
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.2 INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** Old Placerville Road Residential and Office Project
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova
2729 Prospect Park Place
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ben Ritchie (916) 361-8384
4. **Project Location:** On the north side of Old Placerville Road, 0.15 miles east of the intersection of Bradshaw Road and Old Placerville Road, in the City of Rancho Cordova.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Ted Kopecko, Tower Development
4378 Auburn Boulevard, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95841
6. **Current Zoning:** MP – Industrial/Office Park
7. **General Plan and Planning Area:** City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Countryside-Lincoln Village Planning Area
Designated for Low Density Residential
8. **APN Number(s):** 068-0030-044
9. **Description of the Project:** See Section 2.3 of this MND.
10. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The site is bounded by an adjacent retail development to the west, a mobile home park to the north, an apartment complex to the east, and Old Placerville Road to the south. General land uses in the vicinity include low-density residential with some retail/commercial uses along Bradshaw Road.
11. **Other public agencies whose approval may be required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)
 - 1) California American Water Company (Cal-Am)
 - 2) County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1)
 - 3) Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB)
 - 4) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
 - 5) Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD)
 - 6) Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- 6) *“Reviewed Under Previous Document”* applies where the impact has been evaluated and discussed in a previous document. Discussion will include reference to the previous documents. If an impact is reviewed under a previous document, an impact of “Potentially Significant” does not necessarily require an EIR. If the Program EIR identified a significant and unavoidable impact, and the proposed project was adequately described in the Program EIR, an impact of “Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document” does not require an EIR, pursuant to Pub. Res. Code Section 21083.3.

- 7) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program Environmental Impact Report, or other CEQA process, an impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

The proposed site is currently undeveloped. However, the site is surrounded by similar uses as those proposed by the project. To the west is a large retail development. To the north, east, and south are other residential developments of a similar nature.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located within line-of-sight of any scenic vista. While the American River and the associated American River Parkway are located within two miles of the project, ground features and existing development prevent those aesthetic features from being visible from the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to any scenic vista.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Several trees are located on site. A large native oak is located in the center of the project site and will be preserved by the proposed project. Several smaller trees will be removed according to the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance. These smaller trees do not qualify as landmark trees and do not provide any significant aesthetic resource. No other aesthetic features such as rock outcroppings exist on-site. A Cultural Resources Study was conducted for the property in May 2005 (see **Appendix A**). No historic buildings were found on the project site. Due to the above factors, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on scenic resources.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is surrounded by similar residential and commercial development. Residential land uses surround the project on three sides and a large retail development is located immediately adjacent to the project to the west. Therefore, the existing character of the immediate vicinity matches the proposed uses of the project. The proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on the visual character of the site and its surroundings.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be required to comply with City of Rancho Cordova lighting standards and the City's Design Guidelines. Additionally, light sources on-site are limited to overhead lighting in the office portion of the project and typical house lighting on the residential portion. Both of these light source types are found in close proximity to the project. Any effects on nighttime views in the area have already occurred

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

with development of the surrounding land uses, prior to incorporation of the City. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact associated with light and glare.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is not located on any active agricultural land. Some evidence of prior orchard uses on the property was discovered as part of the Cultural Resources Study performed in May 2005. The Cultural Resources Study is attached as **Appendix A**. However, these orchards were abandoned long before incorporation of the City and prior to development of the local area.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The project area does not include any prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. Previous agricultural uses existed on-site, but not since the early twentieth century (Historic Resource Associates, 2005, p. 7). Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on farmland of these types.
- b) *No Impact.* The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact*.
- c) *No Impact.* No uses, features, or characteristics of the project site are used by or facilitate agricultural operations in the vicinity. The nearest agricultural operations exist south of SR-16, more than two miles to the south. The project area is surrounded by residential, commercial, and office land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on agriculture and agricultural resources in the vicinity.

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 type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

Pollutant emissions modeling for the proposed project was conducted by City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department staff using the URBEMIS 2002 version 8.7.0 software provided by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) in May 2006 (see **Appendix B**). The results of the model found that the proposed project would result in the emissions shown in **Table 2** below.

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

	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM10
Construction Phase (2006)	9.13	64.93	72.11	0	52.80
Construction Phase (2007)	4.92	32.49	39.93	0	1.33
Construction Phase (2008)	91.66	52.35	70.18	0	1.92
Operational Phase	5.30	6.05	62.46	0.05	4.94

Source: URBEMIS2002 v.8.7.0

Notes: ROG = Reactive Organic Gasses, NO_x = Nitrogen Oxides, CO = Carbon Monoxide, SO₂ = Sulfur Dioxide, PM10 = Particulate Matter, 10 Micron

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* In order to assist local agencies and municipalities with analyzing project-specific impacts to air quality and compliance with local air district attainment plans, SMAQMD has provided a “Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento”. This guide includes information on significance and mitigation for common air

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

emissions issues. Additionally, SMAQMD will review all development projects, including the proposed project, to ensure their compliance with local, State, and federal plans. According to the significance standards set by SMAQMD, the proposed project would not result in emissions above the significance thresholds identified in SMAQMD's "Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County" (2004). SMAQMD's current standards are shown in **Table 3** below. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with the Metropolitan Air Quality Attainment Plan and impacts would be *less than significant*

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

Pollutant	Threshold of Significance
NO _x During Construction	85
ROG During Operation	65
NO _x During Operation	65

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

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* The proposed project will not produce significant quantities of any pollutant currently tracked by SMAQMD. Current thresholds for emissions of NO_x and ROG are shown in **Table 3**. The proposed project would not violate the standards set by SMAQMD and the City of Rancho Cordova for pollutant emissions during both the construction and operational phases of the project. However, as with any construction, the possibility exists that PM10 emissions throughout the grading and building construction phases could result in short-term instances of significant PM10 emissions not anticipated by the air emissions model. The following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potential PM10 emissions from the project area:

Mitigation Measures

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

Timing/Implementation: Measure shall be included on all improvement plans prior to issuance of grading permits

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

and/or approval of improvement plans. Compliance with this requirement shall continue until the completion of construction activities.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.1a, MM 3.1b, and MM3.1c will ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with construction PM10.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

A Natural Resources Due Diligence Report was conducted for the property in May 2005. This study included literature searches, coordination with federal and state biological resources agencies (i.e. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and site surveys in April 2005. The study found that the site contained primarily non-native grasses and a few oak and almond trees. No special status species were found on-site and none were expected as habitat was not suitable for these species. There was no evidence of wetland features on site. Suitable foraging habitat for raptors was not found due the high level of prior site disturbance, the property's small size, lack of a prey base, and the urban location of the project area. The Natural Resources Due Diligence Report is attached as **Appendix C**.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.* No special status species were found on-site during the site survey conducted in April 2005. Suitable habitat for special status species commonly found in the Carmichael USGS topographic quad was not found either. Suitable foraging habitat for raptors, including Swainson's hawk, was not found on-

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

site. Existing on-site trees could potentially provide nesting habitat for raptors and birds. Ultimately, new trees will be planted on-site that will provide new nesting opportunities. However, construction of the project includes the removal of several small trees and may result in impacts to nesting birds and raptors. Therefore, the following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the project in order to prevent significant impacts to these species:

Mitigation Measures

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

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

Timing/Implementation: All contractors working on the project shall be notified of this measure and this measure shall be included on all improvement plans. Surveys to be performed prior to site disturbance between February 1 and September 1.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project area does not include any sensitive community habitats such as riparian habitats. No wetlands or jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are located on-site, as shown in the results of the Natural Resources Report (**Appendix C**). Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on sensitive habitats.
- c) *No Impact.* No wetlands are located on-site or adjacent to the project site [see discussion b) above]. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to jurisdictional waters or other wetlands.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* The Natural Resources Report (**Appendix C**) found no evidence of nesting birds on the project site. The area is heavily developed and the project site is unsuitable for forage for migratory or local species. However, nearly one year has elapsed since the last site survey, and as the raptor and bird nesting season has begun for 2006, impacts to local or migratory bird nursery sites may occur. Nesting was not observed, but trees on site could potentially provide nesting and shelter habitat. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.1 would ensure that impacts to

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

raptors and special status birds would be *less than significant*. Other impacts to migration routes or movement corridors would be *less than significant*.

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation*. The proposed project includes the removal of trees on-site that may be in conflict with the City's adopted Tree Preservation Ordinance (Article 19.12). A large native oak of 45 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) is located near the middle of the project area. This large oak will be preserved by the project proponent and incorporated into the landscaping for the office portion of the project. However, several other native oaks are located within the project area and are proposed for removal by the applicant. The following mitigation measures are included in order to ensure adherence to the City's Tree Ordinance:

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.2a The large oak tree in the middle of the project area shall be preserved. Prior to the removal of the remaining trees on-site the project proponent shall submit to the City a Tree Removal Plan identifying each tree to be removed and the species, size, location, and relative health of each tree. Removal of any trees on the project site shall be conducted pursuant to the City of Rancho Cordova Tree Preservation Ordinance. Removal of trees shall not occur until the Rancho Cordova Planning Department approves the Tree Removal Plan.

Timing/Implementation: Tree removal plan shall be submitted and approved prior to removal of oak trees on the project site.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

MM 4.2b The large oak tree in the middle of the project area shall be protected from any impacts during construction and from landscaping or structures in the project area. The ground under the oak tree within the drip line shall be maintained in its natural state. Landscaping and irrigation of the area within the drip line shall be conducted only after approval by the City of Rancho Cordova of the landscaping plan. During construction, the tree shall be protected by construction fencing at least six feet from the drip line of the tree. All contractors working on-site shall be notified of the tree's location and its protected status. This mitigation measure shall be included on all improvement plans for the project.

Timing/Implementation: Measure shall be included on all approval plans prior to approval of those plans. Protective measures shall be in place prior to site disturbance. Landscaping requirements under the tree shall be maintained for the life of the tree.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.2a and MM 4.2b would ensure that impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- f) *No Impact.* The City of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento County do not currently have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is being prepared by the County and will be adopted within the next few years. However, the SSHCP is still being formulated and no portion of the plan has been adopted. No Natural Community Conservation Plans are in effect in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

A Cultural Resources Study was performed by Historic Resource Associates in May 2005. The Cultural Resources Study includes a record search at the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. Additionally, Historic Resource Associates performed a site survey of the project area. During the study no significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites were found. No existing historic buildings, structures, or objects were found on the project site. The Cultural Resources Study is attached to this MND as **Appendix A**.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact*. During the site survey of the project area performed by Historic Resource Associates, no historical resources, as defined by State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, were found on the project site. Historical evidence identifies the project site as previously containing an orchard. However, this orchard is long abandoned and no evidence of structures or other historical resources such as barns or home sites were found in the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on historical resources.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation*. The Cultural Resources Study did not find any significant evidence of archeological resources in the project area. Additionally, the report "Archaeological and Historical Investigations for the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan" prepared by Pacific Municipal Consultants in 2005 found that archaeological sites in the City were generally limited to the areas near the American River (Pacific Municipal Consultants, 2005, p. 27). However, as the general vicinity is known to have contained historic and prehistoric uses, the possibility for discovery of a previously unknown archeological resource, paleontological resource, or human remains still exists. In order to protect any previously unknown resources from impacts related to implementation of the proposed project, the following mitigation measure is provided:

Mitigation Measure

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

City shall be immediately notified. The applicant shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with appropriate specialists, as needed. The applicant shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of the cultural resources. In addition, pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission are to be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. This measure shall be included as a note on all project plans.

Timing/Implementation: *Throughout all phases of construction. This measure is to be included on all improvement plans.*

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

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1 would ensure that the project's potential cultural, historical, paleontological, and archeological resource impacts are *less than significant*.

c) See discussion b) above.

d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* There are no known cemeteries on the project site. Historical research performed by both Historic Resource Associates and Pacific Municipal Consultants found no evidence of cemeteries on the project site. However, due to the large Native American population known to reside in the general area in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked grave sites. The proposed project area is not expected to contain any such sites. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1 above would ensure that any impacts to human remains would be *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a)

- i) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No active faults are located within 30 miles of the project site. Additionally, construction on the project site will be subject to California Building Standards Code, which increases the requirements above the Uniform Building Code, partly in order to protect buildings in California from earthquakes and seismic events. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- ii) See discussion under i) above.
- iii) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The soil type underlying the project area is Kimball Silt Loam. This soil type is typically well drained and is not typically associated with liquefaction. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact associated with seismic-related ground failure.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- iv) *No Impact.* The project site is generally flat and does not include any features that would create the possibility of landslide. Adjacent properties are also flat. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* associated with landslides.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Construction activities on previously undeveloped land can result in significant erosion related impacts. However, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the City of Rancho Cordova Erosion Control Ordinance. Additionally, the project proponent will be required to submit and adhere to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), further reducing any erosion-related impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* erosion impacts.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located on Kimball Silt Loam, a stable and well drained soil type. Landslides, lateral spread, and subsidence are not a concern as the general area surrounding the project and the project area itself is characterized by flat terrain. Liquefaction is not a significant concern due to the well drained condition of the soil, the depth to the groundwater table, and the relatively long distances between the project and any active seismic faults. Collapse is not a significant concern as the area shows no sign of, nor is any evidence available that shows subterranean voids or mining in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with these types of hazards.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Kimball Silt Loam is prone to high shrink-swell potential in the project area. However, compliance with the California Building Standards Code would ensure that structures on-site would not be subject to significant risk from this type of event. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with expansive soils.

- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project will be served by County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) for wastewater conveyance from the site. Sewer service already exists at the street and every use within the project area will be connected to CSD-1's service infrastructure. The proposed project will not rely on septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, the proposed project will have *no impact* associated with alternative wastewater systems.

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 type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project does not include any uses that would require routine transport of hazardous materials. However, construction of the proposed project may include the limited use of hazardous materials usually associated with building construction. Any transportation, storage, or use of hazardous materials for the proposed project would be subject to local, State, and federal laws. Consistency with these laws would result in *less than significant* hazardous materials impacts.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* Construction of the proposed project would include the limited use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials, as is normal for residential and office construction. This limited use would likely not result in significant potential for upset or release. However, as the site has lain vacant for some time, illegally dumped or buried material could be located on-site, causing the potential for

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Mitigation Measures

MM 7.1a The project proponent shall coordinate with the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) to ensure that all transformers on-site or immediately adjacent to the site that predate 1979/1980 are sampled and analyzed as needed to determine the presence or absence of PCBs. All PCB-containing transformers shall be removed and replaced with PCB-free transformers according to the requirements of SMUD.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

Timing/Implementation: Throughout all phases of construction.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in coordination with the County Environmental Management Department..

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

- c) *No Impact.* There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the proposed project area. Additionally, the proposed project would not emit hazardous materials as a part of the operation of the project. Nor would the project require the handling or use of any acutely hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact*.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located on a site that was included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

environmental and *no impact* associated with known hazardous materials sites would result from implementation of the proposed project.

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* According to the Mather Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), the proposed project is located within the Safety Restriction Area, specifically within the Overflight Zone (Airport Land Use Commission, 1997, p. 37). Acceptable land uses within the Overflight Zone include single-family detached and two-family dwellings as well as office buildings for rent (Airport Land Use Commission, 1997, pp. 38-39). All land uses within the proposed project are allowed within the Overflight Zone, indicating that the ALUC has found that hazards to people on the ground from aircraft in the Mather Airport airspace is not significant. Construction of the proposed project would not require any extremely tall equipment that would cause a hazard to aircraft and thus to people on the ground. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact associated with hazards for people residing or working in the project area.
- f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located within two miles of any private airstrip. The nearest private airport to the project area is Mosier Airport in Elk Grove, approximately nine miles away to the south. Additionally, per the Federal Aviation Administration's requirements, aircraft in the airspace directly over the project area would be under the control of Mather Airport's control tower, not the control tower of a private airport. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* associated with hazards near private airstrips.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* 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. The project area has been planned for industrial development for some time and development of this parcel was assumed in emergency planning processes. Additionally, the project area is surrounded by urban development of a similar type. The addition of five acres of additional residential and office development within this urbanized area would not affect regional agencies' ability to respond to disasters. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with disaster plans.
- h) *No Impact.* The proposed project is located in and entirely urbanized area. The project is surrounded by similar development and is not located in the vicinity of any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project is not at risk from wildland fire and *no impact* would result from implementation of the project.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to result in significant short-term surface water quality impacts during the construction period and long-term water quality impacts due to surface runoff associated with an increase in impermeable surfaces. 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. Compliance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), best management practices (BMPs), and applicable local ordinances and State requirements, would ensure that the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on water quality.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would result in new impervious surfaces on a site that previously consisted of entirely undeveloped land, decreasing absorption rates and increasing run-off in the project area. However, the project site consists of a small, infill parcel (approximately five acres in size) and by itself the project would not contribute significantly to impacts to the groundwater recharge rate of the area. Land surrounding the project consists of urban development that has already impeded the greater recharge rate of the area. The project area is currently supplied by the California-American Water Company (Cal-Am). Cal-Am's projected capacity through the year 2025 far exceeds the project need for the area, including the need of the proposed project (EDAW, 2006). Therefore, the uses of the proposed project would not result in the need for additional groundwater sources and would not result in significant impacts to groundwater levels. Considering the above factors, implementation of the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is characterized by flat terrain, generally draining to the south towards Old Placerville Road. The drainage for the project site would be modified by the addition of impervious surfaces and other common impacts to drainage from development of a site. However, no significant change will occur. Additionally, the proposed project will be required to be consistent with the City of Rancho Cordova Erosion Control Ordinance, further reducing any erosion impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to erosion and drainage.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion under discussion c) above. The generally flat terrain of the project site as well as adjacent sites, as well as compliance with City Ordinances, would mitigate any potential flooding in the area. The project is located well outside the 100-year floodplain. No uses included in the proposed project could result in a significant chance of flooding, regardless of the site topography. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact associated with flooding.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above. In addition to compliance with a SWPPP, the use of the BMP's listed in **Table 4**, as requested by the City and identified by the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA, January 2003), would further mitigate any operational impacts. This list is representative of recommended BMP's but does not constitute the only practices to be employed. All requirements of the SWPPP shall be followed as well.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

TABLE 4
APPROVED CASQA BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

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

Source: CASQA, 2003

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

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

- f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussions a), b), and d) above.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussions a), b), and d) above.
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is currently undeveloped and is therefore not directly contributing or connected to the storm drain system. However, development of this site has been anticipated and planned for since long before incorporation of the City. The addition of 35 dwelling units and four office buildings would not constitute a substantial new source of runoff. Consistency with a SWPPP would ensure that any runoff from the site was controlled and polluted runoff is prevented. Operational runoff from the project site would not be significant and would be handled by planned infrastructure already in place in the area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with storm water drainage systems.
- i) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Water quality impacts from the construction phase have been addressed in the discussions above and found to be less than significant. Adherence to a SWPPP would reduce many of the anticipated impacts to water quality from the construction phase of the proposed project. The addition of housing and office space on the project site would not include any design features or land uses that could adversely and significantly impact water quality. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to water quality.
- j) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project site is located more than one-half mile from the 100-year floodplain. Additionally, the project elevation of approximately 70 feet above mean sea level is high enough above the American River and any associated tributaries and creeks to preclude the potential for flooding during a 100-year storm event.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact associated with housing in the 100-year floodplain.

- k) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion j) above.
- l) *Less Than Significant Impact.* While the project is located within two miles of the Cordova Meadows Levee, the project is not located in the inundation zone for that levee. Neither is the project located in a location where failure of the Folsom Dam would result in inundation of the project area (SAFCA, 2006). No other significant source of flooding exists within the vicinity of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact associated with flooding.
- m) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located near a large body of water or ocean, precluding the possibility of a tsunami or seiche occurring that could impact the project site. As the topography of the area in which the project is located is flat, mudflows are not a possibility. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in *no impact* from these types of events.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within the Countryside/Lincoln Village Planning Area as identified in the City of Rancho Cordova Draft General Plan (2006, p. 41). Within that Planning Area, the project site is identified as a site for low-density residential (City of Rancho Cordova, 2006, p. 42). The project site is entirely surrounded by similar residential development and a retail development to the west.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located within a completely urbanized portion of the City of Rancho Cordova. The project is located on one of the last vacant parcels in that portion of the City. Residential land uses adjoin the site to the north, east, and south and a retail development is located immediately to the west. Implementation of the project would not result in impacts to that roadway or to the general character of the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is currently zoned MP – Industrial/Office Park. However, the General Plan identifies the area as being planned for low-density residential. The proposed rezone of the project as well as the residential uses to be constructed by the project would bring the parcel into consistency with the City’s Land Use Map and the General Plan. The office portion of the project will not be rezoned. However, conflicts between the general plan and the office portion of the site do not concern environmental effects and are therefore not significant for this discussion. Considering these factors, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to conflicts with local plans.
- c) *No Impact.* The City of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento County do not currently have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is being prepared by the County and will be adopted within the next few years. However, the SSHCP is still being formulated and no portion of the plan has been adopted. No Natural Community Conservation Plans are in effect in the project vicinity. Therefore,

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

the proposed project would have *no impact* on any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 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 type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within a Mineral Resource Zone 2 area, as defined by the California Geological Survey. MRZ-2 areas are described as areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists. Typical mineral resources in the area of Rancho Cordova include gold (largely mined out in the early 20th century) and aggregate deposits that exist as a result of dredge mining in the area (Pacific Municipal Consultants, 2005).

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The vicinity of the project area has been largely urbanized in the latter half of the 20th century. During that time, significant aggregate resources were removed prior to development, including in the immediate vicinity of the project area. The proposed project would not create any new significant impediment to the removal of mineral resources from the site than already exists. Additionally, aggregate resources are not particularly rare, nor is the site planned for mining by any of the local firms that are currently removing mineral resources to the south and east of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with mineral resources.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The City of Rancho Cordova General Plan does not identify the project location as being within a locally important mineral resource. The vast majority of mining in the City is located well to the south and east of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project will have a *less than significant* 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
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

A Noise Impact Study was performed by The Acoustics & Vibration Group for the proposed project in May, 2006 (see **Appendix D**). The report found that the majority of existing noise came from US-50 to the north, Old Placerville Road to the south, the loading docks and cooling towers of the retail property to the west, and overflying aircraft into and out of Mather Airport. Noise impacts from the proposed project on adjacent sensitive receptors to the north, east, and south are expected to be minor.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation.* Three significant sources of noise exist immediately adjacent to the project area. Traffic noise from Old Placerville Road could result in exposure to significant noise levels, however the distance from the residential portion of the project to the roadway combined with standard building materials would ensure that noise from Old Placerville Road would be less than 50 decibels in the day and 45 decibels at night, the maximum allowed under the City's Noise Ordinance. Noise from overflying aircraft was measured during the Noise Impact Study but was not ultimately found to exceed maximum levels. Noise between 75 and 80 decibels was recorded emanating from the loading dock of the grocery store located in the retail center immediately adjacent to the project area to the west. This noise was short in duration and was associated with the engines of delivery trucks. As the exhaust stacks on these delivery trucks are located eight feet or more above the ground, the primary source of the noise was also centered eight feet

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

high. As the truck noise is louder than allowed under City standards, the following mitigation measure is included in order to reduce noise levels:

Mitigation Measures

MM 11.1 The project proponent shall construct a sound wall of at least 10 feet in height along the west property line beginning at the northwest corner of the project and terminating 5 feet south of the north face of the northwest office building. This sound wall shall be constructed of concrete masonry or other materials with a surface weight of 3.5 to 4.0 pounds per square foot. The sound wall shall be continuous along the entire length of the wall with no gaps, including along the ground, or other openings.

Timing/Implementation: Wall shall be constructed prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Construction of the proposed project will not include any practices likely to cause substantial amounts of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (e.g., drilling, jack-and-bore, etc.). Any amounts of groundborne vibration or noise will likely be temporary in nature, ceasing when construction is finished. Therefore, this impact is expected to be *less than significant*.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes only residential and office uses, both land uses that typically do not generate significant levels of noise. Noise generated by the residential uses is expected to be less than significant. The office uses included in the proposed project are also expected to only generate minor noise. The Noise Impact Study (**Appendix D**) did not identify any significant sources of noise from the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to result in *less than significant* noise impacts associated with the uses of the project.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* Construction of the proposed project would involve the transport and use of heavy equipment. The use of heavy equipment and other construction activities would temporarily increase the ambient noise levels in the project's vicinity above existing levels. These increases would be periodic and temporary in nature. In order to reduce noise impacts associated with construction, the following mitigation measure is included:

Mitigation Measure

MM 11.2 The project applicant shall adhere to the following standard mechanisms for mitigation of construction-related nuisances:

- Construction activities shall be limited to between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM on weekends;

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- Stationary sources of construction noise such as compressors and generators shall be placed as far as possible from existing residential uses to the north and east of the project site; and,
- Visible signage providing a name, address, and 24-hour phone number for information and/or complaints regarding the construction activities shall be posted on the site facing Old Placerville Road.

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

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

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

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

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located within the vicinity of Mather Airport. However, the noise contours for the airport are located south of the project area. No measurable noise contours overlay the project area. While aircraft noise was identified in the Noise Impact Study (see **Appendix D**), noise levels were below City-established thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact associated with aircraft noise.
- f) *No Impact.* The nearest private airport to the project area is Mosier Airport in Elk Grove, approximately nine miles away to the south. Pursuant to Federal Aviation Regulations, aircraft flying over the project area are under the control of Mather Airport. Therefore, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airport and *no impact* would occur.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project area was planned for development by both the City of Rancho Cordova and the County of Sacramento. The project is located within an urbanized area, not an undeveloped area with little or no prior development. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly induce growth in the vicinity. Impacts associated with growth inducement would be *less than significant*.
- b) *No Impact.* The project site is currently undeveloped. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any displacement of people or housing and there would be *no impact*.
- c) See discussion b) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

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

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be served by the SMFD. The nearest station to the project area is located less than 0.2 miles away on Bradshaw Road. The addition of the project to the existing service area for SMFD and for the Bradshaw Road Station would not impact SMFD service levels in the project area and no additional stations, equipment, or personnel would be required to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts related to fire protection.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would be served by the RCPD, which is based out of the police station on Rockingham Drive approximately 1.8 miles to the northwest of the project site. The addition of 35 dwelling units and four office units would not constitute a significant increase in service requirements for the Police Department. Therefore, no additional stations, equipment, or personnel would be required to serve the project and *less than significant* impacts are expected.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would generate some new students that would be served by the SCUSD. According to current SCUSD generation rates, the proposed project would result in 15 new elementary school students (K-6) and 11 middle/high school students (7-12). Existing schools can adequately serve these additional 26 students. No new school facilities will be required as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to schools.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes the addition of 35 dwelling units which would require dedication of additional parkland under the current City of Rancho Cordova parkland dedication standard of 5.85 acres per 1000 residents. The proposed project does not include the creation or dedication of any parkland to the CRPD. However, both the City of Rancho Cordova and the CRPD allow for the payment of in-lieu fees to CRPD. As no new parkland is included in or proposed by the proposed project, *less than significant* impacts related to the construction of additional park facilities are expected upon payment of in-lieu fees.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact.* All other public utilities such as wastewater conveyance, water supply, electrical supply, natural gas supply, cable television, and telephone are already located immediately adjacent to the project site. Therefore, construction of additional facilities will be limited to infrastructure to be installed on-site and thus the environmental impacts of that installation are covered in the various sections of this MND. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less than significant* impacts related to other public services.

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 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 type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

Three recreational facilities are within one mile of the project area: Lincoln-Village Community Park, Rosemont North Park, and Rosemont Community Park. All three facilities are maintained and managed by the CRPD.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project could potentially increase use of these parks through the addition of 35 dwelling units. However, the increase would be insubstantial compared to the general urban nature of the surrounding area and the high number of existing housing in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on parks in the vicinity.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes a small public use space located on-site between the office uses and the residential uses. This public use space will include a landscaped area and picnic benches. As this recreational facility is to be constructed on-site, the environmental effects of the construction are included in the analysis of this MND. Therefore, the impact will 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
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXISTING SETTING

A trip generation comparison was conducted by KD Anderson Transportation Engineers for the proposed project in April 2006. This comparison found that the proposed project would result in 549 daily trips, 79 AM Peak Hour trips, and 88 PM Peak Hour trips. The City's current standard of significance for trip generation is 100 or more AM or PM Peak Hour trips or 1000 or more daily trips.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would result in fewer trips than the City's current threshold of significance for traffic impacts. Above the standard of 100 or more AM/PM Peak Hour trips or 1000 daily trips, the City assumes that potentially significant impacts to traffic would occur and requires a traffic impact analysis in order to determine mitigation for the project. However, as the proposed project would not result in enough trips to require a traffic impact study, no significant impacts are expected. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less than significant* impacts related to traffic generation.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion a) above. The project is not expected to generate significant traffic. Therefore, no significant impact to level-of-service on area roads is expected and the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located under the Horizontal Surface of Mather Airport, as identified in the Mather Airport CLUP, which lies 150 feet above the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

ground at the project location (Airport Land Use Commission, 1997). The Horizontal Surface is an Imaginary Surface (established by Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77), above which it is assumed a structure or activity would pose a hazard to air navigation and therefore potentially require a change in air traffic patterns. However, the proposed project does not include any uses taller than two stories. Therefore, at no time would a structure included in the proposed project pierce the horizontal surface. Additionally, while a crane will likely be required for the construction phase of the proposed project, this crane would not approach 150 feet above the ground in height. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact associated with air traffic patterns.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project only includes one small loop road on the project site. This roadway will be analyzed by both the police department and the fire district prior to project approval as part of the City's approval process in order to ensure public safety. There are no intersections included in the project and all sharp corners are within the residential portion where speeds will be limited. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with design feature safety.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.* Steve Trout, Supervising Inspector for the SMFD, was consulted with during the project review phase and he indicated to City Staff that he did not anticipate any issues with access for the fire department and emergency response. Prior to final approval of the proposed project, the SMFD will be re-analyzing the project layout to ensure that access will not be an issue. However, as a full analysis is forthcoming, the following mitigation measure is included in order to ensure that any future issues are addressed:

Mitigation Measure

MM 15.1 If the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire Department identifies that the design of the proposed project would result in an obstruction or reduction in emergency access to the project site, changes to the project design shall be made by the project proponent, to the satisfaction of the SMFD and the City in order to alleviate the problem. Such changes may include, but are not limited to:

- Increase the turn radius of internal roadways;
- Widen internal roadways and parking lots to accommodate fire equipment travel;
- Provide a secondary access to the project site on the western side to the adjacent retail development; and/or,
- Provide a secondary access point onto Old Placerville Road in the southern edge of the project area.

The environmental impacts of the above changes are identical to those identified in the MND. However, should other off-site changes in the project be required by the SMFD, the City will make a determination prior to project approval as to the environmental effect of those changes and whether additional CEQA review of the project is required. If additional CEQA review is warranted, the City shall conduct that review prior to project approval.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Each dwelling on the project site provides at least 2 parking spaces, including inside garages and outside on driveways. Additionally, four visitor parking spaces are included in the northwest and north east corners of the site. Current City standards for parking require two parking spaces per dwelling unit for detached and attached single-family dwellings (City of Rancho Cordova Zoning Code, Title III, Section 330-61). Therefore, the proposed project complies with City parking standards and would provide adequate parking and the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is not required by City Code to provide parking for bicycles. Additionally, while bus service is available within the vicinity, the proposed project is not located immediately adjacent to a bus route and there are no transit stops on Old Placerville Road at the project location. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on transit and alternative transportation.

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 type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project is surrounded by residential and commercial developments that are adequately serviced by CSD-1. According to the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Master Plan (2002), each new Equivalent Single-family Dwelling Unit (ESD) is projected to generate 310 gallons per day (gpd) of additional wastewater. The general assumption used for wastewater generation is 6 ESD's per acre of low-density residential (CSD-1, p. 3-3, 2002). The proposed project includes approximately three acres of residential and would therefore produce approximately 18 ESD's of wastewater or 2.03 million gallons per year. This amount is well within the capacity of CSD-1 systems, as identified in the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Master Plan. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project site is within an urban area adequately serviced by water facilities and wastewater treatment facilities. According to a Water Supply Evaluation performed by EDAW for the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan, the water supplier for the project area has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project (EDAW, 2006). Wastewater service to the project area was planned for in the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Master Plan (CSD-1, 2002). Further, the proposed development will have access to current facilities, and as such will not require new or expanded facilities. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is located on a parcel that has been planned for development. Existing stormwater collection and handling infrastructure was planned such that the addition of 35 dwelling units and four office units on the property would not result in a lack of capacity in the stormwater system. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Cal-Am currently provides water service to the area in which the proposed project will be located. According to a Water Supply Evaluation performed by EDAW for the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, Cal-Am's water supply is expected to be capable of handling the additional requirements of buildout of the City's Planning Area, which includes the proposed project (EDAW, 2006). Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussions a) and b) above.
- f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project will be served by Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI), which collects residential and commercial solid waste and transports any non-recyclable material to the Forward Landfill in Manteca, CA or the Lockwood Regional Landfill in Nevada. Both facilities have adequate capacity to handle the additional generation of waste by the operation of the proposed project. Construction debris will most likely be collected by the contractor and transported to the Kiefer Landfill, south of the City of Rancho Cordova. The Kiefer Landfill also has adequate capacity to accept waste from the proposed project. The addition of 35 residential units and four office units would be an insignificant change in daily waste. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion f) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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