
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 CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance. There are 14 specific environmental issues evaluated in this chapter. Other CEQA considerations are evaluated in Chapter 4.0. The environmental issues evaluated in this chapter include:

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

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

- **No Impact:** No project-related impact to the environment would occur with project development.
- **Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant, but the incorporation of mitigation measure(s) would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level.
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant. If there is one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** North Douglas
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova
2729 Prospect Park Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Hilary Anderson (916) 361-8384
4. **Project Location:** The project site is located within the approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and SunRidge Specific Plan (SDCP/SRSP) areas on the northeast corner of Douglas Road and the proposed Americanos Boulevard. The project site is generally bounded by the future Americanos Boulevard to the west, vacant agricultural land to the north and east, and by Douglas Road to the south.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Lennar Communities Incorporated
1075 Creekside Drive, Suite 110
Roseville CA, 95678
6. **General Plan Designation(s):** Urban Development Area.
7. **Zoning:** RD-4, RD-5, RD-7, RD-10, CMU, and Park.
8. **Specific Plan:** The project location is within the 2,605.8 SunRidge Specific Plan Area, which was approved the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors on September 18, 2002 (Resolution No. 2002-0901).
9. **APN Number:** 072-0300-003, 072-0370-016, 072-0300-004, 073-0010-011, and 073-0010-012
10. **Description of the Project:** The proposed project will include a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Rezone, Development Agreement, and Tentative Subdivision Map. The North Douglas project is located on an approximate 130 acre site and would include 77.3 acres of RD-5, 34.6 acres of RD-7, 7.9 acres of RD-10, 9.0 acres of park uses, 0.3 acres of open space, and 1.1 acres for Americanos Boulevard, as well as the secondary access road. Development of the proposed project would result in the creation of ~~680~~666 dwelling units (du). See **Figure 3** and **Figure 4** for project information. See **Figure 5** for Americanos Improvements and Off-site ditch locations. See **Figure 6** for secondary access road location.
11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is bounded by Aerojet lands to the north, the Security Park Industrial site and Aerojet land to the west, and undeveloped agricultural land to the south and east.
12. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**
 1. Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA)
 2. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
 3. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
 4. Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District (SMUD)
 5. Sacramento Resource Conservation District (SRCD)

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

6. U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
7. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
8. County Sanitation District (CSD-1)
9. California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input 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 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 project, as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. (The discussion demonstrates that there are no potentially significant impacts identified that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, an EIR is not warranted.)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. A "Less than Significant Impact" applies when the proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This category also applies when the impact has been previously addressed and it has been determined that there are no new impacts created by the project. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

4. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
5. "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact". The initial study must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
6. "Reviewed Under Previous Document" applies where the impact has been evaluated and discussed in a previous document. This category could be checked if an impact is either "Potentially Significant" or "Less than Significant". Discussion will include reference to the previous documents.
7. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.
8. Preparers are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individual contacts should be cited in the discussion.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project's potential visual resource impacts were globally addressed in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan EIR (SDCP/SRSP EIR) (State Clearinghouse SCH#97022055, page 4.32). There are no scenic vista views available from the North Douglas project site. Mid-range views consist of rural homesteads, limited agriculture operations, and open space. Long-range views generally consist of rural/agricultural land uses, power transmission lines, industrial and aggregate operations and military/airport operations. Implementation of the projects would not adversely affect views on nearby or distant scenic vistas; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP EIR addressed the Community Plan's potential to substantially damage scenic resources on and in the vicinity of the project site (SDCP/SRSP FEIR page 4.32). The nearest highways are US 50 and the Jackson Highway (State Route 16), which are not designated as a state scenic highway in the vicinity of the project site. United States Highway 50 (US 50) is approximately 4 miles north of the project site and State Route 16 is approximately 4 miles south of the project sites. Due to this distance, implementation of the projects would not damage scenic resources views from these highways. Additionally, the site does not contain any rock outcroppings or historic buildings. Onsite trees are limited to those within a defunct orchard and are not considered to be of aesthetic value. None of the trees impacted by construction of the secondary access road are oak trees or landmark trees. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The entire Community Plan area is specifically identified in the County General Plan as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Service Boundary. Issues resulting from (i) new growth in this area, (ii) conversion of land to urban uses, (iii) compatibility with the surrounding area, (iv) loss of open space, and (v) increase in nighttime lighting and daytime glare were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP FEIR (p. 4.32).

The Sacramento County General Plan EIR noted that development of the project area would include various intensities of development, which could substantially alter existing views and conflict with the scale of existing structures and the rural character of these areas.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The introduction of urban uses and densities into these areas would substantially alter the present nature of their viewsheds, and therefore result in a significant and unavoidable impact (Sacramento County General Plan EIR, pp. 4.10-11).

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

The North Douglas project does not propose any land uses or densities substantially different from those already analyzed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. The City, therefore, could not identify any significant visual impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. Accordingly, the project's contributions to the previously disclosed aesthetic impacts are not peculiar to the project or parcels, and were fully disclosed previously. Notably, the County Board of Supervisors adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for this impact as part of the SDCP/SRSP project approval (See SDCP/SRSP - CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, July 18, 2002, pp. 154-158 [hereinafter, "Findings"]).

In any event, the City would conclude that the project's aesthetic impacts are less than significant even in the absence of prior County determinations considering the aesthetic impacts of the larger land areas to be significant. The area covered by the project represents a relatively small portion of the overall Sunrise Douglas area. Given plans to urbanize those areas surrounding the sites of the two projects, the two project's contributions to the previously-disclosed, larger aesthetic impacts would neither be significant at the project level nor cumulatively considerable viewed in the larger context.

Additionally, recent development of the areas to the south and west of the project area has changed the overall visual character from open space and very low density residential development to a more urban character. Large areas of land that were previously undeveloped have been developed as part of projects initiated following adoption of the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and the Sunridge Specific Plan. Further development, not related to the proposed project, is planned for undeveloped areas to the west and north of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not change the visual character or quality of the surrounding area and would result in a less than significant impact.

- d) Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document. See c) 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
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The soils on the proposed project site are depicted on Sacramento County General Soils Map as being comprised of Fiddymont fine sandy loam, Red Bluff loam, Red Bluff-Xerarents complex, and Red Bluff-Redding complex (NRCS Soil Survey, 1993). In addition, the project site is depicted on the CA Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) as Grazing Land (G) and Farmland of Local Importance (L). Grazing Land is suitable for the grazing of livestock and Farmland of Local Importance are crop and irrigated pasture lands, which do not qualify as Prime or Unique farmland. The proposed project would not convert Prime, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland to non-agricultural uses; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The entire SDCP area, which includes the project site, was specifically identified in the Sacramento County General Plan as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Services Boundary. Issues resulting from (i) new growth in this area, (ii) conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, (iii) compatibility with the surrounding area; and (iv) loss of open space were globally addressed in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan Final EIR (SDCP/SRSP FEIR) (State Clearinghouse SCH#97022055, page 4.32). The FEIR identified three areas of potential inconsistency with the Sacramento County General Plan and the SunRidge Specific Plan; the possible need for development clustering, the possible need to increase certain land uses and to reduce others with the overall mix of land uses; and the possible need for a more transit-oriented design within the project. However, the CEQA Findings of Fact for the SDCP/SRSP project (Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, June 19, 2002, page 31) disagreed with the EIR conclusion and determined that there is "no significant effect" relating to any General Plan inconsistency.

As relating specifically to the North Douglas site, no parcels are under Williamson Act contracts (SDCP/SRSP, page 4.30a). Therefore, the project's conflicts and impacts with

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

existing zoning, nearby agricultural uses, and existing Williamson Act contracts act are considered *less than significant*.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) has prepared its Air Quality Attainment Plan, which describes the local measures, which are planned for implementation to achieve the federal and state air quality standards. The Sunridge Specific Plan, which includes the project site, was developed in collaboration with the SMAQMD's Air Quality Attainment Plan. The North Douglas project would include, but not be limited to, a mixture of complementary uses within ½ mile from the project's boundaries, Class I or Class II bike lanes, multiple and/or direct pedestrian access, state-of-the-art telecommunications capabilities, and located within ¼ mile of a bus stop. In addition to these standards and design features the project would include other features, (see discussion below) to the fulfill SMAQMD's objectives of Policy AQ-15. As such, the projects would not conflict or obstruct SMAQMD's Air Quality Attainment Plan; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

The SunRidge Specific Plan proponents have complied with Mitigation Measure AI-5 (SDCP/SRSP EIR) by submitting an approved AQ-15 Air Quality Plan. (May 3, 2002 Staff Report to Board of Supervisors for May 8, 2002). The following conditions will ensure that the North Douglas project comply with the SunRidge Specific Plan AQ-15 (SunRidge Specific Plan, page 7-7).

Mitigation Measures

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 3.1 The North Douglas project shall participate in a County Service Area (CSA) or an equivalent financing mechanism to the satisfaction of the City Council, for the purpose of funding a variety of transportation demand management strategies, including but not limited to a transit shuttle service, which will contribute to the 15% reduction in emissions mandated by General Plan Policy AQ-15.

The purpose of this CSA is to fund programs and services to reduce air quality impacts and implement trip reduction measures that improve mobility, including but not limited to:

- Incentives for alternative mode use;
- Programs encouraging people to work close to where they live;
- On-site transportation coordinators;
- School pool programs;
- Maintenance and improvement of the Folsom South Canal bikeway; and
- Transit shuttle system.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.1 would reduce this impact to *less than significant*. The North Douglas project is part of CSA-10, Benefit Zone 2. This action was completed on March 8, 2005 and therefore, mitigation measure MM 3.1 has been satisfied.

b) *Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Sacramento County is a known area of non-attainment for State and Federal standards for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀). The SDCP/SRSP EIR determined that construction-related and operational emissions arising from the implementation of the SunRidge Specific Plan would result in emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ that are above the SMAQMD significance thresholds for those pollutants (FEIR, pp. 11.15–11.16, 11.18–11.19). The Master EIR determined that the buildout of the Specific Plan with projects such as North Douglas would contribute to a cumulative increase of construction-related emissions and exacerbates SMAQMD's non-attainment status for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, and PM₁₀ (*ibid.*). The project is subject to the Sacramento County General Plan Policy AQ-15, which is designed to reduce by at least 15 percent air pollution emissions resulting from new developments. Additionally, the SMAQMD has an established construction-related emissions reduction program (Category 1: Reducing NO_x emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment, and Category 2: Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment) to reduce construction-related air quality impacts. The Master EIR determined that the air quality impacts arising from buildout of the Specific Plan and construction-related activities were significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures (FEIR, pp. 11.15–11.16, 11.18–11.20). Implementation of Mitigation Measure AI-1, proposed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR, SMAQMD's approved construction emissions programs (Findings, p. 101), and a measure

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

substituted by the Board for proposed measure AI-5 (Findings, p. 106) were found by the Board to mitigate, but not entirely avoid, these impacts from air pollutant emissions.

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. The project would not create any new or additional significant air quality impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would they cause any impacts peculiar to the projects or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project proposes less environmentally intrusive land use designations than those set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the air quality impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the projects or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) To ensure, however, that the mitigation measures adopted for the Specific Plan are carried out at this project level, the City proposes the following Mitigation Measures, which are revisions to those previously adopted measures, made applicable to this proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are a revision of the previously adopted Mitigation Measure AI-1 for the SDCP/SRSP EIR, which makes it applicable to the North Douglas project.

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

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

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

MM 3.2b The project applicant shall require that the contractor minimize the amount of material actively worked, the amount of disturbed area, and the amount of material stockpiled. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

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

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

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD.

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD.

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

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

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

In addition, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented by the North Douglas project to reduce emissions from off- road diesel powered construction vehicles.

MM 3.2g Category 1: Reducing NO_x emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment.

The prime contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, and operated by either the prime contractor or any subcontractor, will achieve a fleet-averaged 20 percent NO_x reduction and a 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. The prime contractor shall submit to the City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during the construction project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and hours of use or fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs; and,

Category 2: Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The prime contractor shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used on the proposed project sites do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity shall be repaired immediately, and the City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a month summary of the visual results shall be submitted to the City and SMAQMD throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other SMAQMD or state rules or regulation.

Contractor shall submit plan to SMAQMD in advance of the start of construction to allow review by SMAQMD. Review by SMAQMD can take 2 weeks or more. Contractor shall submit written SMAQMD approval to the City construction inspector and the City Planning Department prior to mobilization.

In the event construction equipment meeting the requirements set forth above is determined not to be available, the project applicant shall notify the City and SMAQMD. Upon verification that required low-emission construction equipment is not available, the City may waive this measure. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

Timing/Implementation: *Prior to and during construction activities.*

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

- c) *Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Section 11: Air Quality and discussion a) and b) above.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The land uses proposed under the North Douglas project is not associated with substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, standard equipment and best management practices (BMPs) will be used during all construction activities; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento Rendering Plant is located approximately 2 miles southwest of the project site. The SDCP/SRSP Final EIR (page 4.21) evaluated this issue and determined it to be *significant and unavoidable* and identified Mitigation Measure LA-3 to mitigate the impact to a less than significant level. However, the County Board of Supervisors rejected the original version of Mitigation Measure LA-3 as unnecessary, and instead adopted a revised Mitigation Measure LA-3, which conditions the issuance of building permits within the SunRidge Specific Plan area on the future implementation of odor control systems at the rendering plant. No new impacts would result from project implementation. Therefore, the project would result in *less than significant* impacts. The Sacramento Rendering Plant facility has been retrofitted with state-of-the-art scrubbers and other air pollution reduction devices. The upgrades to the rendering plant have been made and the cost of the upgrades has already been paid.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Therefore, this mitigation measure has been met and the impacts associated with the North Douglas 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
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Existing Setting

The SDCP/SRSP EIR addressed the potential biological impacts of development in a general (non site-specific) manner and applied mitigation measures to subsequent projects seeking approval in conjunction with the SDCP/SRSP. Subsequent projects in the SDCP/SRSP are required to prepare a wetland delineation, site-specific special-status species surveys and obtain appropriate state and federal permits, and to provide "fair-share" mitigation for known biological impacts.

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts to special-status species were globally (non site-specific) evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 14.27–14.32). The North Douglas project site may contain suitable habitat for special status species (FEIR, p. 14.27). The potential impact of development within the SDCP/SRSP area on special status species was disclosed in the Master EIR as significant and unavoidable, for the reason that site-specific information for the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

area was not yet available, and therefore, the analysis in the FEIR assumed that such habitat would not be avoided (FEIR, p. 14.31). Therefore, the FEIR proposed, and the Board adopted, mitigation measures that require future project proponents for development entitlements to conduct determinate surveys for special status species, prepare detailed mitigation plans designed to reduce the impact to such species to a less than significant level, and coordinate with the appropriate agencies to obtain the necessary permits. (Findings, pp. 120-121 (mitigation measures BR-6, BR-7).) To completely fulfill the requirements, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures BR-6 and BR-7, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of these measures at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant impact to special status species to a less than significant level, as required by SDCP/SRSP Mitigation Measure BR-6 (FEIR, p. 14.31; Findings, p. 120).

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. The project would not create any new or additional significant special status species impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would they cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).). Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the special status species impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183). To ensure, however, that the mitigation measures adopted for the Specific Plan are carried out at this project level, the City proposes the following Mitigation Measures, which are revisions to those previously adopted measures, made applicable specifically to this proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

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

MM 4.1a The project proponents shall conduct (or update) determinate surveys for potentially occurring special status species or their habitat using protocol acceptable to the regulatory agencies with authority over these species.

- If any of the special status species or their habitat are indicated, 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 USFWS and CDFG, and shall emphasize a multi-species approach to the maximum extent possible.
- Where project impacts include taking of a federally listed species, a Section 10 Incidental Take Permit or a Biological Opinion resulting from Section 7 Consultation with another federal agency shall be obtained from the USFWS and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act.
- Where project impacts include taking of a state listed animal species, a "2081" permit shall be obtained from the CDFG and permit

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

conditions implemented, pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

Determinate surveys pursuant to mitigation measure MM 4.1a were conducted for both the original North Douglas project and the secondary access road. No special status species were found. Therefore, mitigation measure MM 4.1a has been satisfied.

MM 4.1b

If development of the North Douglas project would result in a loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, the project's applicants shall mitigate for such loss 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 Department of Fish and Game).
- The project's proponents shall, to the satisfaction of the CDFG, prepare and implement a Swainson's hawk mitigation plan that will include preservation of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.
- ~~The project's proponents shall submit payment of a Swainson's hawk impact mitigation fee per acre impacted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in the amount set forth in Chapter 16.130 of the Sacramento County Code as such may be amended from time to time and to the extent that said Chapter remains in effect.~~

Should the City Council of the City of Rancho Cordova adopt a Swainson's hawk mitigation policy/program (which may include a mitigation fee) prior to implementation of one of the measures above, the project proponent ~~may~~ shall be subject to that program instead.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

In August 2005, the applicant obtained a conservation easement at the Gill Ranch Preserve for off-site mitigation of Swainson's hawk habitat impacts related to the original North Douglas project. Therefore, the requirements of mitigation measure MM 4.1b have been met for the North Douglas project. However, the requirements of mitigation measure MM 4.1b are still applicable for the secondary access road area.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 4.1c Prior to each phase of grading and construction, a preconstruction survey shall be performed between April 1 and July 31 to determine if active raptor nesting is taking place within and immediately adjacent to the project site. If nesting is observed, consultation with the Department of Fish and Game shall occur in order to determine the protective measures which must be implemented for the nesting birds of prey. If nesting is not observed, further action is not required.

Timing/Implementation: ~~Prior to issuance of building permits.~~ Prior to approval of improvement plans or the issuance of grading permits.

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

The applicant has submitted to the City a nesting raptor survey of the proposed secondary access road area. The survey was performed on August 25, 2005 and no nesting raptors were observed. Any work that will begin between April 1 and July 31 will require an updated nesting raptor survey.

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

- b) Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document. See a) above.
- c) Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation /Reviewed Under Previous Document. Impacts to wetlands were globally (non site-specific) evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR (See FEIR, pp. 14.22–14.24). The North Douglas project site contains federally protected wetlands (i.e., vernal pools, ponds and wet swales), which could be disturbed by grading and other site preparation activities. The potential impact of development within the SDCP/SRSP area on wetlands was disclosed in the Master EIR as significant and unavoidable, for the reason that site-specific information for the area was not yet available, and therefore, the analysis in the FEIR assumed that wetland-dependent species such as fairy/tadpole shrimp were present (FEIR, p. 14.22). It was also assumed in the FEIR's analysis that such impacts would be mitigated with off-site compensation, rather than on-site preservation (FEIR, p. 14.23). The FEIR noted that the County's General Plan policy mandating "no net loss" for wetlands acreage is applicable to all development within the SDCP/SRSP area, and that impacts to wetlands are also subject to federal regulation and permitting (FEIR, p.14.23–14.24). The FEIR proposed a mitigation measure requiring future project proponents for development entitlements to place the highest priority on avoiding and preserving on-site wetlands. (FEIR, pp. 14.24–14.25 (mitigation measure BR-1).) The Board rejected this measure as infeasible, however, on the grounds that, due to the area's designation in the General Plan as an Urban Growth Area, the preservation of vast swaths of land upon which diffuse, low quality wetlands may occur was inconsistent with the intent of the General Plan and an inefficient use of this land (Findings, pp. 116-117). The Board determined, instead, to adopt a measure requiring future project proponents to prepare wetland delineations of their parcels and to submit wetland avoidance/mitigation, monitoring and maintenance plans sufficient to comply with the County's "no net loss" wetlands policy and the applicable state and federal agencies' permitting requirements. (Findings, pp. 117-118 (mitigation measures BR-2, BR-3, BR-4).) The Board's measures also allowed for flexibility in achieving compliance with the no net loss policy, in order to accommodate future improvements in wetlands mitigation

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

strategies. (Findings, pp. 118-119 (mitigation measures BR-3 and SRSP zoning condition No. 62).)

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant wetlands impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would they cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the wetlands impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15183.)

The alignment of the secondary access road does not directly or indirectly affect any wetlands, except for a small non-jurisdictional ditch along Grant Line Road. The ditch is less than 0.19 acres in size and would be removed during construction of the intersection with Grant Line Road. The proposed project includes the creation of ditches along both sides of the secondary access road, fundamentally increasing the amount of roadside ditches in the project area. As the ditch to be removed is not a jurisdictional water of the U.S., and because the amount of roadside ditches within the project it to be increased along the secondary access road, significant impacts to wetlands as a result of the secondary access road are not expected.

To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are carried out at the project-specific level, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures BR-2 and BR-4, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of these measures at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant impact to special status species to a less than significant level, as required by the County's and federal government's no net loss policies (FEIR, pp. 14.23–14.24; Findings, pp. 116–119).

In a letter dated March 31, 2006 from Craig W. Hiatt with ECORP Consulting, Mr. Hiatt stated that the alignment of the secondary access road avoids the wetlands and provides 40 foot buffers from the wetland features. Mr. Hiatt further stated that the buffers are sufficient to prevent significant indirect impacts to wetlands if the following practices are implemented:

1. The work shall take place during the "dry" season;
2. A storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) is prepared and adequate soil erosion best management practices (BMPs) are designed and implemented (i.e., straw wattles, silt fence);
3. The wetlands in the vicinity of the road project are demarcated with orange construction fencing to aid the contractor(s) in identifying sensitive aquatic resources; and,
4. A biological monitor is on-site to assist the contractor(s) in avoiding any wetland features.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures (based on BR-2 and BR-4 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to the North Douglas project.

MM 4.2a If wetland impacts occur, the project shall comply with Sacramento County's no net loss policies for wetland habitat acreage and values (CO-62, CO-70, CO-83, and CO-96), which establish minimum performance for a wetland avoidance/mitigation strategy.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 4.2b If the project needs to obtain a Clean Water Act permit then the North Douglas project proponents shall submit a wetland delineation for the proposed development areas, and a detailed plan which describes the specific methods to be implemented to avoid and/or mitigate any project impacts upon wetlands such that no net loss in wetland habitat or acreage and values is achieved. This detailed Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall be prepared in consultation with the US Army Corps, the USFWS, and the CDFG, and shall incorporate the following components.

- A wetland delineation of the project site and any proposed off-site wetland preservation/creation site(s), verified by the US Army Corps of Engineers;
- The location of proposed wetland preservation, acquisition, and creation site(s);
- A detailed map of proposed wetland creation site(s) showing the acreage, distribution, and type of wetlands to be created to ensure no net loss in wetland habitat acreage, values and functions. Compensation wetlands shall be designed to:
 - Meet or exceed the hydrophytic conditions and operating functions of the existing wetlands proposed for impact.
 - Mitigate the loss of special status species habitat, including fairy/tadpole shrimp, as required by the USFWS and the CDFG;
- A monitoring plan designed to assess whether the compensation wetlands are functioning as intended. Specific performance standards for hydrologic, floral, and faunal parameters shall be proposed to determine success of the created wetlands. The monitoring plan shall specify the corrective measures/modifications to be implemented in the event that monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met. Monitoring shall occur for at least five years and until success criteria are met, and as required by the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the USFWS; and

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- A maintenance plan for the wetland preservation/mitigation areas describing the measures to be implemented to assure that they are maintained as wetland habitat in perpetuity. The maintenance plan address buffering from adjacent uses, fencing, access, erosion control, and weed eradication.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of final map and/or site disturbance (whichever comes first) and during all phases of construction. The monitoring plan shall remain in place for a period of five years after construction activities have been completed.

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

MM 4.2c

For portions of the project, which will not directly affect wetlands but may indirectly affect wetlands, the applicant shall prepare a "Wetland Impact Minimization Plan," which will provide specific "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) for construction and operation, and provide a copy to the Planning Department for approval prior to site disturbance. All BMPs shall be incorporated into the project design and operation in order to ensure to no adverse environmental effects to or waste/pollutant discharge (e.g., sediment and urban pollutants) into a wetland that would result in a "take" of tadpole and fairy shrimp. The "Wetland Impact Minimization Plan" shall provide feasible and effective BMPs that are proven to be suitable for the soil conditions, hydrology and topography in the project area. Additionally, redundant BMPs shall be utilized to ensure no adverse effect to wetlands. Approval of the "Wetland Impact Minimization Plan" shall occur prior to any site disturbance. The BMPs and proposed setbacks shall be clearly shown on improvement plans for each impacted wetland and vernal pool within the area of effect. BMPs shall be listed in the improvement plans and detailed drawings shall be provided for the affected wetlands and vernal pools. The applicant shall provide funds for the City to hire a qualified professional to verify the adequacy of the BMPs to meet the standards. Field monitoring, sampling and reporting shall be conducted throughout project construction and after storm events (in combination with SWPPP monitoring) to ensure that the BMPs are working. The applicant shall fund a full-time monitoring position for a qualified monitor to conduct onsite monitoring. If BMPs are found to be ineffective through field monitoring and sampling, the applicant and monitor shall work with the City to incorporate new BMPs. At the conclusion of grading activities, the construction monitor will prepare a compliance report. The report shall be distributed no later than two weeks after grading activities have been concluded. City staff shall be authorized to conduct spot monitoring during construction activities and after storm events. The monitor will be given authority to postpone or shutdown construction activities if a violation occurs. *If 404 permits are issued allowing fill and/or discharge into previously avoided wetlands, the conditions of said permits will supersede the conditions of this mitigation measure.* The combination of BMPs selected for the project shall be appropriate for clay soils and shall be effective at meeting all of the following objectives: erosion control; sediment control; tracking control; wind

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

erosion control; non-stormwater management control; and waste management and materials pollution control.

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

MM 4.2d The "Wetland Impact Minimization Plan" required by mitigation measure MM 4.2c shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and shall incorporate the following elements:

- The work shall take place during the "dry" season.
- The wetlands in the vicinity of the road project are demarcated with orange construction fencing to aid the contractor(s) in identifying sensitive aquatic resources.
- A biological monitor is on-site to assist the contractor(s) in avoiding any wetland features.

Timing/Implementation: Plan shall be approved by the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department prior to approval of grading or improvement plans for the secondary access road.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.2a through MM 4.2ed would reduce the project's impacts to wetlands to *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any fish or wildlife species or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites or corridors; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site may contain oaks, cottonwoods, ornamentals and various orchard trees. Impacts to native oaks or landmark trees were identified as a potentially significant but mitigable impact in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR (FEIR, p. 14.33). The FEIR proposed, and the Board adopted, a mitigation measure requiring future project proponents to submit an on-site tree survey and a mitigation plan for the loss of large oak or other trees (FEIR, p. 14.33; Findings, p. 122 (mitigation measure BR-9).

The secondary access road alignment does include some small trees. However, these trees are from an abandoned orchard on the project site and do not qualify as landmark or native trees and are not protected under the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance (Hiatt, Craig. Letter received September 1, 2005).

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant impacts to on-site trees that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would they cause any impacts peculiar to the projects or parcels. (See CEQA

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).). Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the trees impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are carried out at the project-specific level, the City is requiring the following mitigation measure, which is based on the requirements of measure BR-9, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of this measure at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant impact to trees to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 14.33).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure (based on BR-9 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the North Douglas project.

MM 4.3 The project applicants for the North Douglas project 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. Consistent with General Plan policies, the removal of any native oak tree measuring six inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) and the removal of any non-oak native tree (excluding cottonwoods and willows) measuring 19 inches or greater dbh necessary to accommodate future development shall be mitigated by planting replacement trees (in-kind species on an inch-for-inch basis) within the project area. In addition, other non-native landmark size (19" or greater) may require mitigation as determined on a project- by- project basis.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of improvement plans or grading permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.3 would reduce potential impacts to on-site trees to *less than significant*.

A tree survey has been completed for the North Douglas project, which found no trees to be preserved and protected. Therefore, this mitigation measure has been met.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 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 type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Existing Setting

Record searches and field examinations were conducted in preparation for the SDCP/SRSP EIR; however, only portions of the Plan area were surveyed. There were two previous surveys that covered the Plan area include: Slaymaker 1988 and Peak and Associates, Inc. 1989. The most current survey was conducted on May 30, 1997. The surveys concluded that the Plan area was void of any prehistoric resources; however, did identify two historic resources within the area. The most current survey included only portions of the North Douglas project site. A survey of the secondary access road area was conducted in August 2005. This survey found no evidence of significant cultural or historic resources within the secondary access road area of effect (ECORP, August 2005. See Appendix D. No historical, archeological, paleontologic, or evidence of human remains were identified during the most recent survey; however, significant resources may be present on the project site and additional surveys would be required or existing surveys updated.

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As indicated above, limited Cultural Resource surveys were conducted and evaluated for SDCP/SRSP EIR. The surveys, including that for the secondary access road site, indicated that the North Douglas site was free of important cultural/historical resources and it was determined that the site has a low probability of such resources. However, only portions of the site were included in the survey areas. The SDCP/SRSP EIR identified mitigation to reduce potential impacts on cultural and historical resources (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 15.9). Although, implementation of the project is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts, project-specific survey results are required to identify any potential cultural, historic, archeological, or paleontologic resources that may be present on site.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure (based on CR-1 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the North Douglas project.

MM 5.1 Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during development activities, work shall be suspended and the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

City of Rancho Cordova shall be immediately notified. At that time, the City will coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with appropriate specialist, as needed. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of the cultural resources. In addition, pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.

Timing/Implementation: ~~Prior to issuance of building permits.~~ Throughout construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- g) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation /Reviewed Under Previous Document. See a) above.*
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation /Reviewed Under Previous Document. See a) above.*
- i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document. There are no known cemeteries on the project site; however, due to the large Native American population in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked sites, such as gravesites or areas of spiritual significance, which may not contain any surface evidence of occupancy. The project is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.1 would reduce any potential human remain impacts to 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
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>

Existing Setting

The Spink Corporation evaluated the soils within the SDCP/SRSP areas including the geological conditions of the North Douglas project site. Design of the buildings in accordance with Title 24, Chapter 23 of the California Code of Regulations (1991 Edition of the California Building Code, with January 1, 1993 supplements) would ensure that significant damage to buildings as a result of seismic ground shaking is prevented. The SDCP/SRSP EIR concluded that the soil types and geologic conditions occurring within the SRSP area are suitable for the land uses proposed for the North Douglas project.

Discussion of Impacts

- a)
- i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential for impacts to public safety resulting from surface fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or other seismic hazards is not considered to be an issue of significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic history of the area. This issue, along with the issues in items ii, iii, and iv, were previously discussed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR and were determined to be less than significant and did not require mitigation (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, pages 13.18-13.19). Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- ii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See response to a (i) above. The potential for strong seismic ground shaking is not a significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic activity of the area; however, any development would be required to comply with any seismic standards enforced by the UBC.
- iii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See response to a (i) above. The soil types of the North Douglas project site consist of fine sandy loams, gravelly loams, Red-Bluff Redding complex and silt loams, which do not constitute a potential impact for ground failure or liquefaction.
- iv) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site is characterized by flat terrain and gently sloping topography; as such, the site has very low potential for landslides.
- j) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Grading activities associated with development of the project would remove vegetative cover and would expose soils to wind and surface water runoff. The project is subject to the Sacramento County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, which established administrative procedures, standards of review and enforcement procedures for controlling erosion, sedimentation, and disruption of existing drainage. This issue was addressed in the SDCP/SRSP FEIR (page 13.18); therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- k) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The soil groups present on the project site have high percentages of clay, which expand with wetting and drying conditions. These soils present a mild geologic hazard due to high-shrink swell potential. The project is subject to standard construction requirements that mitigate this issue (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, page 13.19); therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- l) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See c) above.
- m) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not use a septic tank system or other alternative wastewater systems. The project would be served by the extension of Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) facilities; therefore, there is no impact.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Existing Setting

The initial Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the entire SDCP/SRSP area by Wallace-Kuhl & Associates (dated 1997). The Assessment identified potential hazardous impacts resulting from including but not limited to: the exposure to off-site groundwater contamination; exposure to residual agricultural chemicals; potential Kiefer Landfill impacts; exposure to toxic air emission sources; exposure to PCB's and radon; and the potential of exposure to asbestos during the construction period.

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* This issue was reviewed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and the SunRidge Specific Plan Areas (See Section 16. Hazardous Materials). The land uses proposed as part of the North Douglas project site consists of residential, parks, and landscape corridor lots, which

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

are not associated with the use of large amounts of hazardous materials. Therefore, implementation of the project is expected to result in *less than significant* hazardous material transportation and disposal related impacts.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Construction activities would include the use of heavy equipment, which involves the use of oils, fuels and other potentially flammable substances that are typically associated with construction activities. In addition, as noted in the Master EIR, the North Douglas project site may contain PCB-containing transformers, underground storage tanks, and/or trash and other debris, which could pose a health and safety risk to people in the vicinity if PCB exposure occurs as a result of leakage or combustion, or if people come into contact with contaminated or hazardous materials associated with the storage tanks or illegally dumped debris (FEIR, pp. 16.16–16.20). The FEIR determined that these potentially significant impacts could be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures requiring inspection and removal of these hazards (*Ibid.*).

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant impacts arising from hazardous materials that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would they cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).). Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the hazardous materials impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are carried out at the project-specific level, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures TX-3, TX-6, TX-7, and TX-8 adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of these measures at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant impacts from hazardous materials to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 16.16–16.20).

Mitigation Measures

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

- MM 7.1b** As development occurs, all debris, trash, refuse, and abandoned, discarded, and/or out-of-service items shall be removed from the North Douglas project site and disposed of or recycled off-site.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 7.1a through 7.1c would reduce potential PCB, underground storage tanks, and/or trash and debris impacts to *less than significant*. No other significant risks of explosion or accidental release of hazardous substances are anticipated; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR, Section 16: Hazardous Materials and discussions a) and b) above. There are three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school proposed in the SDCP/SRSP areas. However, development of the North Douglas project would not result in the release of acute hazardous materials adversely affecting these proposed school sites. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed project site is not listed as having past hazardous materials involvement. However, there is documented groundwater contamination within close proximity to the proposed project area (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 16.13). However, the use of on-site wells is not part of the North Douglas project. Instead, the project proposes to obtain potable water from an off-site well field (known as the North Vineyard Well Field [NVWF]), located approximately 5 miles southwest of the SDCP/SRSP project area, ultimately to be combined with surface water supplies as part of the planned Zone 40 conjunctive use system (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 16.14). The California Department of Health Services believes that the NVWF will provide a guaranteed supply of drinking water for the indefinite future. Therefore, the potential for exposure to groundwater contamination is considered to be less than significant.

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant impacts arising from hazardous groundwater contaminants that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. [c][1]). Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the groundwater contamination impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are carried out at the project-specific level, the City is requiring the following mitigation measure, which is based on the requirements of measure TX-5, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of this measure at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant impacts from hazardous materials to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 16.18).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures

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

MM 7.2 As development occurs, each site shall be specifically inspected for water supply wells, septic tanks, leach lines, and cisterns. All water supply wells shall be properly destroyed via the well abandonment procedures of the County Environmental Health Division. Septic tanks, leach lines, and cisterns shall be located, removed, and backfilled in accordance with the recommendations of a qualified geotechnical engineer.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 7.2 would reduce any other potential public and environment impacts resulting from these sites to *less than significant*.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP) area of the Sacramento Mather Airport, but is within two miles of the facility. Additionally, the project is not located under the imaginary surfaces (Part 77), nor is it within the overflight zone. Implementation of the project would not adversely affect operations of this facility and is not anticipated to result in safety-related hazards or adverse impacts to people residing or working on the project sites. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 4.29).
- f) *No Impact.* The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the *Sacramento County Multi-hazard Disaster Plan, the Sacramento County Area Plan* or any other adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site is not adjacent to wildlands and is in an area designated for urbanized land uses. Additionally, implementation of the project would not place residences or structure where they are intermixed with wildlands. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* and does not require mitigation.

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
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <u>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?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <u>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?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <u>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?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements were addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (See, generally, FEIR, section 9). The Master EIR for the SDCP/SRSP area determined that the Specific Plan has the potential to result in significant short-term surface water quality impacts during the construction period and long-term water quality impacts due to urban runoff and accumulated pollutants after development (FEIR, pp. 1.15, 9.12; Findings, p. 78). As expected in the FEIR, construction of the proposed project would create new sources of urban runoff (FEIR, pp. 9.12–9.13). Unless the runoff is controlled, it would generate new runoff pollutants such as oil, gasoline, and other chemicals with potentially adverse impacts on water quality. The FEIR concluded that, through the use of water quality control basins proposed in the SDCP/SRSP Master Drainage Plan, combined with flood control detention facilities, compliance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") and applicable County ordinances and State requirements, such impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (Ibid.). A SWPPP will also be required for the North Douglas project to address site-specific erosion control and water quality issues after construction. Because the County Land Grading and erosion Control Ordinance and State requirements already apply to the project, no further mitigation for water quality impacts is necessary (FEIR, p. 9.13).

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant water quality or waste discharge impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the water quality impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are carried out at the project-specific level, the City is requiring the following mitigation measure, which is based on the requirements of measure HY-3, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of this measure at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant water quality impacts to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 9.13).

Mitigation Measures

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

- MM 8.1** The North Douglas project applicants shall provide storm water quality source and treatment measures consistent with Volume 5 of the Sacramento County Drainage Manual. The final design of such and treatment control measures shall be subject to the approval of the Sacramento County WRD.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. The water supply plan's potential impacts on area groundwater levels were extensively examined in the Master EIR (See FEIR, pp. 7.35–7.56). The Board ultimately concluded that all such impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level (Findings, pp. 60-70).

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant groundwater supply impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the groundwater impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15183.) Developments subsequent to the approval of the SDCP/SRSP within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas are subject to mitigation measures demonstrating the acquisition of adequate surface supplies has been achieved and that groundwater levels will not be adversely impacted (Findings, pp. 60-70). Implementation of these measures at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant groundwater impacts to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (*ibid.*).

- c) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. As noted for the larger SDCP/SRSP project, conversion of approximately 325.1 acres of agricultural lands to suburban development will substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site (FEIR, p. 9.11). Buildout under the SDCP/SRSP such as the proposed North Douglas project would increase drainage rates that could result in flooding and erosion (*ibid.*). The Master EIR and the Board determined that drainage and detention facilities that ensure post-development peak flows are reduced to at least pre-development levels will mitigate potential drainage and flooding impacts to a less than significant level (FEIR, p. 9.11; Findings, pp. 76-77). The Board imposed mitigation measures requiring the facilities outlined in the SDCP/SRSP Master Drainage Plan be constructed as development within the planning area occurs (Findings, pp. 77-80 (mitigation measures HY-2, HY-4, HY-5). No additional on- or off-site siltation or erosion impacts are anticipated beyond those previously identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR.

However, the off-site ditches depicted in **Figure 5** are located on property not owned by the applicant. Permission from the adjacent landowners would have to be obtained prior to site disturbance.

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant drainage impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the drainage impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are carried out at the project-specific level, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures HY-2, HY-4, and HY-5, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas (Findings, pp. 76-80).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of these measures at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant drainage impacts to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, p. 9.14).

Mitigation Measures

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

MM 8.2a The North Douglas project shall implement the improvements described in the "Final Master Drainage Study for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Area" (Final MDS) (Spink Corporation, October 16, 1998) as amended by the "Amendment to the Final Master Drainage Study, Sunrise Community Plan Area" (Amendment (MHM Engineers & Surveyors, October 19, 2001. Such improvements shall be designed to ensure that post-development peak (100-year) flows do not exceed existing peak flows to the satisfaction of the County Water Resources Division (WRD). Construction of the improvements may be phased as described in the Final MDS and subject to the approval of the WRD, so long as the project proponent(s) provide hydrologic/hydraulic analyses which demonstrate that the phased improvements will reduce peak flows or at least pre-development of the two Folsom South Canal overchutes at Lower Morrison Creek to the satisfaction of the WRD.

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 8.2b Implementation of the improvements described in the "Final Master Drainage Study for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Area" (Final MDS) (Spink Corporation, October 16, 1998) as amended by the "Amendment to the Final Master Drainage Study, Sunrise Community Plan Area" (Amendment (MHM Engineers & Surveyors, October 19, 2001 shall not occur until the following items have been submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova for review and approval:

- A wetland delineation for the improvement area verified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- A detailed mitigation plan for wetlands to be impacted by the proposed improvements which specifically describes the measures which will be implemented to achieve no net loss in wetland habitat acreage and values.
- Determinate surveys of the improvement area for potentially occurring special status species.
- A detailed mitigation plan developed in cooperation with the regulatory resources agencies. (US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game) which is designed to reduce impacts of the proposed improvements on any special status species identified in the determinate surveys to a less than significant level.
- A vegetation/tree survey for the improvement area, which identifies any existing marsh and riparian habitat.
- A detailed vegetation/tree replacement planting plan which describes the planting/relocation measures to be implemented to provide in-kind replacement plantings on an inch-for-inch basis for any riparian and marsh habitat which will be impacted by the proposed improvements.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 8.2c

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 8.2d

The project applicant shall obtain appropriate easements from all adjacent property owners for which the off-site ditches are located. Copies of any easements shall be provided to the Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to site disturbance in off-site areas.

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

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 8.2a through 8.2d would reduce the project's potential water quality standards and waste discharge requirement impacts to less than significant.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology and discussions c) above and g) below.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above. In addition to compliance with a SWPPP, the use of the following BMPs 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 BMPs but does not constitute the only practices to be employed. All requirements of the SWPPP shall be followed as well.

<u>CASQA Identifier</u>	<u>BMP Name</u>
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 Waster Management

More information on these BMPs, including their implementation and requirements, is available at www.casqa.com or upon request at the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department. Use of these and other BMPs, as well as adherence with a SWPPP under discussion (a) above would ensure that impacts from the project are *less than significant*.

- f) *Less than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above.
- h) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology and discussion above in a) and c).
- i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above.
- j) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* According to the SDCP/SRSP EIR and as depicted on current FEMA maps, the entire project site is located outside the 500-year floodplain (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 9.1b). The proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- k) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology and discussion g) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- l) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology, and discussion g) above.
- m) *No Impact.* The project site is not located near the Pacific Ocean, nor is it near a large water body that would be capable of creating seiches or tsunamis.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP area is currently undeveloped and is surrounded by limited development; as such, the project would not divide an established community. The Master Plan EIR identified nine residential clusters or community “villages” for the SDCP area, which included land use allocations for the SDCP/SRSP areas. These allocations included, but were not limited to, residential densities, public service acreage, and commercial square footage. Land use related impacts for the Community Plan and SunRidge Specific Plan areas were evaluated in the previous Master EIR (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 4.28). Implementation of the North Douglas project would not result in any additional land use impacts than those identified in previous documents; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR, Section 4: Land Use and a) above. The Board found that the land use designations contained within the SDCP/SRSP project were not inconsistent with the County’s General Plan, and that, as a result, this project did not cause any significant impacts with respect to General Plan consistency (SDCP/SRSP Findings, p. 31). The North Douglas project proposes land uses that are substantially consistent with the Community Plan and Specific Plan designations for these areas (See FEIR, pp. 4.15a–4.17b)(See **Figure 3**). Although the proposed designations vary slightly from the specific plan, the proposed designations are environmentally less intrusive. This is due in large part to the loss of the CMU land use designation depicted in the specific plan, and the creation of approximately 2.0 additional acres of park uses. Development of the North Douglas project would not result in any new or significant additional land use impacts beyond those identified in the Master EIR. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Currently, there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in Sacramento County; therefore, *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
X. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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

Motor vehicle traffic is the major existing noise source in the SDCP/SRSP area. Major mobile sources include the vehicular traffic along Sunrise Boulevard, Douglas Road, Grant Line Road, Jackson Highway, and Kiefer Boulevard and daily aircraft noise from nearby Mather Airport. Stationary sources of noise in the vicinity of the project area include the Cordova Shooting Center, the Kiefer Road Landfill, the Sacramento Rendering Company, American River Aggregates and Asphalt, and the Douglas Security Park.

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP Master EIR evaluated noise impacts associated with development of the Community Plan and Specific Plan areas (FEIR, pp. 12.15–12.16). The Master EIR determined that the impacts of traffic noise, proposed commercial, business/professional and school uses were significant, but in most cases, mitigable to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures requiring acoustical analysis and the development of noise attenuation measures as future projects within the SDCP/SRSP areas are proposed (*Ibid.*; Findings, pp. 111-114). As predicted in the Master EIR, the North Douglas project may place residential and other land uses in close proximity to roadways, which may result in traffic noise in excess of established Sacramento County General Plan and Noise Ordinance Standards (FEIR, pp. 12.15–12.16). This project, however, is subject to the mitigation measures adopted by the County for these impacts. Therefore, this impact will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant noise impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the noise impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) Implementation of the previously adopted SDCP/SRSP mitigation measures NS-5 and NS-6 at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant noise impacts to a *less than significant* level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 12.15–12.16; Findings, pp. 111-114).

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the North Douglas project would not generate excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise sources. Construction activities would temporarily increase groundbourne related impacts; however, standard Sacramento County Noise Ordinance requirements would reduce this impact to *less than significant*.
- c) *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above. In addition, implementation of the project would substantially increase traffic volumes and result in changes in traffic noise levels adjacent to roadways in the vicinity of the projects. However, it should be noted that the proposed project's land uses would result in less traffic noise than the plan evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP EIR due to the elimination of the CMU and the additional 2 acres of parks. The project would also result in additional stationary noise sources from the proposed park and recreational uses. To reduce potential noise impacts from these sources, the project will incorporate the use of setbacks, barriers and various site designs to help shield noise sensitive areas (i.e., residential areas, school sites, and parks). However, site-specific mitigation measures are necessary to lessen impacts of ambient traffic noise.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures apply specifically to the North Douglas project.

MM 11.1 The North Douglas noise-sensitive land uses proposed for development within the future 60 dB Ldn traffic noise contour shall be required to prepare an acoustical analysis, and to implement identified noise attenuation measures necessary to ensure compliance with the noise standards of the County General Plan Noise Element.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 11.1 would ensure compliance with Sacramento County noise standards and reduce future ambient noise levels to *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the project would involve the transport and use of heavy equipment. The use of heavy equipment and other construction activities would temporarily increase the ambient noise levels in project's vicinity above existing levels. However, these increases would be periodic and subject to Sacramento County Noise Ordinance regarding construction activities. The

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

North Douglas project would not result in any additional temporary noise increases than those identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR.

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

MM 11.2 The North Douglas project shall include standard mechanisms for mitigation of construction related nuisances including, restrictions on the hours of construction activities, restrictions on noise levels associated with construction equipment, watering and/or other dust control at all construction sites, City approval of proposed construction storage and staging areas (including employee parking). The project applicants shall continuously post visible signage providing a name, address, and 24-hour phone for information and/or complaints regarding the construction activities. This may be a City number if applicable.

Timing/Implementation: ~~Prior to issuance of building permits.~~ Approval of storage and staging areas to be obtained prior to site disturbance. Remainder of measure applicable throughout construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 11.2 would reduce the project's potential temporary noise impacts to *less than significant*.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As noted in the Master EIR, buildout of the SDCP area could result in the construction of approximately 22,503 residential units, commercial/business/professional land uses and school and park sites (FEIR, p. 3.5). The project site is located within the SDCP and SRSP areas, which were designated in the Sacramento County General Plan as an Urban Growth Area (FEIR, p. 4.33). Potential impacts relating to population and housing were globally addressed in the General Plan EIR (*ibid.*).

The North Douglas project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant growth inducement impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).) Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the growth-inducing impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) Therefore, the North Douglas growth inducement impacts are considered *less than significant*.

b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will provide approximately ~~680~~ 666 residential units on land that currently has two rural residences. Therefore, there would be no significant displacement of existing housing and no need for the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c) *No Impact.* See 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
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on fire protection were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to less than significant. The Sacramento Metro Fire District indicated that one or two more fire stations would be needed to accommodate the proposed growth within the SRSP area. During the project's development, the primary calls for fire service will most likely be for emergency medical responses. The proposed project is subject to modern fire codes, which would decrease the likeliness of structure related fire responses. The project proposes a primary access point into and out of the site off of Douglas Road and a secondary access road extending east from the northeast corner of the site to Grant Line Road. The secondary access road was added to the project specifically to provide a second access point to the project from nearby major roads and at the request of the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District.

Mitigation Measures

Because the project would result in a new impact to fire protection, a new mitigation measure is required.

MM 13.1a Prior to the issuance of building permits for the 251st unit, a second access road designed to the satisfaction of the Fire District and the City of Rancho Cordova shall be constructed. This road would need to be evaluated for environmental impacts prior to construction.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

This Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration includes provisions for the secondary access road, thereby satisfying mitigation measure MM 13.1a.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

MM 13.1b The North Douglas project shall comply with the following design measures:

- Cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 150-feet in length where possible, in order to facilitate emergency vehicle response throughout the development area. Off-site street bikeways, pathways, and recreational areas shall provide adequate access for fire fighting apparatus.
- All development shall meet the minimum water supply requirements for fire flow, by type of land use.
- Accessibility for fire control shall meet the specifications of the Fire District and shall be in place during all phases of the project.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of the mitigation measures MM 13.1a through 13.1c would fully mitigate the proposed project's potential impacts on fire protection services to *less than significant*. Implementation of MM 13.1a may result in environmental impacts to biological and cultural resources, air quality, noise, and traffic (short-term). ~~These impacts would need to be evaluated and mitigated in a separate environmental document.~~ The potential environmental impacts of mitigation measure MM 13.1a are analyzed and mitigated in this Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento County Sheriff's Department will provide law enforcement services to the North Douglas project site. The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on law enforcement were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to less than significant. The Sheriff's Department reviewed the SDCP/SRSP projects and identified various design features, which can be included in future development proposals to minimize the demand for law enforcement services (SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 6.16).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure (based on PS-6 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the North Douglas project.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of the mitigation measure MM 13.2 would mitigate the project's potential impacts on law enforcement services to *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Construction of the proposed residential units would generate students for schools. However, the SDCP/SRSP FEIR states, "The public Facilities Financing Plan for the Specific Plan area indicates that funding of needed school facilities will occur through the payment of Elk Grove and Folsom Cordova school impact fees, through participation in the Elk Grove School District's Mello Roos CFD, and through the State School Building Program. By contributing towards the costs of school facilities as outlined in the proposed Financing Plan, and by designating an adequate number of sites for new school construction, Sunrise Douglas Plan area development will have a less than significant impact on school facilities". Specifically, the proposed project would also have a *less than significant* impact on school facilities.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Construction of the residential units would generate the need for additional parkland. The project proposes the construction of a 9.0-acre park to serve the proposed residential units. This park is of a larger size than proposed in the SDCP/SRSP FEIR (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, page 4.15a). This is considered a *less than significant* impact to park resources.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Section 6: Public Services and a) through d) above. Three new electrical substations will be needed to serve the SRSP area. It is important to note that SMUD has indicated the need for a substation on or near the proposed project site. However, the specific location of the substation has yet to be determined. If a substation were to be placed on the North Douglas site, the impacts of this substation would have to be analyzed under a separate environmental document. Natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure will also be extended to serve the proposed land uses within the SRSP area. The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on electrical, natural gas, and cable service were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to recordation of final map.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 13.3c The residential design of the North Douglas project shall adhere to the SMUD Energy Efficiency/Load Management Measures for Residential New Construction.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 13.3d The North Douglas project applicants shall address and resolve issues related to the provision of telephone and cable television services within the project areas through close coordination with the applicable service provider during project planning and development.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See XIII. Public Services d) above. There are nine community, neighborhood and mini parks on approximately 83.29 acres and an additional 15.05 acres of open space proposed within the SDCP/SRSP areas. The North Douglas project would include an approximate 9.0-acre community park, which is 2 acres more than was evaluated in the SDCP/SRST EIR. The community park would reduce potential impacts and deterioration on existing facilities by the provision of new facilities. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above. The potential environmental impacts of park construction and provision were addressed in the appropriate technical sections of the SDCP/SRSP EIR. The construction of the proposed community park would not result in additional environmental impacts than those identified in the EIR; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Existing Setting

The Traffic and Circulation section of the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR assessed the potential traffic-related impacts resulting from buildout under the SRSP (FEIR, section 10). The analysis examined the project-specific and cumulative effects on the Specific Plan area's roadways, intersections, freeway operations, and proposed transit and bikeway facilities (FEIR, pp. 10.17–10.36). Implementation of the SRSP would increase A.M. and P.M. peak hour and daily vehicle trips over existing conditions (FEIR, p. 10.17). The SDCP/SRSP EIR identified thirty-one (31) traffic and circulation mitigation measures, most of which the Board subsequently adopted (Findings, pp. 80-98). The North Douglas project will have to comply with the applicable adopted mitigation measures. Those measures would provide the required improvements for roads that would serve the proposed project sites (i.e., Sunrise Boulevard, Douglas Road, Americanos Road, and Pyramid Road, etc.). The proposed project is currently designed with ~~only one~~ two access points; ~~which is including a primary access~~ off of Douglas Road and a secondary access road extending east from the northeast corner of the site to Grant Line Road. ~~Prior to the approval of more than 250 units, the project will be required to construct a secondary access to connect to Grant Line Road (See Section XIII).~~

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Traffic and Circulation issues were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 10: Traffic and Circulation). The SDCP/SRSP EIR indicated that a significant number of trips would be generated by implementation of the SRSP under existing plus project conditions. Buildout

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

under the SRSP is projected to generate approximately 152,400 daily vehicle trips – 10,155 during the A.M. peak hour and 15,830 during the P.M. peak hour.

A project specific traffic analysis was conducted by Fehr and Peers, dated December 31, 2003 (See **Appendix A**). This analysis was conducted to compare the project under the SDCP/SRSP, with the currently proposed project, which varies slightly with the Specific Plan. Using the same methodology and ITE manual, Fehr and Peers calculated that the proposed project would produce 585 trips during the PM peak hour. This is 73 trips less during the PM peak hour than the previously proposed project. This is due in large part to the elimination of CMU land use designation, and the increase in park uses proposed by the North Douglas project.

A traffic study of the impacts of the secondary access road in the proposed project was conducted by Fehr and Peers on November 14, 2005 (See **Appendix C**). The study recommended two options for lane configuration and traffic control at the proposed Raymer Way/Grant Line Road intersection. Option 1 provides for full access, while Option 2 offers limited (right-turn in/right-turn out) access. The percentage of project-related traffic traveling to/from the east using the proposed Raymer Way is anticipated to be relatively low and is consistent with the traffic analysis completed for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan. As currently designed, the intersection of the secondary access road and Grant Line Road would not require a traffic signal.

The North Douglas project would increase the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, and congestion at intersections over existing conditions. The project applicants are responsible for their fair share of improvements identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (Mitigation Measures TC-1 through TC-7 and TC-9 through TC-31), which would mitigate the project's traffic related impacts to the furthest extent possible.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures (based on TC-1 through TC-31 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to the North Douglas project.

MM 15.1 The North Douglas project shall participate in fair share funding for freeway, transit, and rail improvements identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR in Mitigation Measures TC-1 through TC-7 and TC-9 through TC-31.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 15.1 would reduce the project's impacts on volume-to-capacity ratio and congestion at intersections to *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above. The cumulative traffic related impacts of buildout under the Specific Plan were addressed in the Master EIR, which indicated that the cumulative conditions in the SRSP area would exacerbate unacceptable conditions at some roadways bordering the SRSP. The North Douglas project proposes less severe traffic impacts than those previously analyzed in the Master EIR, with no new impacts identified. However, mitigation is necessary to insure a less than significant impact to cumulative traffic conditions.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure (based on TC-20 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the North Douglas project.

MM 15.2 The North Douglas project applicants shall participate in their fair share of traffic calming measures required along Sunrise Boulevard (i.e., signal timing, striping, and left turn restriction).

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 15.2 would reduce the project's cumulative impacts on area roadways to *less than significant*.

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed project does not involve any aviation-related uses but is located within two-miles of the Sacramento Mather Airport. The project site is not located within the airport safety zones, ~~or~~ within the approach and departure paths for aircraft using the airport, nor it is under the imaginary surfaces (FAR Part 77), and Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed roadway system for the North Douglas project would be designed consistent with Sacramento County Department of Transportation Engineering standards and the approved SRSP; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP identified roadway improvements, which will ensure adequate emergency access to the North Douglas project site, including the secondary access road. Therefore, *less than significant* impacts are anticipated.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP EIR indicated that all development projects within the SRSP area are subject to parking requirements established in the Sacramento County Zoning Code for the proposed land uses. In addition, the SDCP/SRSP EIR (page 10.36) indicated that parking related impacts are considered *less than significant* and no mitigation measures are necessary.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRDP EIR evaluated alternative transportation modes for the SunRidge Specific Plan area. The projects will incorporate pedestrian pathways and bikeways and the routing of the collector streets will provide bikeway and pedestrian connections to regional bikeway systems and regional transit. SRSP preliminary conceptual transit routes are proposed along Douglas Road and Pyramid Road. In addition, the bikeways will meet the standards set forth in the 2010 Sacramento City/County Bikeway Master Plan (SRSP page 4-7). The project would not conflict with the provision of alternative modes of transportation; therefore, *less than significant* impacts are anticipated.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Existing Setting

As previously discussed in the Project Description above, the SDCP/SRSP and its accompanying Environmental Impact Report specify anticipated residential, commercial and institutional land uses, and the needed infrastructure and financing systems to support an anticipated 22,503 dwelling units. Utility and service system providers reviewed the North Douglas project and returned comments that were translated into project level conditions of approval. The mitigation measures proposed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors outline the processes by which new systems and conveyances must be designed, approved, and implemented within the SDCP and SRSP areas. There were no additional utility or service systems impacts identified for the North Douglas project that are greater than those already acknowledged in the Master EIR and SDCP/SRSP – CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopted by the Board in July 2002.

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Wastewater treatment issues were addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 8: Sewer Service). No wastewater treatment impacts were identified in the EIR that conflicted with applicable Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) requirements or standards. Interim sewer outfall will be needed to serve the projects due to the timing of construction of the proposed CSD-1 Mather and Laguna Interceptors. Temporary facilities include a pump station

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

(located approximately 4,000 feet south of Douglas Road and 1,200 feet east of Sunrise Boulevard) with an ultimate capacity of approximately 5.75 (mgd), serving approximately 8,000 dwelling units. The wastewater from the North Douglas project would be pumped via an 18-inch 36,000-foot force main to the Bradshaw Interceptor at Bradshaw Road and Jackson Highway. The 18-inch force main has a capacity of approximately 9.0 mgd at a velocity of 8 fps; therefore, the proposed facilities (interim and long-term) would fully accommodate the sewer flows anticipated from the proposed developments, which includes buildout of the SRSP area (SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 8.6); therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential environmental impacts associated with providing new wastewater and water facilities were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (See Section 7: Water Supply and Section 8: Sewer Service). Although, there is presently no public sewer or water infrastructure available for the proposed projects, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and County Sanitation District-1 (CSD-1) planned facilities and interceptor construction will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate SRSP buildout sewer flows (see a) above and the SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 8.6). The water supply plan for the SRSP area and the North Douglas project includes the construction of water supply facilities in phases according to increases in water demand. The water supply plan includes construction of the Excelsior Groundwater Treatment Plant, formerly known as the North Vineyard Well Field (NVWF), located near the intersection Florin and Excelsior Roads to extract groundwater from the basin underlying Zone 40. The "initial phase" would include construction of water supply facilities with sufficient capacity to deliver up to approximately 2,265 acre-feet per year, with a maximum day flow rate of approximately 4.0 mgd. Groundwater extraction and treatment, pumping and pipeline conveyance, and water storage facilities would be constructed during the "initial phase." Subsequent phases include expansion of "initial phase" facilities to deliver an additional 3,262 acre-feet year and a maximum flow rate of approximately 10.0 mgd. Groundwater extraction and treatment, pumping and pipeline conveyance, and water storage facilities would also be expanded during these subsequent phases. All water supply facilities for the SRSP, including the North Douglas project, will be integrated with the planned Zone 40 surface and groundwater conjunctive use program described in the *Water Forum Plan (WFP)*. For a discussion on potential water service impacts, see d) below. The North Douglas project will be required to construct the necessary wastewater and water infrastructure facilities to accommodate the proposed land uses. Additionally, project site was identified for urban growth and planned for urban utility services to fully accommodate the projected sewer flows.

The following mitigation measures (based on SE-1, SE-4, and WS-1 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to the North Douglas project.

MM 16.1a Prior to the submittal of improvement plans for the North Douglas project; the project proponent shall provide a detailed sewer design report, which addresses all necessary on-site and off-site facilities to the City of Rancho Cordova Department of Public Works for review and approval.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of improvement plans.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning and Public Works Departments.

MM 16.1b Implementation of off-site sewer facility improvements shall not occur until all necessary permits and/or agreements for the proposed improvements have

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

been obtained from the US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of improvement plans.

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

MM 16.1c Entitlements for the North Douglas project (i.e., subdivision maps, parcel maps, use permits, building permits, etc.) shall not be granted unless agreements are in place, consistent with Sacramento County General Plan Policy CO-20. Additionally, entitlements shall not be approved unless either: (a) sufficient EDUs are available under CO-20 development cap; or (b) additional supplemental water supplies are acquired and the CO-20 development cap is sufficiently expanded if needed.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to tentative map approval.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

MM 16.1d The project applicants shall pay any SCWA development fee or development fee surcharge imposed to fund the construction of all water facilities, extraordinary water facilities and water mitigation measures attributable to development within the SunRidge Specific Plan, as determined by the Sacramento County Department of Water Resources.

Timing/Implementation: Prior final map recordation.

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

MM 16.1e Prior to the approval of any building permits, the Excelsior Groundwater Treatment Plant shall be constructed, including the water extraction, treatment, delivery, and storage facilities to the satisfaction of SCWA. These facilities include those for the well field and delivery pipelines. The Excelsior Groundwater Treatment Plant is formerly known as the North Vineyard Well Field.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 16.1a through 16.1e would reduce potential wastewater and water facility construction and expansion impacts to *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential environmental impacts associated with providing storm drainage facilities were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 9, Drainage and Hydrology, pages 9.11 through 9.15). In addition, see Section VIII: Hydrology and Water Quality of this initial study. The land uses proposed in the North Douglas project would increase the rate and volume of drainage runoff from the sites; however, implementation of drainage and detention improvements and Mitigation Measures 8.1 through 8.2 contained in this MND, which was revised from the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

SDCP/SRSP EIR, would ensure that post-development peak flows are reduced to a least pre-development levels and would mitigate potential storm water drainage and associated environmental impacts to *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The water supply plan and associated environmental impacts for the SDCP/SRSP areas were evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 7: Water Supply). A conjunctive use program, consistent with the Water Forum Plan (WFP), will ultimately be implemented to supply water to the proposed project sites. Implementation of MM 16.1c, identified above, will ensure compliance with the CO-20 development cap by only allowing development to proceed for which a safe and reliable long-term water supply has been identified and acquired. Review of the North Douglas project is not anticipated to result in any additional water supply impacts than those identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. Therefore, water supply impacts are considered *less than significant*. The reader is referred to Section IX: Drainage and Hydrology of this initial study, for potential water contamination issues. Additionally, **Appendix B** of this MND illustrates the City's compliance with provisions of SB 610 regarding the North Douglas project.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Section Sewer Service 8 and a) above. The SDCP/SRSP areas were identified for urban growth and planned for urban services. Planned sewer facilities and infrastructure will fully accommodate the sewer flows anticipated from the proposed development (SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 8.6); therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* This issue was globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP Final EIR and indicated that the Kiefer Landfill would have adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed projects under buildout conditions (page 6.21). Additionally, the Kiefer Landfill expansion was recently approved, which gives the facility a permitted capacity to serve the growth projected in Sacramento County through 2035; therefore, solid waste impacts are considered less than significant. Since approval of the SDCP/SRSP FEIR by the County Board of Supervisors, Browning-Ferris Industries, Inc. (BFI) has contracted with the City of Rancho Cordova to provide solid waste collection and processing for the City. BFI processes all waste and transfers non-recyclable material to the Forward Landfill in Manteca. San Joaquin County and the City of Manteca have indicated that sufficient capacity exists in the Forward Landfill to serve the City's needs, including the proposed project. If additional capacity were required, BFI would deliver the remaining solid waste to Kiefer Landfill. Both landfills used by BFI have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project, resulting in less than significant impacts related to solid waste.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See f) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
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) <u>Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As noted in Sections I through XVI above, the North Douglas project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to biological resources (i.e., special-status species and wetlands), visual resources, cultural resources, hydrology/water quality, traffic and circulation, public services and utility and service systems.
- b) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.* Incorporation of all mitigation measures above would reduce any environmental impacts, both short- and long-term, to *less than significant*. The North Douglas project area is designed to be consistent with the goals of the SunRidge Specific Plan and the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan Master EIR. The secondary access road fulfills mitigation measures identified in this MND. Therefore, the North Douglas project (including the secondary access road) meets the short- and long-term environmental goals of the City.
- c) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* There are several proposed developments within the SDCP/SRSP areas (i.e., Anatolia, Sunridge Park and Lot J). The North Douglas project, together with other proposed and planned development in the vicinity could result in potentially significant cumulative impacts.
- d) *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Potential project impacts such as air quality, transportation/traffic, hydrology/water quality,

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

provision of public services, provision of utilities, and noise could cause substantial adverse effects in human beings, either directly or indirectly.