-site. Northwestern pond turtle will not be impacted by the proposed project as it was not found during on-site surveys, it has not historically been found in the vicinity of the project, and because on-site streams will remain undisturbed. Valley elderberry longhorn beetle will not be impacted by the proposed project as no elderberry

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

---

plants are located on-site. As described in the Section 404 Individual Permit for the proposed project, two species of federally listed fairy shrimp occur on-site and would be directly impacted as a result of the fill of Jurisdictional Waters on-site. As part of the Section 404 process, the applicant will be required to mitigate for impacts to these species by preserving Jurisdictional Waters off-site, pursuant to the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Such off-site preservation will be consistent with City Policy NR.2.1 which requires “no net loss” of wetlands consistent with State and federal policies. The provisions of a 404 Individual Permit, once approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will mitigate impacts to these species. In order to ensure consistency with City Policies as well as federal and State policies and regulations, the following mitigation measure is included:

#### Mitigation Measure

**MM 4.1a** The project proponent shall obtain all required U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) permits pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, all necessary California Endangered Species Act permits from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), pursuant to the Fish and Game Code, and Section 401 Water Quality Certifications from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB) prior to the approval of any improvement or grading plans. As the project includes the potential take of a federally listed species, a Biological Opinion or Incidental Take Permit (issued as a result of a Section 7 Consultation) shall be obtained by the project proponent.

-and-

The project proponent shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Rancho Cordova Planning Department that the project complies with City no net loss Policies (NR.1.9 and NR.2.1) for wetland and riparian habitat acreage and values prior to the approval of any improvement or grading plans.

*Timing/Implementation: All required permits and opinions shall be secured by the project proponent and copies of said permits and opinion shall be provided to the Rancho Cordova Planning Department prior to the approval of improvement/grading plans. No net loss shall be demonstrated prior to the approval of improvement/grading plans.*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in consultation with USACE, CDFG, and CVRWQB.*

During the site survey conducted by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (**Appendix C3**), no special-status plant species were found on-site. However, more than a year has elapsed since the last survey. New occurrences of these species may be impacted by the proposed project. While Swainson’s hawk was not indicated in the area by either the CNDDDB or site surveys, Swainson’s hawk is known to utilize similar habitats in the vicinity and impacts to the species may occur. As the project site is currently undeveloped, raptor nesting could take place on-site. Raptors are considered special-status species by the CDFG. The following mitigation



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

---

measures, pursuant to City Policy NR.1.7 and Action Item NR.1.7.1, are included in order to mitigate potential impacts to Swainson's hawk, nesting raptors, and special-status species:

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 4.1b** The project applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by implementing one of the following alternatives:

- For projects within a one-mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 1.0 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. For projects within a one to five mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 0.75 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. For projects within a five to ten mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 0.5 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. This land shall be protected through fee title or conservation easement (acceptable to the California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG]); or,
- The project proponent shall, to the satisfaction of the CDFG, prepare and implement a Swainson's hawk mitigation plan that will include preservation of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.

Should the City Council of the City of Rancho Cordova adopt a Swainson's hawk mitigation ordinance/program prior to implementation of one of the measures above, the project proponent shall be subject to that program instead.

*Timing/Implementation: Preservation of habitat and approval of mitigation plan shall occur prior to approval of grading or improvement plans.*

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

**MM 4.1c** Prior to each phase of grading and construction, the project proponent shall ensure that a preconstruction survey is performed between February 1 and September 1 to determine if active nesting is taking place by raptors or special status birds on the project site. This survey shall be conducted by a person of adequate qualifications to make such a determination, such as a certified biologist or other such professional. If nesting is observed, the City Planning Department shall be notified immediately and consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) shall occur in order to determine the protective measure which must be implemented for the nesting birds. If nesting is not observed, further action will not be required.

If all construction occurs between September 2 and January 31, no preconstruction survey is required.

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

---

*Timing/Implementation:* This measure shall be included on all improvement plans. Surveys to be performed no more than 30 days prior to site disturbance between February 1 and September 1.

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

#### **MM 4.1d**

The project proponent shall update determinate surveys for potentially occurring special-status species or their habitat using protocol acceptable to the regulatory agencies with authority over these species or assume species presence within the area of project activity.

- If any special-status species or their habitat are indicated or assumed, a detailed plan which describes the specific methods to be implemented to avoid and/or mitigate any project impacts upon special-status species to a less than significant level will be required. This detailed Special Status Species Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall be prepared in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and shall emphasize a multi-species approach to the maximum extent possible. The Special-Status Species Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall be submitted to the City Planning Department for approval.
- Where project impacts include take of a State listed animal species, a “2081-incidental take” permit shall be obtained from the CDFG and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act.

Determinate surveys for potentially occurring special-status species shall be conducted no more than three months prior to site disturbance. A copy of all determinate surveys shall be provided to the City Planning Department.

*Timing/Implementation:* Determinate surveys shall be performed no more than three months prior to site disturbance. Any required avoidance/mitigation plans or permits listed above shall be provided to the City Planning Department prior to approval of improvement or grading plans or prior to site disturbance, whichever comes first.

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

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1a through MM 4.1d would ensure that all impacts to special status species from implementation of the proposed project are *less than significant*.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above for information on identified impacts of the General Plan on special-status species. The GP-EIR combined discussion of special-status species

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

impacts to include impacts to habitat as well as individuals of special-status species. Impacts to habitat from the implementation of the General Plan occurred for the same reasons and in the same intensity as impacts to individuals of any special-status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48). See discussion a) above for information and mitigation regarding impacts to habitat and natural communities. Mitigation measures MM 4.1a through MM 4.1d will ensure that impacts are *less than significant*.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR addressed potential direct and indirect impacts to Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. (Jurisdictional Waters) as a result of wide-spread development of the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-52 through 4.10-56). Policies and Action Items included in the General Plan would reduce impacts to Jurisdictional Waters, especially Policy NR.2.1 which requires “no net loss” of wetlands (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-56). While no net loss of wetlands will occur regionally, some loss of Jurisdictional Waters will occur within the General Plan Planning Area (Ibid.). Because of this local loss of Jurisdictional Waters, the impact of the General Plan was found to be significant and unavoidable (Ibid.).

According to the Wetland Delineation prepared for the project (**Appendix C2**), a total of 4.422 acres of wetlands currently exist on the project site. The types of wetlands and their respective acreages are shown in **Table 5** below.

**TABLE 5  
EXISTING WETLANDS AND IMPACTS TO WETLANDS FROM THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

Wetland Type	Existing Acreage	Proposed Fill Acreage	Preserved Acreage <sup>1</sup>
<b>Wetlands</b>	<b>2.364</b>	<b>0.616</b>	<b>1.748</b>
Vernal Pools	1.223	0.397	0.826
Seasonal Wetland Swale	1.139	0.219	0.920
Seasonal Wetland	0.002	0.000	0.002
<b>Other Waters</b>	<b>2.058</b>	<b>0.011</b>	<b>2.047</b>
Pond (Man-made)	1.914	0.000	1.914
Ephemeral Drainage	0.144	0.011	0.133
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.422</b>	<b>0.627</b>	<b>3.795</b>

Source: Wetland Delineation (Appendix C2); Section 404 Individual Permit

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Does not include off-site preservation of wetlands required by the USACE and the City.

As shown in **Table 5** above, the majority of wetlands on-site will be preserved by the proposed project. Approximately 86 percent of wetlands on-site will be preserved. While the project will fill approximately 0.627 acres of wetlands, the majority of which consists of vernal pools and seasonal wetland swales. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.1a and consistency with City Policy NR.2.1 will ensure that no net loss of wetlands will occur and *less than significant* impacts are expected.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts to habitat for raptors and other nesting birds were addressed in the GP-EIR (GP-DEIR, pp. 48 through 4.10-52). Raptors are protected by the California Department of Fish and Game and are considered a special-status species under CEQA.

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

---

Just as with impacts to habitat for other special-status species, wide-spread development of the City and the General Plan Planning Area would result in a net loss of raptor and nesting habitat and a significant and unavoidable impact was expected (GP DEIR, pp. 52). Discussion of impacts to movement corridors was also included in the GP-EIR (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-56 through 4.10-61). Development of greenfield areas of the General Plan Planning Area would change the biological condition and characteristics of the area, resulting in changes in animal movement throughout the area (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-56). While City Policies and Action Items would reduce this impact, loss and/or modification of movement corridors would still occur and the impact of the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-61).

As shown in discussion a) above, impacts to nursery sites for raptors and other special-status species may occur with implementation of the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1c and MM 4.1d will ensure that impacts to these nursery sites is mitigated. The primary movement corridor existing on-site is Morrison Creek which transverses the site from northeast to west. Morrison Creek is located entirely within the wetland preserve on-site and will not be modified or impacted by the proposed project. The wetland preserve surrounding the creek connects directly with a proposed preserve on the Rio Del Oro site immediately to the west, providing a connected preserve and creek corridor that will provide for species movement through the site. With the establishment of the on-site wetland preserve and the implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.1c and MM 4.1d, impacts to nursery sites and movement corridors will be *less than significant*.

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

The project site is largely devoid of trees. Some small trees exist immediately adjacent to the stock pond. However, these trees will remain undisturbed as they reside in the on-site wetland preserve. The remaining residence on-site is surrounded by landscaping that may include trees. The removal of these trees could be inconsistent with City Policies, Action Items, and the Tree Preservation Ordinance. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is included:

#### Mitigation Measure

- MM 4.2** Prior to the start of construction, the project proponent shall submit a survey identifying the specific type, size, and location of all existing on-site trees. Existing on-site trees shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Prior to the removal of the any trees, the project proponent shall submit to the City a Tree Removal Plan identifying each tree to be removed and the species, size, location, and relative health of each tree. Removal of any trees on the project site shall be conducted pursuant to the City of Rancho Cordova Tree Preservation Ordinance. Removal of trees

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

---

shall not occur until the Rancho Cordova Planning Department approves the Tree Removal Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

A Cultural Resources Inventory was performed by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (ECORP) for the project site, formerly known as the Whitlow Property, in March 2006. Pacific Municipal Consultants peer-reviewed the report in May of that year and requested additional information on a stock pond on the site as well as existing structures. In July 2006 a revised report was prepared with the requested information. A records search and a full field survey were used in order to compile a list of potential cultural resources on site that may be impacted by the proposed project. Additional information from a previous survey, also performed by ECORP, was used in the study as well.

The Cultural Resources Inventory found that there were no known cultural resources located on the property. One resource was listed within ½ mile which consisted of placer mining tailings located north of the project. These tailings are the result of placer gold mining conducted in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The project site includes existing structures and an existing stock pond. However, none of the on-site structures or the stock pond are eligible for listing in the National Registry of Historic Places or the California Registry of Historic Places. Therefore, they are not considered to be cultural resources. The project vicinity was widely used by Native American groups in prehistory, but no evidence was found on-site of any artifacts or prehistoric sites. The Cultural Resources Inventory is included with this MND as **Appendix A**.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

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

---

During the site survey of the project area performed by ECORP, no historic resources, as defined by State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, were found on the project site. Historic resources were found within ½ mile of the project, but those resources would not be affected by construction of the proposed project. Existing structures located on-site will be removed as a result of the project, but they do not qualify as historical resources (see **Appendix A**). However, potential impacts to unknown historic resources may occur with any excavation or grading in the project site.

The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the GP-EIR. Construction of the proposed project would not create any new or additional significant cultural resources impacts that were not already identified in the Program EIR, nor would the project cause any project-specific impacts peculiar to the project or parcel. The General Plan includes requirements that would protect any unknown historic resources from impacts occurring as a result of development in the Planning Area. However, to ensure that the Policies and Action Items adopted in the General Plan are carried out, the following mitigation measures, which state the requirements of Rancho Cordova Action Item CHR.1.3.1, are included in this MND:

#### Mitigation Measure

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above. Just as with historic resources, archeological resources would be adequately protected by City Policies, restated in this document as mitigation measures MM 5.1a and MM5.1b. Implementation of these measures would result in *less than significant* impacts to archaeological resources.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporations/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified possible impacts to paleontological resources as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-14). However, no such paleontological resources were identified in the Rancho Cordova Planning Area and City policy would protect unknown resources. For these reasons, the impact of the General Plan was found to be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-15).

The Cultural Resources Inventory did not find any evidence of paleontological resources in the project area. The potential exists for unknown paleontological resources to be located on-site and these unknown resources could potentially be impacted during construction. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 5.1a and MM 5.1b would ensure that any unknown paleontological resources are protected. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to archaeological resources.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The discussion in the GP-EIR concerning historic resources impacts included discussion of potential impacts to human remains [see discussion a) above]. Impacts were the same in that known resources were adequately protected but unknown human remains outside established cemeteries could potentially be affected. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts as a result of the General Plan were expected (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-14).

There are no known cemeteries on the project site. No sign of abandoned or historic cemeteries was found during the Cultural Resources Inventory performed by ECORP (**Appendix A**). However, due to the large Native American population known to reside in the general area in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked grave sites. The proposed project area is not expected to contain any such sites. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1b above would ensure that any impacts to human remains from the proposed project would be *less than significant*.



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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a)

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

The proposed project is located within the incorporated boundaries of the City and would likewise not be subjected to strong seismic shaking. Minor shaking is a concern as, according to the California Geological Survey, the project is located

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

---

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

- ii) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion under i) above.
- iii) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified that seismic shaking was not a concern in the City [see discussion i) above]. Liquefaction is the process in which water is combined with unconsolidated soils as a result of seismic activities involving ground motions and pressure. Without strong ground motion, liquefaction is unlikely. Additionally, the water table is generally too low in the areas of the City to provide enough moisture for liquefaction to occur (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-20). Therefore, the impact of the General Plan was found to be less than significant.

As identified in the GP-EIR, the project site is located in an area in which strong seismic shaking is unlikely. The soil type underlying the project area, Red Bluff-Redding complex, is not conducive to liquefaction (USDA, 1993). Additionally, groundwater below the project site is more than 150 feet below the surface, further reducing the risk of liquefaction (Wallace - Kuhl, and Associates, 2004). Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from ground failure and liquefaction.

- iv) *No Impact.* According to the Cultural Resources Inventory, the project site is comprised of generally flat, rolling terrain that slopes gently from southeast to northwest. The project site does not include any sharp slopes or other features that would create the possibility of landslide. Adjacent properties are also comprised of similar characteristics. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* associated with landslides.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts related to soil erosion from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.8-21 through 4.8-23). These erosion impacts were generally associated with construction of new roadways and other capital infrastructure and development of undeveloped portions of the City and the Planning Area. Additional impacts were due to increases in runoff due to a net increase in impervious surfaces in the City. However, compliance with the City's Erosion Control Ordinance and the current NPDES permit conditions for the City would ensure that impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan would be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-23).

Construction activities on previously undeveloped land can result in significant erosion related impacts. The portion of the project site to be impacted by the proposed project consists of Red Bluff-Redding complex. According to the Soil Survey of Sacramento County (1993), Red Bluff-Redding complex soils have only a slight to moderate erosion potential. Additionally, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the City of Rancho Cordova Erosion Control Ordinance and the City's NPDES permit. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* erosion impacts.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR stated that impacts relating to soil stability as a result of implementation of the General Plan would be minor (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-23). Primary concerns with soil stability in the City are associated

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

with shrink/swell potential – the potential of soils to expand during wet seasons and shrink during dry seasons. Impacts due to soil stability would be mitigated by consistency with the UBC and the CBC (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-24). Therefore, the impact of the General Plan was found to be less than significant.

The project site includes four soil types, as shown in the Soil Survey of Sacramento County (1993). These soils types, their shrink/swell potential, and their water holding capacity are shown in **Table 6** below.

**TABLE 6**  
**SOIL TYPES IN THE PROJECT AREA**

Soil Type	Shrink/Swell Potential	Water Holding Capacity
159 Hicksville gravelly loam (0-2% slopes)	Moderate To High	High
192 Red Bluff loam (2-5% slopes)	Moderate To High	High
193 Red Bluff-Redding Complex (0-5% slopes)	Slight To Moderate	Low to High
198 Redding gravelly loam (0-8% slopes)	Moderate to High	Low

Source: Soil Survey of Sacramento County (2003); Rancho Cordova General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (2006); Section 404 Individual Permit: Whitlow Property (2006).

Three of the soils found in the project site exhibit moderate to high shrink/swell potential. Construction on these soils would require additional measures, mandated by the CBC and the UBC, in order to mitigate impacts to structures from shrink/swell. However, these soils occur in the northern portion of the project site, within the wetland preserve. All construction will occur within the Red Bluff-Redding complex soils, which exhibit slight to moderate shrink/swell potential. Compliance with CBC and UBC building requirements will reduce any impacts resulting from soil stability. Information on landslides, liquefaction, and collapse is included in discussions i), iii), and iv) above. Those discussions found that impacts from other soil stability events would be low. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to soil stability.

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

A Sewer Study for the proposed project was prepared by Wood Rodgers in March, 2006. The study includes infrastructure and regulatory changes to allow wastewater connections from the proposed project southward to planned infrastructure on Douglas Road. County Sanitation District No. 1 (CSD-1) approved the Sewer Study on June 5, 2006. Therefore, the proposed project will be connected to the public sewer system. Additionally, compliance with City Action Item ISF.2.6.3 would require that the project be connected to the public

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

---

sewer system. Therefore, the proposed project does not propose to use any alternative wastewater disposal systems and *no impact* would occur.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project does not include any uses that would require routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, construction of the proposed project may include the limited use of hazardous materials usually associated with building construction.

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

---

Any transportation, storage, or use of hazardous materials for the proposed project would be subject to local, State, and federal laws as well as City Policies and Action Items. Consistency with these laws and policies would limit hazards to the public from the use of these materials. Additionally, at the time of construction the project will be substantially surrounded by undeveloped open space. Additional homes are under construction south of the project site; however, they will not be occupied during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to result in *less than significant* hazardous materials impacts.

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

The GP-EIR identified areas of the General Plan Planning Area that were either listed by the State or the federal government as containing hazardous waste or were known areas of contamination (such as the Aerojet groundwater pollution plume). The proposed project is not located in any such area (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-5). Construction of the proposed project would include the limited use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials (such as paints, fuels, solvents, etc.), as is normal for residential construction. This limited use would likely not result in significant potential for upset or release as all use, transportation, and disposal of such materials will be regulated by federal, State, and local policies and regulations (including City Policies and Action Items). However, as the site has lain vacant for some time, illegally dumped or buried material could be located on-site, causing the potential for significant impacts. An additional concern is previously forgotten underground storage tanks, commonly used by agricultural uses. Previously unknown USTs could be located on-site. Excavation of the site in preparation for construction and during construction of the detention basin could result in the discovery of USTs.

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

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM 7.1a** The project proponent shall coordinate with the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) to ensure that all transformers on-site or immediately adjacent to the site that predate 1979/1980 are sampled and analyzed as needed to determine the presence or absence of PCBs. All PCB-containing transformers shall be removed and replaced with PCB-free transformers according to the requirements of SMUD. The project proponent shall provide copies of all coordination materials between the proponent and SMUD to the City Planning Department for review. A letter from SMUD stating the status of any on-site transformers and a plan for removal of any PCB-containing transformers shall suffice to meet the requirements of this measure.

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

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

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

---

**MM 7.1b** As construction occurs, all debris, trash, refuse, and abandoned, discarded, and/or out-of-service items shall be removed from the proposed project sites and deposited off-site in an appropriate disposal facility. No storage of any these materials shall occur on those portions of the site designated for both the wetland preserve and the detention basin.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement/grading plans prior to approval. Measure shall be implemented throughout all phases of construction. All such materials shall be completely removed prior to issuance of building permits.

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

**MM 7.1c** If any underground storage tanks (UST) are discovered during construction activities, the City Planning Department must be contacted and all construction activities within 500 feet of the UST shall cease immediately. The UST shall be removed as required by the County Environmental Management Department (EMD), Hazardous Materials Division. In addition, groundwater and soil investigation for contamination and remediation in the tank vicinity shall be conducted if required by the EMD.

*Timing/Implementation:* Measure shall be included on all improvement/grading plans prior to approval. Measure shall be implemented throughout all phases of construction.

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

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 7.1a through MM 7.1c would ensure that impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials from implementation of the proposed project are *less than significant*.

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR discussed the siting of public schools as being subject to the siting requirements of the California Department of Education (GP-DEIR, p. 4.4-25). In addition to CEQA review, potential school sites will be reviewed by various agencies to ensure the new school site is safe from toxic hazards (GP-DEIR, p. 4.4-25). General Plan policies and actions will reduce the potential impacts of the General Plan from hazardous materials transport, use, and storage from surrounding uses, including school sites, to a less than significant level (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28).

There are currently no schools located within five miles of the proposed project. Schools are planned south and north of the proposed project at varying distances. The Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD) has not indicated that it has accepted any of those school sites and no construction has begun. As stated in discussion a) above, construction of the project will involve the limited use of hazardous materials as is normal for the construction of homes and parks. These emissions are limited to the construction of the project and will not occur during operation of the project. Therefore, emissions of any hazardous materials by the proposed project would not occur at a time when local schools are in operation in the project vicinity. The proposed project does not include a school site,

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

---

ensuring no effect to schools on-site. Considering the above factors, as well as information provided in the GP-EIR (above), the proposed project would have *no impact* related to schools and hazardous emissions.

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

The proposed project is not located on a site that was included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, including those sites identified in the GP-EIR (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-5). The Aerojet groundwater contamination plume is located within a mile of the project site, but successive modeling of the plume shows it growing to the west, away from the proposed project. As a result, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and a *less than significant* impact associated with known hazardous materials sites would result from implementation of the proposed project.

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

According to the Mather Airport CLUP, the proposed project is not located within the Safety Restriction Area, established at a maximum distance from the runways of 10,000 feet (Airport Land Use Commission, p. 37). The proposed project is located outside the CLUP and Mather Airport Master Plan boundaries and no other public airports are located within twelve miles of the project site. Safety impacts related to aircraft outside a Safety Restriction Area and such a great distance from a public airport are considered to be extremely unlikely. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to safety and public airports.

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



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

---

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

Typical physical changes to the environment that could impede adopted emergency response plans such as the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Disaster Plan typically concern impedances to traffic circulation and other associated features that would slow the response to any indicated emergency. The proposed project is connected to the Circulation Plan for the City through the North Douglas I project to the south and from there to both Grant Line West and Americanos Boulevard. The proposed project includes an internal roadway system and would provide additional access for emergency response to the area, as the site is currently only served by a small private road. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact associated with adopted emergency planning.

- h) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP EIR identified potential impacts of safety hazards associated with wildland fires due to the construction of residential areas adjacent to open space and natural areas (GP DEIR, pp.4.12-9). Adoption of General Plan policies and action items, as well as required project review by the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD), would ensure minimal impacts to residential areas from wildland fires, resulting in a less than significant impact from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-10).

The proposed project includes a 19.8-acre wetland preserve on-site. Grasses that commonly grow in this area could be ignited by weather (lightning) or by human causes, resulting in a risk of wildland fire in the vicinity of the project. Current SMFD requirements for fire breaks and landscaping would allow for adequate setbacks between the occupied portions of the project site and any wildland portions of the site. Additionally, roads will be placed between the proposed residences and the wetland preserve, providing additional setback from any potential wildland fires. Access to the wetland preserve for fire fighting purposes is provided on-site [see discussion e) in Checklist XV, Transportation/Traffic below]. Adequate setbacks will be provided pursuant to SMFD requirements and access for firefighting operations is adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to wildland fires.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project would involve site preparation and construction activities, which would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the site and result in urbanized runoff (i.e., oils, grease, fuel, antifreeze, byproducts of combustion such as lead, cadmium, nickel, and other metals) and other surface pollutants. These constituents could result in water quality impacts to onsite and offsite drainage flows and to downstream area waterways and result in violations of applicable federal, state and regional water quality standards. The City of Rancho Cordova operates under a County-wide NPDES permit for municipal discharges to surface waters (NPDES No. CAS082597). The permit requires that the City impose water quality and watershed protection measures for all development projects. The intent of the waste discharge requirements in the NPDES Permit is to attain water quality standards and protection of beneficial uses consistent with the Basin Plan. The NPDES permit prohibits discharges from causing violations of applicable water quality standards or impairing the water quality in the receiving aquatic resource. The City has identified a range of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and measurable goals to address the stormwater discharges in the City. Additionally, the project is subject to regulations/procedures, including but not limited to the City of Rancho Cordova Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance. Strict adherence to the provisions of the NPDES permit and the correct use of proven Best Management Practices would ensure that the project does not violate any water quality standards or other stormwater discharge requirements and *less than significant* impacts would result.

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

The proposed project would result in new impervious surfaces on a site that previously consisted of undeveloped land, decreasing absorption rates and increasing run-off in the project area. According to a Water Study performed for the proposed project by Wood Rodgers in April, 2006 and information provided by the Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA), the proposed project would receive groundwater from the North Vineyard Well Field (NVWF). In the EIR for the NVWF, no significant or unavoidable impacts to the environment from construction and operation of the NVWF were found (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-50). Therefore, while the General Plan identified significant and unavoidable impacts to groundwater levels in the Planning Area, the proposed project would utilize a groundwater source that is expected not to cause any significant drop in groundwater levels and the impact would be *less than significant*.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts due to erosion and siltation as a result of new development in the City and the Planning Area (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-34 through 4.9-39). Adherence to City policies, action

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

---

items, the conditions of the City's NPDES permit, and the City's Erosion Control Ordinance would result in less than significant impacts related to erosion and siltation as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-39).

A Drainage Study was prepared for the proposed project by Wood Rodgers in April, 2006 (**Appendix D**). According to the Drainage Study, the construction of an on-site detention basin would allow for stormwater to be retained on-site and released slowly into Morrison Creek, preventing any severe erosion and allowing downstream stormwater conveyances to handle the additional flows from the project. Construction of this detention basin will be required to adhere to City policies and actions as well as the requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB) and the City's NPDES permit. Stormwater runoff from the developed portion of the site will be conveyed by underground drainage lines. 100-year peak event flows will be handled by streets on-site. All drainage from developed portions of the site will be directed to the detention basin. The northern portion of the site that constitutes the wetland preserve will remain undisturbed. The detention basin will prevent any impacts to the undisturbed portion of the project site. Additionally, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the City's Erosion Control Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project will result in *less than significant* impacts related to erosion and siltation.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts from flooding due to implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-41 through 4.9-43). These impacts were associated with the addition of impermeable surfaces, primarily roads, within the City. City Policies and Action Items would be adequate to reduce any flooding impacts. Therefore, the GP-EIR found that the impact of the General Plan on flooding would be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-43).

The portion of the proposed project to be developed is generally flat. Stormwater flows below the 100-year event severity would be handled by underground drainage facilities draining to an on-site detention basin. High stormwater flows, such as those experienced during a 100-year event, would be handled by both the underground system and the streets of the project. All stormwater flows will be directed to the on-site detention basin where they will be slowly released into the existing hydrological features of the site, including Morrison Creek. The detention basin has been designed in order to accommodate 100-year event flows (see **Appendix D**). With the construction of on-site infrastructure, impacts due to flooding are expected to be *less than significant*.

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above for information on the GP-EIR and impacts to water quality. In addition to compliance with a SWPPP, the use of the BMP's listed in **Table 7**, as requested by the City and identified by the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA, January 2003), would further mitigate any operational impacts. This list is representative of recommended BMP's but does not constitute the only practices to be employed. All requirements of the SWPPP and the City's NPDES permit shall be followed as well.

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

TABLE 7  
APPROVED CASQA BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

CASQA Identifier	BMP Name
NS-8	Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning
NS-9	Vehicle and Equipment Fueling
NS-10	Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance
WM-1	Material Delivery and Storage
WM-2	Material Use
WM-3	Stockpile Management
WM-4	Spill Prevention and Control
WM-5	Solid Waste Management
WM-6	Hazardous Waste Management

Source: CASQA, 2003

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

Use of these and other standard practice BMP's, as well as adherence to the SWPPP identified in discussion a) above would ensure that impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

- f) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions a), b), and d) above. The on-site detention basin serves to not only hold stormwater flows for slow release, reducing the impact of those flows, but also serves as a settling pond to allow pollutants and solids to settle out of the water before release to receiving waters. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion f) above.
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion c) above. The primary restriction for handling stormwater flows downstream from the proposed project is a series of concrete overchutes that cross the Folsom South Canal. These overchutes are near capacity and cannot handle large quantities of additional stormwater flows. Plans are underway to increase the number of overchutes or the capacity of existing overchutes. However, until that time capacity is not available for the additional flows from the proposed project. The on-site detention basin will serve to hold heavy stormwater flows and allow a slow release of such flows into the stormwater system in order to avoid exceeding the capacity of the overchutes. Therefore, on-site facilities will prevent downstream capacity from being exceeded with the addition of project flows and the impact will be *less than significant*.
- i) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Water quality impacts from the construction phase have been addressed in the discussions above and found to be less than significant. Adherence to a SWPPP would reduce many of the anticipated impacts to water quality from the construction phase of the proposed project. The proposed project includes only residential and open space uses and would not, by its nature or use, cause any significant water quality impacts not addressed above. Adherence to City policies and action items would further reduce any

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

---

potential water quality impacts. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to water quality.

- j) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR discussed impacts related to flooding, which included consideration of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.9-41 through 4.9-43). City Policies and Action Items would prevent either an increase in the 100-year floodplain from the result of the construction of any structures as or the placement of housing within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, impacts from the General Plan were found to be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-43).

The Drainage Study (**Appendix D**) included an exhibit showing the approximate extent of the 100-year floodplain as shown by the California Department of Water Resources (2006, p. 4). The proposed project is partially located within the 100-year floodplain. However, those portions of the project that lie within the floodplain will remain undisturbed as they are located entirely within the wetland preserve. No housing will be constructed within the floodplain by the proposed project and such an action is prevented by City Action Item S.2.2.5. Upstream modification, effected by separate projects, will be prevented from increasing the floodplain by consistency with City Action Item S.2.2.9. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

- k) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion j) above. No structures will be placed within the 100-year floodplain. On-site stormwater infrastructure will likewise be placed outside the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant impact*.
- l) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions c), d), h), j), and k) above for information on the GP-EIR's findings regarding flooding impacts and the infrastructure and design elements included in the proposed project and downstream of the proposed project for the handling of stormwater flows and flood events. The detention basin on-site and other on-site stormwater conveyance infrastructure, as well as the preservation of Morrison Creek, would serve to prevent conditions in which flooding would be a major concern. All dams and levees in the area are situated along the American River, more than 4.5 miles to the north. No such structures are located upstream of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to flooding.
- m) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is not located near to a large body of water or ocean, precluding the possibility of a tsunami or seiche occurring that could impact the project site. As the topography of the area in which the project is located is flat, mudflows are not a possibility. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact from these types of events.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within the Grant Line West Planning Area as identified in the General Plan. Within the Planning Area, the project site is identified as an area for Residential - Mixed Density (General Plan, p. 71). Residential – Mixed Density indicates a mix of residential densities with target average density in the medium density range (General Plan, p.46). Environmental constraints for the proposed project, as identified in the Conceptual Land Plan for the Grant Line West Planning Area, includes Morrison Creek which runs through the project site from northeast to west.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project is located in a rural portion of the City that is currently undeveloped. Several development projects are planned immediately north, west, and south of the project site. Wide-spread urbanization of the project site is identified in the General Plan (p. 46). The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the General Plan Program EIR. Construction of the proposed project in this portion of the City would not create any new or additional impacts to existing communities that were not already identified in the Program EIR; nor would the project result in any new impacts peculiar to the project or parcel. As the GP-EIR found that impacts related to physical division of an existing community were less than significant and because the proposed project is consistent with and described in the Program EIR, no further environmental analysis is required pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3 and the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact.

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

---

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

Primary impacts related to conflicts between the General Plan and other plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect occur near Mather Airport (primarily within the Rio del Oro project to the west of the proposed project) and in those portions of the General Plan Planning Area that lie outside the incorporated boundaries of the City (GP DEIR, p. 4.1-56; GP FEIR, p. 4.0-4). The proposed project is located within the incorporated limits, preventing conflicts with the Sacramento County General Plan, and outside the Mather CLUP areas and the Mather Airport Master Plan boundaries, preventing conflicts with Mather Airport plans and policies. The General Plan included Conceptual Land Plans for the Grant Line West Planning Area which outlined areas within the Planning Area earmarked for preservation for environmental reasons (General Plan, p. 71). Within the project area, the Conceptual Land Plan for the Grant Line West Planning Area identifies proposed preservation of Morrison Creek as it traverses the project site from northeast to west. The proposed project would preserve not only the creek corridor but also approximately 19.8 acres of wetland preserve surrounding the corridor, ensuring consistency with the land use plans in the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with local land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and the impact would be *less than significant*.

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

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



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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

Typical mineral resources in the area of Rancho Cordova include gold (largely mined out in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century) and aggregate deposits that exist as a result of dredge mining in the area (Pacific Municipal Consultants, 2005). Approximately one third of the General Plan Planning Area is located within an MRZ-2 Zone, as identified by California Geological Survey and the State Mining and Geology Board (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-26). An MRZ-2 classification identifies areas where substantial mineral deposits are known to exist. The proposed project is not located within an area designated as MRZ-2. Also included in the GP-EIR is a figure identifying existing areas either under current mining contracts or planned for future mining. The proposed project is outside any such areas. The nearest mining site is located within one mile of the project site to the north and northwest. However, no evidence exists that any mineral resources are located on-site.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project is not located within either an MRZ-2 zone or within an area identified in the GP-EIR as containing either existing or planned mining operations. Aerial photos of the site show no evidence of dredge mining, an operation which results in large tailings of aggregate resources. The proposed project is located approximately one quarter mile from existing mining operations to the north. However, these operations do not rely on any resource or infrastructure located the project site in order to operate. Therefore, development of the site would neither hamper existing mining operations nor would the project cause any mineral resource to become unavailable and a *less than significant* impact is expected.

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

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is in an undeveloped portion of the City. A few estate-residential homes are located in the vicinity but the majority of the area is undeveloped pasture and grazing land. No significant sources of noise are located in the vicinity. Urban development is planned to the north, west, and south of the proposed project in the next few years. Development to the north and the west could contain sensitive receptors to noise. However, at this time no sensitive receptors are located within four miles of the proposed project. Mather Airport is located four miles to the west of the proposed project. The project site is located outside the 60 db Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour for the airport.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

With adoption of the General Plan on June 26, 2006, the City adopted noise standards establishing the maximum noise level a mobile or stationary source of noise may generate

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

---

within the City. Noise generation from traffic related sources (i.e roads, highways, railroads, airports, etc.) is limited to 60 decibels (db) of day-night average noise level (Ldn) outdoors and 45 db, Ldn indoors (General Plan Noise Element, p. 13). Stationary sources of noise are limited to 55 db equivalent continuous noise level (Leq) in daylight hours and 45 db, Leq during nighttime hours. A reduction in 10 db is mandated for uses that generate tonal, repetitive, or impulsive noise (such as that from aggregate mining or from the Cordova Shooting Center) or noise generated as speech or music (General Plan Noise Element, p. 12). Noise in excess of these standards is considered significant in this MND.

No significant sources of noise are located within the vicinity of the proposed project. Significant noise is generated by Mather Airport to the west; however, the 60 CNEL noise contour, the lowest noise contour measured around the airport, is located more than two miles to the west of the proposed project. Grant Line Road was identified in the GP-EIR as a potential source for significant traffic noise (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-5). However, according to the GP-EIR, 60 dbh of noise is generated by traffic on the roadway at a distance of 108 feet. The proposed project is located more than 3,000 feet from Grant Line Road. Therefore, significant noise from Grant Line Road is not expected. Construction noise generated by adjacent projects such as the North Douglas I project to the south and the Rio Del Oro project to the west is possible as they will both be under construction during and after the construction of the proposed project. North Douglas I will begin construction prior to the proposed project and will continue during construction of the proposed project. However, it is expected that both projects will be complete at approximately the same time. Construction of the Rio del Oro project to the west will likely occur after occupation of the proposed project. However, located immediately adjacent to the proposed project will be a wetland preserve, providing adequate distance between any new construction in the future and the uses of the proposed project to mitigate any noise impacts. Noise impacts to residents of the proposed project will not be significant.

The proposed project consists of open space, parks, and residential uses. The park included in the proposed project includes only limited recreational uses that will not generate significant noise. Residential uses do not, as a rule, generate significant noise during their operation. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to generate significant noise above City standards during operation. During construction of the proposed project, some intermittent and short-term noise could be generated. At the time of construction of the proposed project it is anticipated that no sensitive receptors to noise will be located within one mile of the project site except for two rural residences – one to the north and one to the east. In order to ensure that construction noise does not exceed City noise standards, the following mitigation measure is included in order to reduce noise levels to below City noise standards:

#### Mitigation Measure

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

- Construction activities shall be limited to between 6:00 AM and 8:00 PM on weekdays and 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends;
- Stationary sources of construction noise such as compressors and generators shall be placed as far as possible from existing residential uses to the north and east of the project site; and,

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

---

- The project proponent shall provide a name, address, and 24-hour phone number for information and/or complaints regarding the construction activities to the residents of any homes within ½ mile of the proposed project.
- If homes are occupied within the North Douglas I project to the south prior to completion of construction of the proposed project, the project proponent shall post visible signage providing a name, address, and 24-hour phone number for information and/or complaints regarding the construction activities on the site facing the North Douglas I site.

These requirements shall be included as a note on all construction plans and in the improvement plan submittal.

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

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

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

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

Construction of the proposed project will not include any practices likely to cause substantial amounts of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (e.g., pile driving, jack-and-bore, etc.). Any amounts of groundborne vibration or noise will likely be temporary in nature, ceasing when construction is finished. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 11.1 would further reduce any impacts related to construction of the project. Therefore, this impact is expected to be *less than significant*.

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

The proposed project primarily includes residential uses, specifically single-family detached homes, which do not by their nature or design generate significant sources of operational

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

---

noise. While some types of recreational uses can generate significant operational noise (i.e. stadiums, large athletic venues, concert halls, etc.), the proposed park on-site does not include those types of recreational uses. Adherence to City Policies and Action Items, as well as the building standards of the California Building Code and the Uniform Building Code would ensure that impacts to residents both on and off site would be *less than significant*.

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

The proposed project is located within the Grant Line West Planning Area, which was not identified in the GP-EIR as one of the planning areas in which noise impacts could occur as a result of Mather Airport. Additionally, the proposed project is located more than two miles from the primary approach path into Mather Airport (Mather Master Plan, 2004). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive noise levels from Mather Airport and *less than significant* impacts are expected.

- f) *No Impact.* The nearest private airport to the project area is Rancho Murrieta Airport, approximately 7.8 miles away to the southeast. Pursuant to Federal Aviation Regulations, aircraft flying over the project area are under the control of Mather Airport and Sacramento Approach Control. Therefore, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airport and *no impact* would occur.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within the City of Rancho Cordova in the Grant Line West Planning Area. The Grant Line West Planning Area is identified in the General Plan for full residential development with some retail and a few areas of natural resources preservation centered on Morrison Creek. Existing housing in the Grant Line West Planning Area is limited to a few rural, estate-residential homes.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project primarily includes residential units, which would directly induce growth in an area of the City that currently consists of pasture land and rural, estate-density residential. Additionally, provision of utilities such as water and wastewater to the proposed project could provide for additional growth in the vicinity. The General Plan specifically identified urban development of the area and surrounding areas both within and outside the Grant Line West Planning Area. The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the GP-EIR. Urbanization of the proposed project site would not result in any project-specific growth inducement that was not identified in the Program EIR. As the GP-EIR found that growth inducement impacts were significant and unavoidable and because the proposed project is consistent with and described in the Program EIR, no further environmental analysis is required pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3.

b) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts due to the displacement of people and housing as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.3-14). These impacts were primarily due to the installation of infrastructure such as streets (Ibid). Consistency with State and

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

---

federal laws relating to displacement of existing residents and housing would ensure that impacts of the General Plan would be less than significant (Ibid.).

The project site is currently undeveloped except for one rural residence and three or four outbuildings. The residents of the existing residence were the original owners of the property and have sold their interest in the property and the home to the project proponent for development. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any forced displacement of people or housing. Residents that would relocate as a result of the proposed project have been justly compensated by the project proponent. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to result in a *less than significant* impact.

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

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The SMFD has identified the need for additional fire stations and equipment in order to serve the development in the southern half of the City, as described in the GP-EIR. In order to provide initial service to the vicinity of the proposed project, SMFD proposes to construct a fire station in the Anatolia Development near the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and Chrysanthy Boulevard. This new fire station would provide initial service to the proposed project while additional stations, planned for elsewhere in the Sunridge Specific Plan area, are constructed to serve the project area and the vicinity. The environmental impacts of construction of the Anatolia station were analyzed by the City of Rancho Cordova and the project was found to be exempt under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (City of Rancho Cordova, City Council Resolution Number 63-2006). The environmental review of future stations will be conducted by the City of Rancho Cordova as SMFD identifies the



---

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

locations and design of those stations. The proposed project will be adequately served by the Anatolia station and the construction of that station was found by the City to be exempt from CEQA. The proposed project would not require the construction of fire prevention or emergency response infrastructure or facilities that would have a significant environmental effect. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact related to the provision of fire prevention and emergency response services.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts related to the need for additional police protection infrastructure and facilities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-16 through 4.12-20). Just as with fire protection, the substantial growth predicted in the GP-EIR would require additional fire protection infrastructure and facilities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-16 and 4.12-17). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items would result in less than significant impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-17).

The proposed project would be served by the RCPD, which is based out of the police station on Rockingham Drive approximately 5.5 miles to the west of the project site. The RCPD operates under a contractual agreement between the City and the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. As new development is approved, including the proposed project, additional funding is approved by the City in order to provide law enforcement services to that project. The addition of 153 units of housing is expected to generate 452 residents (assuming 2.95 residents per dwelling unit). The current service standard for the RCPD is one officer per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the proposed project by itself will not result in the need for more than one additional officer. The addition of one officer will not require additional facilities to be constructed. Therefore, the proposed project will result in *less than significant* impacts related to the provision of law enforcement services.

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

The addition of 153 residential units by the proposed project will result in the generation of additional students that will require the use of educational facilities provide by FCUSD. The expected student generation of the proposed project, according to current FCUSD generation rates, is shown in **Table 8** below.

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

**TABLE 8  
NEW STUDENT POPULATION GENERATED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Single Family Detached Generation Rate (Students per Dwelling Unit)</b>	<b>Students Generated by Proposed Project</b>
K-5	0.299	46
6-8	0.104	16
9-12	0.107	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>79</b>

*Source: Generation rates are from the GP DEIR, p. 4.12-77.*

As shown in the table above, the proposed project will result in 79 new students to be served by FCUSD. New schools are planned in projects to the north, west, and south that will serve the students generated by the proposed project. An elementary school is planned to the North in the Heritage Falls project as well as to the south in the Sunridge Park project. A middle school (grades 6-8) and a high school (grades 9-12) is planned for the Rio del Oro project to the west. However, none of these schools have been constructed and it is likely that they will not be in operation upon occupancy of the proposed project. Students generated by the proposed project will be bussed to facilities with adequate capacity to serve the students until such time that schools in the vicinity are capable of serving those students. The environmental effects of the construction of these schools are included in the analysis of those developments in which the schools are situated. The proposed project is not expected to result in the need for any additional schools above those already planned for adjacent developments. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact related to educational services provisions.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential environmental impacts related to the provision of additional parks to serve the growth anticipated in the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-89 through 4.12-96). Adherence to City Policy and Action Items as well as the requirements of the Cordova Recreation and Park District (CRPD) would ensure less than significant impacts from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-95 and 4.12-96).

The proposed project includes the construction of 153 dwelling units that is expected to result in an additional 452 residents (assuming 2.95 residents per dwelling unit). According to current agreements with the CRPD and the City, as well as City Policy, five acres of parks must be dedicated to CRPD for each 1,000 new residents. Additionally, 1.75 acres per 1,000 new residents must be set aside for open space. The addition of 452 residents would require 2.26 acres of park dedication and 0.8 acres of open space. The proposed project includes a four-acre park, satisfying the requirement for parkland dedication to CRPD. The proposed project also includes approximately 0.5 acres of open space and 0.7 acres of pedestrian paseos, satisfying the requirement for open space dedication. All of these facilities are located on-site, thus the environmental impact of construction of these facilities is included in this Initial Study/MND. Therefore, the proposed project will have a *less than significant* impact on the environment associated with parks.

- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include, nor does it require the construction of any other public facilities other than those discussed in discussions a) through d) above. No currently adopted Policies or ordinances of either the City or any Responsible Agency would

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

---

require such facilities to be constructed as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, *no impact* is expected.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

There are currently no park facilities within three miles of the proposed project. A number of parks are planned to the north, west, and south of the proposed project as part of the Heritage Falls project (north), the Rio del Oro project (west), and the Sunridge Specific Plan (south); however none of these parks are in operation. Public parks within the City are generally the responsibility of CRPD to operate and maintain. Any new parks constructed must meet CRPD's standards for dedication prior to CRPD taking responsibility for the park.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion d) of checklist XIII, Public Services above for information on the GP-EIR's conclusions as to impacts related to parks and recreation. The proposed project would add 153 units of single-family residences, increasing the use of parks in the vicinity of the proposed project. In order to offset this demand, the proposed project includes a four-acre park on-site, more than adequate to meet the City's and CRPD's requirement for parkland dedication [see discussion d) in checklist XIII, Public Services, above]. Therefore, while the proposed project would impact local parks, the on-site park will absorb the additional park use by residents of the proposed project and *less than significant* impacts are expected.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above. The proposed project includes a four-acre park on-site. The environmental impact of the construction and operation of the on-site park is addressed in the checklists of this Initial Study/MND. Therefore, construction and operation of the on-site park will result in *less than significant* environmental impacts.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

A Traffic Study for the proposed project was performed by Fehr & Peers in June, 2006 (see **Appendix E**). The Traffic Study analyzed the impact of the proposed project on local intersections in combination with planned development in the Sunridge Specific Plan to the south of the proposed project. A summary of the vehicle trips generated by the proposed project is shown in **Table 9** below.

**TABLE 9  
PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION – PROPOSED PROJECT**

Trip Rate				Trips			
AM Peak		PM Peak		AM Peak		PM Peak	
IN	OUT	IN	OUT	IN	OUT	IN	OUT
0.19	0.56	0.64	0.37	29	86	98	57

*Source: Fehr & Peers, 2006 (Appendix E)*

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed traffic impacts to the existing roadway network in the General Plan Planning Area as a result of the population, dwelling unit, and employee increases expected to occur with implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-27 through 4.5-45). Several new

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

---

roadways and improvement of existing roadways was described in the General Plan in order to address the additional expected traffic load. However, even with these improvements and adherence to City Policies and Action Items the impact of the General Plan would remain significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.5-42).

The Traffic Study for the proposed project identified the existing roadway conditions as well as the existing plus project condition (see **Appendix E**). As shown in **Table 9** above, the proposed project would result in a maximum peak increase of 155 peak hour trips. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines generated by the County of Sacramento and used by the City Public Works department to assign significance, any project that would generate 100 or more peak hour trips may result in a significant impact and further study will be required. Consistent with this requirement, the Traffic Study was conducted in order to determine if these additional trips would result in a significant impact on City roadways and intersections. According to City standards (pursuant to City Policy C.1.2) traffic impacts are considered significant if they will result in a level of service (LOS) of E or worse. As shown in the Traffic Study, none of the intersections or roadway segments included in the study would experience a level of service worse than LOS D with the addition of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have a *less than significant* impact on local traffic patterns.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion b) above.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed safety and hazards impacts related to the provision of land uses within the Mather Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Mather CLUP) and their impact on safety related to air traffic in and out of the airport (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28 and 4.4-29). The General Plan established the Mather Planning Area that corresponds to the Master Plan boundaries of the Mather Airport. Policies included in the General Plan were more stringent than the safety restrictions of the Mather CLUP (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items as well as the requirements of the Mather CLUP would ensure less than significant impacts from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-29).

The proposed project is located more than four miles from Mather Airport. No other airports exist within eight miles of the project. The proposed project is outside the overflight zone, the outermost boundary of the airport safety restriction area (Mather CLUP, 1996). The proposed project is also located outside the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 imaginary surfaces, which establish heights above which a structure may pose a hazard to aircraft. Therefore, safety risks associated with aircraft and the proposed project are considered to be *less than significant*.

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

The proposed project includes only on-site roadways. These on-site roadways will be subject to the requirements of the City Public Works Department and the RCPD for safety. Land uses surrounding the project currently consist of rural residential and, in the future, will likely consist almost entirely of urban residential development similar to the proposed

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

---

project. While surrounding land to the north and east is zoned for agricultural use, no active agricultural operations exist in the area. Therefore, conflicts are not expected. Consistency with City requirements, CRPD requirements, and City Policies and Action Items will ensure that impacts will be *less than significant*.

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. The GP-EIR identified impacts related to emergency access within the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, p. 4.5-48). As the roadway network in the City was to be improved and additional routes were to be added by the General Plan, impacts were found to be less than significant (Ibid.).

Chrishana McDonald, Fire Inspector for the SMFD, was provided information on the proposed project and she provided conditions for emergency access to the proposed project. Of key concern to the SMFD was access to the 19.8-acre wetland preserve in the northern half of the project site. Access to the remainder of the site was adequate for current SMFD requirements. In order to provide access to the wetland preserve while still maintaining the biological integrity of the preserve, the following mitigation measure is provided:

#### Mitigation Measure

**MM 15.1** The project proponent shall provide an access point for Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD) response to fire in the wetland preserve. This access shall be designed to the specifications and requirements of the SMFD and shall include the following design features:

- The access point shall be located along Street 2 (as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map) and shall travel through Lot D (the pedestrian paseo that lies along the wetland preserve from the neighborhood park to the eastern boundary of the site). The preferable location for the access point is immediately adjacent to the neighborhood park on Street 2.
- The access point shall utilize short, roll-over curbs of a height adequate to allow fire trucks to easily roll over the curb. A driveway apron shall not be used.
- If possible, the access point shall utilize landscaping that allows for fire trucks to roll through the pedestrian paseo without causing major damage to the landscaping in lieu of a gravel or concrete path.
- A suitable gate or breakdown barrier shall be included along the wetland preserve to allow for SMFD access without providing access to residents and other vehicles. The gate and any locking mechanism shall be designed to the satisfaction of the SMFD.

*Timing/Implementation:* *Design of fire access point shall be approved by both SMFD and the City Planning Department prior to approval of grading and/or improvement plans. Construction of the access point shall be complete prior to issuance of building permits.*

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

---

*Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in consultation with the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District.*

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 15.1 would ensure that the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact related to emergency access.

- f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The current City Zoning Code includes requirements for parking provisions by land use in the City. Single family homes, such as those to be constructed by the proposed project, are required to provide adequate parking for two vehicles. The current site map and information provided by the applicant on the eventual design of homes within the proposed project indicates that adequate parking will be provided by the driveways of the homes. Consistency with City Zoning Code requirements will be determined during the Design Review stage of the project, following approval of the final map. Therefore, the proposed project will provide adequate parking and *less than significant* impacts are expected.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed potential impacts to transit, pedestrian, and bicycle provisions within the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-49 through 4.5-53). Development of the City's Transit Master Plan and the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan would ensure that impacts of the General Plan to these provisions would be less than significant (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-49 and 4.5-50).

The proposed project is not located within an area identified for transit service by either the General Plan or the Transit Master Plan. The nearest bicycle/pedestrian facilities to the proposed project, as indicated in the Bikeway and Trails Plan in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, are located on Americanos Boulevard to the south and Grant Line Road to the east. No such facilities are planned for the project site. On-site pedestrian and bicycle improvements primarily consist of pedestrian paseos which provide pedestrian circulation to flow from both outside the project (in the North Douglas I area) and within the project towards the park and other public uses on-site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation and *less than significant* impacts are expected.



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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

A sewer study was conducted for the proposed project by Wood Rodgers in May, 2006 (see **Appendix F**). The sewer study indicated that the project would eventually be served by the Aerojet Interceptor, a major transmission main planned by County Sanitation District #1 (CSD-1) in their Sewerage Facilities Expansion Master Plan (March, 2002). Construction of the Aerojet Interceptor will begin within a very short time frame between the North Douglas I project and a lift station at the Anatolia projects to the west. Until such time as the Aerojet Interceptor is completed from the Anatolia projects to the Sacramento Regional Water Treatment Plant (SRWTP), interim service is provided by a force main from the Anatolia Lift Station to the Bradshaw Interceptor, west of Mather Airport. According to the Sewer Study, adequate capacity exists between the proposed project and the lift station. No on-site treatment facilities are planned for the project.

Water supply for the proposed project will be provided by the North Vineyard Well Field (NVWF), established as a result of the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan (SDCP/SRSP), approved by the County in 2002 (State Clearinghouse Number 97022055). The environmental impacts of the creation of that well field were addressed in the EIR prepared by the County for the SDCP/SRSP project. According to the Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA), the proposed project was not originally included in the water entitlements granted by the SDCP/SRSP. However, in the intervening time since approval of the SDCP/SRSP and now the Specific Plan area has been entitled with less density of development than that originally

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

---

analyzed. SCWA has determined that with the reduced density of development in the Specific Plan area, the NVWF can serve the proposed project (Cole, 2005).

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

According to the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Master Plan (2002), each new Equivalent Single-family Dwelling Unit (ESD) is projected to generate 310 gallons per day (gpd) of additional wastewater. The general assumption used for wastewater generation is 6 ESD's per acre of low-density residential (CSD-1, p. 3-3, 2002). The proposed project includes approximately 17.7 acres of residential and would therefore produce approximately 106.2 ESD's of wastewater or 12.02 million gallons per year (approximately 33,000 gallons per day). Current capacity at the SRWTP exceeds 181 million gallons per day. Therefore, adequate capacity exists at the SRWTP and the project would have a *less than significant* impact.

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

The GP-EIR addressed potential impacts as a result of additional water supply infrastructure as well (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-28 through 4.12-32). Additional infrastructure will be required to serve anticipated growth in the General Plan Planning Area, including new wells, treatment facilities, and conveyance infrastructure (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-19). Some study of the environmental impact of such expansion has already been conducted by water agencies and significant and unavoidable impacts were indicated. As the General Plan would contribute to the need for the expansion, the General Plan was also found to result in significant and unavoidable impacts (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-32).

Expansion of wastewater handling and transmission to the proposed project was addressed in the Sewer Study prepared by Wood Rodgers (see **Appendix F**). The proposed project would connect to existing (or currently under construction) sewerage infrastructure located in the North Douglas I project to the south. From there it would be connected to the portion for the Aerojet Interceptor currently under construction. The environmental impacts of the installation of infrastructure within the North Douglas I project and the portion of the interceptor between North Douglas I and the Anatolia Lift Station has already been addressed in the Anatolia Subdivisions and Development Agreement MND (State

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

Clearinghouse Number 2003042004), the Jaeger/Chrysanthy Major Road, Sanitary Sewer, Water Transmission Main, and Drainage MND (State Clearinghouse Number 2006012131), and the Anatolia III Major Roads, Sewer Force Main, and Water Transmission Main MND (State Clearinghouse Number 2005082109) and were found to be less than significant. At this time, CSD-1 has indicated that adequate capacity does not exist from the Anatolia Lift Station to the Bradshaw Interceptor to serve the proposed project. Therefore, the following mitigation measure, pursuant to City Policy ISF.2.6 and Action Item ISF.2.6.1, is proposed to ensure adequate capacity exists prior to the proposed project's need for wastewater service:

#### Mitigation Measure

**MM 16.1** Prior to approval of the Final Subdivision Map, the project proponent shall demonstrate to the City Planning Department that adequate capacity exists to handle wastewater flows (both average dry weather flows and average wet weather flows) from the proposed project and any other projects served by the Anatolia Lift Station between the proposed project and the Sacramento Regional Water Treatment Plant.

*Timing/Implementation:* Prior to approval of the Final Subdivision Map.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in consultation with County Sanitation District #1 and Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 16.1 above would ensure that impacts related to the provision of wastewater infrastructure would be *less than significant*.

Water supply infrastructure is located immediately adjacent to the proposed project to the south, in the North Douglas I project. North Douglas I includes underground water transmission lines as well as a water storage facilities on-site. Water to serve both the proposed project and the North Douglas I project will be supplied by the North Vineyard Well Field. The environmental impacts of infrastructure to deliver the water from the NVWF to the North Douglas I project was included in an EIR prepared for the Sunridge Specific Plan in July 17, 2002 (State Clearinghouse Number 97022055). The only additional infrastructure required to serve the proposed project will be located on-site. The environmental effects of the construction of this on-site infrastructure are included in this MND. Therefore, *less than significant* impacts related to the provision of water supply infrastructure would occur.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion c) in checklist VII, Hydrology and Water Quality for information on stormwater drainage facilities and their associated environmental effects. Off-site stormwater infrastructure will not be required by the proposed project, as shown in the Drainage Study (see **Appendix D**).
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential environmental impacts related to available water supplies and the increased demand in the City and the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.9-43 through 4.9-57). According to the analysis in the GP-EIR, adequate supplies of water exist through buildout of the current incorporated boundaries of the City (GP DEIR, p. 45). However, new sources of water will be required to serve buildout conditions for those portions of the General Plan Planning Area that lie outside current City boundaries. Significant

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

environmental effects may occur from the acquisition of these additional sources. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts of the General Plan are expected (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-57).

According to the SCWA, the proposed project will be served by the NVWF and adequate capacity exists to serve the development of the proposed project. Water supply infrastructure is planned for installation in the North Douglas I project, immediately south of the proposed project. North Douglas I will be served by the NVWF as well. Therefore, the only additional water supply infrastructure required by the proposed project is the installation of on-site water lines under the streets to be constructed. Analysis of the environmental impacts of the installation of this on-site infrastructure is included in this MND. Analysis of the environmental impacts of the development of the NVWF and the installation of water transmission mains to deliver water to the North Douglas I project was conducted by the County of Sacramento in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 97022055) and subsequent environmental review conducted by the City of Rancho Cordova. As the proposed project would only require on-site infrastructure, and as the environmental impact of the installation of the on-site infrastructure is included in this MND, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact related to the provision of water supply.

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

The proposed project will be served by Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI), which collects residential and commercial solid waste and transports any non-recyclable material to the Forward Landfill in Manteca, CA or the Lockwood Regional Landfill in Nevada. The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) utilizes a standard generation rate for solid waste from residents of 0.36 tons per year per resident. Assuming that the proposed project would result in an additional 452 residents (2.95 residents per dwelling unit for 153 dwelling units), approximately 162.7 tons per year of solid waste will be generated by the project. Calculated for daily solid waste production, the proposed project will result in approximately 0.45 tons per day. The approximate daily intake capacities of all landfills that may serve the project (both during construction and after) are shown in **Table 10** below.

**TABLE 10**  
**INTAKE CAPACITY AT THE KIEFER, FORWARD, AND LOCKWOOD REGIONAL LANDFILLS**  
**AND PROJECT CONTRIBUTION OF SOLID WASTE (2006)**

Landfill Name	Maximum Daily Intake (Tons)	Current Daily Intake (Tons)	Excess Daily Intake Available (Tons)	Maximum Project Contribution (Percent) <sup>1</sup>
Kiefer Road	10,815	6,362	4,453	0.01
Forward	8,668	791	7,877	0.06

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

---

Lockwood Regional	N/A	4,000	N/A	0.01
-------------------	-----	-------	-----	------

Source: Current and maximum daily intake: GP DEIR, p. 4.12-57.

Notes: <sup>1</sup>Maximum Project Contribution represents the percentage increase the proposed project would have in daily intake for any one facility, assuming that all of the solid waste from the proposed project was transported to that facility. The actual contribution of the proposed project to any one facility would be less as recycled material is removed prior to transportation.

As shown in **Table 10** above, the maximum that the proposed project would contribute to any one facility is 0.06 percent of that facilities current daily intake. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute a significant quantity of solid waste to any disposal facility and no expansion of any facility is expected. The proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to the capacity of any landfill.

- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be served by an existing waste handling service, provided by BFI for other residential land uses in the City. BFI operates consistent with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations. All landfills that would serve the proposed project also conform to all applicable statutes and regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As demonstrated in checklists I through XVI above, the proposed project is not expected to result in any significant impacts related to biological or cultural resources. Further, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this MND would ensure that the project's impacts are *less than significant*.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Incorporation of the mitigation measures for the project would reduce any environmental impacts to less than significant in both the short-term and long-term. The area is designated by the General Plan for Mixed Density Residential, with which the proposed project is consistent. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all Rancho Cordova General Plan policies, ensuring that the long-term environmental goals of the City are adhered to. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- c) *Potentially Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Section 4.0 of this MND addresses the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts in the cumulative setting. See Section 4.4 for the project's contribution to cumulative impacts.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.