

---

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, including the CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance. There are 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 project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures;
- **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant, but the incorporation of mitigation measure(s) would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level; or,
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed 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:** Tri-Tool 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:** Jeff Beiswenger (916) 851-8750
4. **Project Location:** The project is located on the northwest corner of Quicksilver Drive and Security Park Drive in the Security Park area of the City of Rancho Cordova.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Majors' Engineering  
P.O. Box 274  
Clarksburg, CA 95612  
(916) 372-2100
6. **Current Zoning:** M-2 – Heavy Industrial
7. **General Plan and Planning Area:** City of Rancho Cordova General Plan  
Security Park Planning Area  
Designated for Intensive Industrial
8. **APN Number(s):** 072-0540-003
9. **Description of the Project:** See Section 2.2 of this MND.
10. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** See Section 2.2 of this MND.
11. **Other public agencies whose approval may be required:** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)
  - 1) California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
  - 2) Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB)
  - 3) County Sanitation District (CSD-1)
  - 4) Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) Zone 40
  - 5) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
  - 6) Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD)
  - 7) Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)
  - 8) Sacramento Resource Conservation District (SRCD)
  - 9) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
  - 10) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

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

#### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

#### PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Tri-Tool project (hereafter referred to as the “proposed project”), as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of a Mitigate Negative Declaration. 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*”

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

---

*Impact* to a “*Less than Significant Impact*”. The initial study must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within the Security Park area, which is zoned for and predominated by industrial development. This area is surrounded by undeveloped lands and lands undergoing residential and commercial development.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The approval of the proposed boundary line adjustment and subsequent development of one 110,040 square foot industrial building will change the current view but will not adversely affect any scenic vistas nor is it located in the vicinity of a scenic highway. The project is located within the City limits in an industrially zoned area that has been partially developed with industrial uses. This project also consists of an application for Design Review by the City, which ensures physical, visual, and functional compatibility between uses and proper attention to site and architectural design; therefore no impact to scenic vistas is expected. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Additionally, it is located next to the tall Security Park building, which is highly visible.

b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR found that there were no highways within the Planning Area that were designated by State or local agencies as “scenic highways” (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-6).

See discussion a), above.

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

---

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts relating to the alteration of scenic resources in the City were identified in the GP-EIR and were predominantly associated with the urbanization of the rural and undeveloped portions of the City and areas east of the incorporated boundaries (GP DEIR, pp. 4.13-8 through 4.13-10). Impacts of the General Plan to visual resources were found to be significant and unavoidable (GP DIER, p. 4.13-10).

See discussion a), above.

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

The proposed project would not create a substantial amount of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The project site is currently zoned M-2 and would not convert prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance.

b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Just as with other types of farmland, the GP-EIR identified impacts to farmland currently under Williamson Act Contracts (GP-DEIR, pp. 4.2-22 through 4.2-23). Impacts of the General Plan to Williamson Act land were found to be significant and unavoidable due to the significant loss of such land at buildout of the General Plan.

The project site does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. The surrounding zones for the property are M-2.

c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR stated that impacts could occur to agricultural land uses as a result of urbanization of adjacent areas to operating agricultural operations (GP DEIR, p. 4.2-20). Placing urban development immediately adjacent to agricultural uses can potentially result in interface conflicts between the uses, which could ultimately result in cessation of agricultural uses in those locations (GP DEIR, pp. 4.2-20 through 4.2-21). Impacts to agriculture as a result of these interface conflicts of the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable.

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

---

The proposed project is located on a site that is zoned for industrial uses and has previously been disturbed by adjacent uses. Surrounding uses consist primarily of other industrial land; therefore, the project does not involve any changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farm land to non-agricultural use.



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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

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

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

	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM10
Construction Phase	242.77	62.24	79.36	0.01	2.40
Operational Phase	5.30	8.71	64.80	0.03	5.42

*Source: URBEMIS2002 v.8.7.0*

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento area is currently out of compliance with federal requirements for 8-hour ozone air quality standards and 1-hour ozone air quality standards. The region is in compliance with all other emissions standards. SMAQMD released the final "Sacramento Regional Nonattainment Area 8-Hour Ozone Rate-of-Progress Plan" (Ozone Plan) in February 2006. According to the GP-EIR, projected buildout of the General Plan Planning Area would be consistent with the assumptions used during preparation of the Ozone Plan (GP FEIR, pp. 4.0-5 through 4.0-6). However, because there currently exist no feasible methods to completely offset air pollutant

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

---

emission increases from land uses under the General Plan, the impact of the General Plan was considered to be significant and unavoidable (GP FEIR, pp. 4.0-6).

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

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

Sacramento County is a known area of non-attainment for State and Federal standards for Carbon Monoxide (CO), ozone, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10). Construction of the project would result in temporary generation of emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10. Construction-related emissions would be produced from mobile and stationary construction equipment exhaust and soil erosion. Based on the URBEMIS outputs in **Table 1**, construction emissions would equal approximately 242.77 ppd of ROG, 62.24 ppd of NOx, and 2.40 ppd of PM10. The impact is considered less than significant because estimated emissions would fall well below the SMAQMD threshold levels of 85 ppd for NOx and 275 ppd of PM10. Because the project would require over five acres of land to be graded at one time, PM10 levels from soil erosion and dust generation would exceed the threshold levels without mitigation. According to the standards set forth in the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Guide to Air Quality Assessment, a site between 5.1 and 8 acres would generate PM10 that would require Level One mitigation. The following measures would, therefore, mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**MM 3.1a** The project applicant shall require that the contractors water all exposed surfaces, graded areas, storage piles and haul roads at least twice daily during construction. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

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

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

**MM 3.1b** The project applicant shall require paved streets adjacent to construction sites to be washed or swept daily to remove accumulated dust. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

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

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

---

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

- MM 3.1c** The project applicant shall require that, when transporting soil or other materials by truck during construction, two feet of freeboard shall be maintained by the contractor, and that the materials be covered. This requirement shall be included as a note in all project construction plans.

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

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

- MM 3.1d** The project applicant shall comply fully with SMAQMD District Rule 402.

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

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

- c) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified that increases in Ozone precursors (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG) would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on the region's status of nonattainment (GP DEIR, pp. 4.6-17 through 4.6-26). See discussions a) and b) above for more information on the GP-EIR findings related to ozone precursors.

See b), above for project specific discussion and incorporated mitigation.

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

See a) and b) above for project specific discussion. Project operations include machining of tools, which would not typically create any objectionable odors. In addition, all project related operations will be conducted within an enclosed building; therefore, 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/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion d) above. The proposed project site is surrounded by similar, industrial-type land uses. 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 Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>	Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### EXISTING SETTING

The project site consists of disturbed annual grassland and seasonal wetlands. These wetland features are distributed primarily throughout the northern half of the property. The area has been heavily degraded by human activity for several years.

A survey of the site was conducted by WRA Environmental Consultants on January 19, 2006. It was concluded that the on-site wetland features total approximately 0.2 acres and are potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. The site was also found to contain potentially suitable habitat for several regionally occurring special-status species, including slender Orcutt grass, Sacramento Orcutt grass, vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, white-tailed kite, Cooper's hawk, burrowing owl, and Swainson's hawk.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential direct and indirect impacts to special-status species (those species identified in the checklist above) as a result of the implementation of

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

---

the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48). While City Policies and Action Items would mitigate much of the impact of the General Plan, widespread development of undeveloped portions of the General Plan Planning Area as well as construction of the Circulation Plan would result in a net loss of biological resources. Therefore, the General Plan was found to result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-43 and 4.10-48).

As stated in the existing site conditions, a survey of the site was conducted by WRA Environmental Consultants. Although the site is highly degraded, it was determined to contain potentially suitable habitat for several special status species of state and/or federal importance. Detailed surveys are required prior to any activity on the site to confirm the presence or absence of special status species. Given the size, location and condition of the site, implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce any impacts to potentially occurring special status species or habitat to a less than significant level.

**MM 4.1a** Prior to any site disturbance, special status species surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. A written report of required surveys shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department for review. If it is determined that there are no special status species occurring onsite, no further action is needed. If it is found that the project would adversely affect or include the taking of federally listed species (e.g., vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, California tiger salamander, etc.), a Section 10 Incidental Take Permit or a Biological Opinion resulting from Section 7 Consultation with another federal agency shall be obtained from the USFWS and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act.

*Timing/Implementation:* All required surveys, permits and documentation of agency consultation shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department for review and approval prior to site disturbance.

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

**MM 4.1b** Prior to any site disturbance, special status species surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. A written report of required surveys shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department for review. If it is determined that there are no special status species occurring onsite, no further action is needed. If the project would adversely affect or include the taking of a listed animal species, a "2081" permit shall be obtained from the CDFG and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act. All required fencing and other physical protective measures must be shown on all grading and improvement plans. All required permits must be secured prior to the approval of any grading or improvement plans.

*Timing/Implementation:* All required surveys, permits and documentation of agency consultation shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova

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

---

*Planning Department for review and approval prior to site disturbance.*

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

**MM 4.1c** Prior to the approval of grading and improvement plans or prior to any ground-disturbing activities, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall preserve, to the satisfaction of the City, suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat to ensure 1:1 mitigation of habitat value for Swainson's hawk foraging habitat lost as a result of the project, as determined by the City in consultation with DFG and a qualified biologist. The 1:1 habitat value shall be based on Swainson's hawk nesting distribution and an assessment of habitat quality, availability, and use within the City's Planning Area. If specific data for Rancho Cordova's Swainson's hawk habitat is not available at the time this mitigation measures is being implemented, the mitigation ratio shall be consistent with the 1994 California Department of Fish and Game Swainson's Hawk Guidelines included in the "Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (*Buteo swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California." Such mitigation shall be accomplished through either the transfer of fee title or perpetual conservation easement. The mitigation land shall be located within the known foraging area and within Sacramento County. The City, in consultation with DFG, will determine the appropriateness of the mitigation land. Prior to approval of such mitigation, the City shall consult with DFG regarding the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation. If mitigation is accomplished through conservation easement, then such easement shall ensure the continued management of the land to maintain Swainson's hawk foraging values, including but not limited to ongoing agricultural uses and the maintenance of all existing water rights associated with the land. The conservation easement shall be recordable and shall prohibit any activity which substantially impairs or diminishes the lands capacity as suitable Swainson's hawk habitat. The project applicant shall transfer said Swainson's hawk mitigation land, through either conservation easement or fee title, to a third party, non-profit conservation organization (Conservation Operator), with the City and DFG named as third party beneficiaries. The Conservation Operator shall be a qualified conservation easement land manager that manages land as its primary function. Additionally, the Conservation Operator shall be a tax-exempt non-profit conservation organization meeting the criteria of Civil Code Section 815.3(a) and be selected or approved by the City, in consultation with DFG. The City, in consultation with DFG and the Conservation Operator, shall approve the content and form of the conservation easement. The City, DFG and Conservation Operator shall each have the power to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. The Conservation Operator shall monitor the easement in perpetuity to assure compliance with the terms of the easement. The project applicant shall pay to the City an endowment fee, in an amount determined by the City, in consultation with DFG and the Conservation Operator, which will produce sufficient interest in perpetuity to operate, maintain, manage, and enforce such conservation easement. The endowment funds shall either be submitted to the City to be distributed to an appropriate third party non-profit conservation agency, or they shall be

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

---

submitted directly to the third party non-profit conservation agency in exchange for an agreement to manage and maintain the lands in perpetuity. The Conservation Operator shall not sell, lease, or transfer any interest of any conservation easement or mitigation land it acquires without prior written approval of the City and DFG. If the Conservation Operator ceases to exist, the duty to hold, administer, manage, maintain and enforce the interest shall be transferred to another entity acceptable to the City and DFG. The Rancho Cordova Planning Department shall ensure that mitigation habitat is properly established and is functioning as habitat by conducting regular monitoring of the mitigation site(s) for the first 10 years after establishment of the easement.

Or

The project applicant may participate in a future City Swainson's Hawk Foraging Habitat Ordinance (once adopted) as an alternative to the measure above.

Or

The project applicant may participate in a future HCP (once adopted) as an alternative to the above measures.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *The loss of Swainson's hawk habitat must be fully mitigated prior to any ground disturbance.*

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

#### **MM 4.1d**

Prior to ground disturbance, preconstruction surveys shall be performed between March 1 and July 31 to determine if active migratory bird nesting, including burrowing owl nesting, is taking place in the area. Two surveys will be conducted, at least one week apart, with the second survey occurring no more than two days prior to construction. If nesting is observed, consultation with the Department of Fish and Game shall occur in order to determine the protective measures which must be implemented for the nesting birds of prey. If nesting is not observed, further action is not required.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Prior to any site disturbance.*

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.1a through 4.1d would reduce project-specific impacts to special-status species to *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above for information on identified impacts of the General Plan on special-status species. The GP-EIR combined discussion of special-status species impacts to include impacts to habitat as well as individuals of special-status species. Impacts to habitat from the implementation of the General Plan occurred for the same

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

---

reasons and in the same intensity as impacts to individuals of any special-status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48). See a) and c) for project specific discussion and incorporated mitigation.

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

The site visit conducted by WRA Environmental Consultants on January 19, 2006 included a full wetland delineation. Although the site is degraded, it was determined that there are approximately 0.2 acres of seasonal wetlands, which are potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S., onsite. The wetland features were determined to meet the three criteria (i.e., hydric soil, dominance of hydrophytic vegetation, and wetland hydrology) for wetland determination, and exhibit hydrology that potentially connects with Morrison Creek, a documented water of the U.S. The swales do not meet the criteria (i.e., bed-and-bank conditions) for an intermittent stream. Given the size, location and condition of the site, implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce any impacts to wetland habitat to a less than significant level.

**MM 4.2a** If wetland impacts occur, the project shall comply with the City's no net loss policies for wetland habitat acreage and values (NR.2.1), which establish minimum performance for a wetland avoidance/mitigation strategy.

*Timing/Implementation:* Prior to any direct or indirect impacts to wetland swales.

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

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

- A wetland delineation of the project site and any proposed off-site wetland preservation/creation site(s), verified by the US Army Corps of Engineers;
- The location of proposed wetland preservation, acquisition, and creation site(s);



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

---

- A detailed map of proposed wetland creation site(s) showing the acreage, distribution, and type of wetlands to be created to ensure no net loss in wetland habitat acreage, values and functions. Compensation wetlands shall be designed to:
  - Meet or exceed the hydrophytic conditions and operating functions of the existing wetlands proposed for impact.
  - Mitigate the loss of special status species habitat, including fairy/tadpole shrimp, as required by the USFWS and the CDFG;
- A monitoring plan designed to assess whether the compensation wetlands are functioning as intended. Specific performance standards for hydrologic, floral, and faunal parameters shall be proposed to determine success of the created wetlands. The monitoring plan shall specify the corrective measures/modifications to be implemented in the event that monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met. Monitoring shall occur for at least five years and until success criteria are met, and as required by the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the USFWS; and
- A maintenance plan for the wetland preservation/mitigation areas describing the measures to be implemented to assure that they are maintained as wetland habitat in perpetuity. The maintenance plan address buffering from adjacent uses, fencing, access, erosion control, and weed eradication.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Prior to any direct or indirect impacts to wetland swales.*

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

#### **MM 4.2c**

If onsite grading or construction occurs prior to consultation and/or permitting for wetlands, the project applicant shall protect all onsite and potentially occurring offsite wetland features from all potential direct and indirect impacts. The applicant shall maintain a suitable setback and buffer, which will be determined by the Planning Director, around all wetland features, and along the western and southern edges of the property. The setback and buffer must be shown on all grading and improvement plans along with any other measures required by the Planning Director to prevent any impacts to onsite or offsite wetland features. In addition, the project applicant shall implement “Best Management Practices” (BMPs) in accordance with Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water guidelines.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Prior to site disturbance and during all phases of construction.*

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

---

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.2a through 4.2c would reduce the project's impacts to wetlands to *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts to habitat for raptors and other nesting birds were addressed in the GP-EIR (GP-DEIR, pp. 48 through 4.10-52). Raptors are protected by the California Department of Fish and Game and are considered a special-status species under CEQA. Just as with impacts to habitat for other special-status species, wide-spread development of the City and the General Plan Planning Area would result in a net loss of raptor and nesting habitat and a significant and unavoidable impact was expected (GP DEIR, pp. 52). Discussion of impacts to movement corridors was also included in the GP-EIR (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-56 through 4.10-61). Development of greenfield areas of the General Plan Planning Area would change the biological condition and characteristics of the area, resulting in changes in animal movement throughout the area (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-56). While City Policies and Action Items would reduce this impact, loss and/or modification of movement corridors would still occur and the impact of the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-61).

See a) above for project specific discussion and incorporated mitigation.

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

There are no native or landmark trees on the project site; therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

Currently, there is not an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the City of Rancho Cordova or Sacramento County; therefore, the project should not conflict with such plans and the impact would be less than significant.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

Although implementation of the project is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts, project-specific survey results are required to identify any potential cultural, historic, archeological, or paleontologic resources that may be present onsite. Implementation of the following Mitigation Measure MM 5.1 would reduce the project's potential cultural, historic, paleontologic, and archeological resource impacts to *less than significant*.

**MM 5.1**      Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during development activities, work shall be suspended and the City of Rancho Cordova shall be immediately notified. At that time, the City will coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with appropriate specialist, as needed. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of the cultural resources. In addition, pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.

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

---

*Timing/Implementation:*      *Prior to/during any groundbreaking activity.*

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

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified possible impacts to paleontological resources as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-14). However, no such paleontological resources were identified in the Rancho Cordova Planning Area and City policy would protect unknown resources. For these reasons, the impact of the General Plan was found to be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.11-15).

See a) above for project specific discussion and incorporated mitigation.

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

There are no known cemeteries on the project site, however, due to the large Native American population in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked sites, such as gravesites or areas of spiritual significance, which may not contain any surface evidence of occupancy. The project is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.1 would reduce any potential impacts to human remains to less than significant.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a)

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

The potential for impacts to public safety resulting from surface fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or other seismic hazards is not considered to be an issue of

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

---

significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic history of the area; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

See a) i., above. The soil type of the project site consists of Red-Bluff Redding complex, which does not constitute a potential impact for ground failure or liquefaction.

- iv) *Less than Significant Impact* - The project site is characterized by flat terrain and gently sloping topography; as such, the site has a very low potential for landslides.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts related to soil erosion from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.8-21 through 4.8-23). These erosion impacts were generally associated with construction of new roadways and other capital infrastructure and development of undeveloped portions of the City and the Planning Area. Additional impacts were due to increases in runoff due to a net increase in impervious surfaces in the City. However, compliance with the City's Erosion Control Ordinance and the current NPDES permit conditions for the City would ensure that impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan would be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-23).

Grading activities associated with development of the project would remove vegetative cover and would expose soils to wind and surface water runoff. The project is subject to the Sacramento County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, which established administrative procedures, standards of review and enforcement procedures for controlling erosion, sedimentation, and disruption of drainage; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR stated that impacts relating to soil stability as a result of implementation of the General Plan would be minor (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-23). Primary concerns with soil stability in the City are associated with shrink/swell potential – the potential of soils to expand during wet seasons and shrink during dry seasons. Impacts due to soil stability would be mitigated by consistency with the UBC and the CBC (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-24). Therefore, the impact of the General Plan was found to be less than significant.

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

---

The soil groups present on the project site have high percentages of clay, which expand with wetting and drying conditions. These soils present a mild geologic hazard due to high shrink-swell potential. The project is subject to standard construction requirements that mitigate this issue; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

- d) Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document. See discussion c) above.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact Significance/Reviewed Under Previous Document*. The GP-EIR identified potential soils impacts of the General Plan related to the use of alternative wastewater handling systems such as septic systems resulting from development of residential lots of two acres or more (GP DEIR, pp. 4.8-24 through 4.8-26). The portions of the Rancho Cordova Planning Area that could contain such lots exist outside the City boundaries in the outlying Planning Areas. For residential development with lots less than two acres in size, City policy requires the use of the public sewer system (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-26).

See discussion a) and c), above. The project would require the construction of a septic tank system or other alternative wastewater system; however, the soils in the area are relatively stable. Standards set forth in the Sacramento County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance and the Uniform Building Code, to which the project is subject, would mitigate this potential impact to a level that is *less than significant*.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The project would include the construction of a new industrial building to expand Tri-Tool, Inc. existing operations located on the adjacent property. The new building would add a total of 110,040 square feet, with 23,858 square feet for offices, 51,122 square feet for



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

---

manufacturing area, and 35,060 square feet for storage. Although the project would include manufacturing, there would be no new uses in the area; the new structure would only expand existing facilities on the adjacent property, allowing for more space for current uses. No new materials would be transported as a result of this project, and the new facilities would not include any new uses; therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

See a), above for project specific discussion.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR discussed the siting of public schools as being subject to the siting requirements of the California Department of Education (GP-DEIR, p. 4.4-25). In addition to CEQA review, potential school sites will be reviewed by various agencies to ensure the new school site is safe from toxic hazards (GP-DEIR, p. 4.4-25). General Plan policies and actions will reduce the potential impacts of the General Plan from hazardous materials transport, use, and storage from surrounding uses, including school sites, to a less than significant level (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28).

See a), above for project specific discussion. Additionally there is no school existing or proposed within one-quarter mile of the project site.

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

The project site is not located on a hazardous materials site. The project is within one mile of the McDonnell Douglas site, which has been identified as a contaminated site; therefore, contamination from this site may have migrated through groundwater to the project site. It is unlikely that construction of the project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of this off-site contamination. In the unlikely event that a contaminated area is encountered during construction of the project, it is required by law that activities in the area are stopped until the hazard is contained. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP EIR identified potential impacts of development within an airport land use plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28). The Mather Airport CLUP Safety Restriction Area overlies several portions of the City, restricting development in those areas to uses allowed within the CLUP. Adherence to General Plan policies, federal regulations, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and Mather Airport

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

---

Planning Area provisions would reduce the potential for safety hazards. Therefore, the General Plan was found to have a less than significant impact (GP FEIR, p. 4.0-29).

The project site is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP) area of the Sacramento County Mather Airport, and is not within two miles of the facility. Implementation of the project would not adversely affect operations of this facility and it is not anticipated to result in safety related hazards or adverse impacts to people working on the project site. As this is an industrial area, it is not anticipated that any people would be residing on the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

The proposed project would not conflict with the *Sacramento County Multi-hazard Disaster Plan*, the *Sacramento County Area Plan*, or any other adopted emergency response or evacuation plan; therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

Currently there are undeveloped open areas adjacent to the project site. The proposed project will create new facilities identical to those existing on adjacent properties, which have not caused any wildfires. The proposed project would pave areas around the proposed structure to allow for parking, and all new uses on the site would be conducted inside a fully enclosed building. Additionally, the project does not include residences, and does not propose to intermix structures with wildlands. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

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

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

---

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

Activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to result in significant short-term surface water quality impacts during the construction period and long-term water quality impacts due to runoff from new impervious surfaces. Unless runoff is controlled, the project could generate new runoff pollutants such as oil, gasoline, and other chemicals with potentially adverse impacts on water quality. Compliance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), best management practices (BMPs), and applicable local ordinances and State requirements, would ensure that the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact.

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

Sufficient water supply to service the proposed project will be provided by California-American Water. The project falls within an industrial area with existing structures of similar uses for which water supply was previously allocated. The new facility will not require substantial water supply beyond existing uses. As such, significant additional groundwater supplies will not be needed for this project. While the project would increase impervious surfaces, the project area is small and does not contribute significantly to groundwater recharge in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to groundwater quality.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts due to erosion and siltation as a result of new development in the City and the Planning Area (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-34 through 4.9-39). Adherence to City policies, action items, the conditions of the City's NPDES permit, and the City's Erosion Control Ordinance would result in less than significant impacts related to erosion and siltation as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-39).

Grading of approximately 5.919 acres of undeveloped land to accommodate industrial development would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. Construction of the project would increase drainage rates that could result in flooding and erosion. The proposed project has been reviewed by the Sacramento County Department of Water Resources, and a determination was made that the project could accommodate Water Resources approved drainage facilities that would ensure post-development flows are reduced to at least pre-development levels. The following mitigation measure will ensure that this impact is mitigated to a less than significant level.

- MM 8.1** Prior to any grading activities onsite, construct drainage facilities accepted by the Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the Sacramento County

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

---

Department of Water Resources that will sufficiently alleviate all additional runoff that would be caused by construction of the project. Plans for the retention and drainage facilities, including any associated landscaping, must be reviewed and approved by the Rancho Cordova Planning Department and the Sacramento County Department of Water Resources.

*Timing/Implementation:*        *Prior to any grading.*

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

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

See c), above for project specific discussion and incorporated mitigation.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact Significance/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above for information on the GP-EIR and impacts to water quality.

See a) and b), above for project specific discussion. The project is not expected to result in the discharge of stormwater from any outdoor work areas; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure 8.1 would reduce any potential impacts to stormwater to *less than significant*.

- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions a), b), and d) above. The project is not expected to result in impacts to water quality; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure 8.1 would reduce any potential impacts to *less than significant*.

- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion f) above.

- h) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion c) above.

- i) *Less than significant impact* – See a), b) and f), above.

- j) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR discussed impacts related to flooding, which included consideration of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.9-41 through 4.9-43). City Policies and Action Items would prevent either an increase in the 100-year floodplain from the result of the construction of any structures as or the placement of housing within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, impacts from the General Plan were found to be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-43).

There are no residential structures proposed with this project. Additionally, the entire project site is located outside of the 100-year floodplain.

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

---

- k) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion j) above.
- l) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions c), d), h), j), and k) above.
- m) *No impact* - The project site is not located near the Pacific Ocean, nor is it near a large water body that would be capable of creating seiches or tsunamis. The project site is characterized by generally flat terrain, as is the surrounding area, therefore, there would also be no mudflows on or near the project site.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project site is located in an area that is zoned M-2, and is currently surrounded by industrial uses; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

The project site is currently zoned M-2, which allows heavy industrial uses. The warehouse, manufacturing and small number of industrial offices are identical to other uses in the area, which are consistent with areas zoned M-2, and allowed by right. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR addressed potential impacts related to conflicts between the General Plan and any adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-62 and 4.10-63). While the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) and the Vernal Pool Recovery Plan are currently being prepared by the County and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

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

---

Service (respectively), no such plans have been adopted (GP DEIR, p. 4.10-63). Because of this, the General Plan would have no impact on adopted plans (Ibid.).

Currently, there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan in Sacramento County; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.



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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The project site is not identified by the California Division of Mines and Geology or in the General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report as a high quality resource area; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The manufacturing, warehouse, and small amount of industrial office uses are identical to other uses on adjacent properties, therefore, noises created by this use would be no different than those already existing in the area. Additionally, over half of the proposed project would consist of storage and a small amount of industrial offices, which would generate little to no noise in the surrounding area. All manufacturing would be conducted within an enclosed area specifically designed for manufacturing uses, which would buffer any noise created on-site from surrounding uses. The site is currently surrounded by industrial uses and undeveloped land, so there would not be any sensitive receptors impacted by noise generated by construction of the project. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

---

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

See a), above for project specific discussion.

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

See a), above for project specific discussion.

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

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed noise impacts related to airports, specifically the Mather Airport located immediately south and west of the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.7-30 through 4.7-32). Five planning areas within the City were identified as having potential airport-related noise impacts: Mather Planning Area, Jackson Planning Area, Sunrise Boulevard South Planning Area, Rio del Oro Planning Area, and the Aerojet Planning Area (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-30). Single-event noise impacts were also identified for those portions of the City that lie under the primary flight paths for Mather Airport (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-30). For the five planning areas identified above and areas of the City directly under the approach path for Mather Airport the impact of the General Plan was found to be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.7-32).

See a), above for project specific discussion. The project is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Area (CLUP) of the Sacramento Mather Airport. Although the project is within two miles of the airport, no adverse or excessive noise impacts are anticipated at the proposed sites from operation of this facility. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The project does not propose the development of any new residential areas, nor does it propose the expansion of any existing infrastructure. As that the proposed project would only construct new facilities to allow for more space for existing Tri-Tool operations, and does not propose to add new employees or expand services, the project would not result in substantial population growth by adding businesses to the area. The proposed project would continue existing operations of the adjacent Tri-Tool facilities, which manufacture custom products for commercial users to be delivered by Tri-Tool, and do not include any on-site sales. This expansion of facilities does not propose to increase frequency of deliveries. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

- b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts due to the displacement of people and housing as a result of implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.3-14). These impacts were primarily due to the installation of infrastructure such as streets (Ibid). Consistency with State and federal laws relating to displacement of existing residents and housing would ensure that impacts of the General Plan would be less than significant (Ibid.).

There is no housing existing on the project site or in the immediate vicinity of the project site, nor is it zoned for residential development; therefore, *no impacts* to housing would occur.

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion b) above.

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

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

#### EXISTING SETTING

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The project as proposed would not result in the need for any additional governmental/public facilities, nor would it significantly increase demand on existing governmental/public facilities. The project does not propose to add any new employees or uses to the area, it would simply expand the square footage of existing manufacturing, warehouse, and small industrial offices of the adjacent Tri-Tool facilities. Therefore, the impacts are considered *less than significant*.

b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential impacts related to the need for additional police protection infrastructure and facilities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-16 through 4.12-20). Just as with fire protection, the substantial growth predicted in the GP-EIR would require additional fire protection infrastructure and facilities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-16 and 4.12-17). Consistency with City

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

---

Policies and Action Items would result in less than significant impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-17).

See a), above for project specific discussion.

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

See a), above for project specific discussion.

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

See a), above for project specific discussion.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact - See a), above.*

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion d) of checklist XIII, Public Services above for information on the GP-EIR's conclusions as to impacts related to parks and recreation. The project consists of one parcel that would be used for industrial facilities in an area surrounded by other industrial uses. In addition, the proposed project does not include the construction of any residences and would not increase the population of the vicinity. Therefore, it is not expected that the use of any recreational facilities would be increased as a result of the project, and this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above. The project does not include recreational facilities, nor does it require their construction or expansion; therefore, *no impacts* are expected.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed traffic impacts to the existing roadway network in the General Plan Planning Area as a result of the population, dwelling unit, and employee increases expected to occur with implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-27 through 4.5-45). Several new roadways and improvement of existing roadways was described in the General Plan in order to address the additional expected traffic load. However, even with these improvements and adherence to City Policies and Action Items the impact of the General Plan would remain significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.5-42).

The project proposes the development of one lot with a 110,040 square foot industrial building, including approximately 23,858 square feet of office space, only 18,585 square feet of which will be used for employee offices, and approximately 51,122 square feet of industrial space, only 46,010 square feet of which will be used for industrial (manufacturing) uses, on 5.919 acres of land zoned for heavy industrial uses. Therefore, new uses on this site could generate up to an average of 67 trips during peak flows. This is fewer than the 100 trips threshold required by the Traffic Impacts Analysis Guidelines for a traffic study. Given that the surrounding area is developed with heavy industrial uses, this project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic to the area. Additionally, newly generated trips would be limited beyond those expected for new facilities of this type because the project proposes to expand square footage of existing facilities on the adjacent property without



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

---

adding new employees or increasing deliveries (either pick-up or drop-off). Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.
- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed safety and hazards impacts related to the provision of land uses within the Mather Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Mather CLUP) and their impact on safety related to air traffic in and out of the airport (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28 and 4.4-29). The General Plan established the Mather Planning Area that corresponds to the Master Plan boundaries of the Mather Airport. Policies included in the General Plan were more stringent than the safety restrictions of the Mather CLUP (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-28). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items as well as the requirements of the Mather CLUP would ensure less than significant impacts from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.4-29).

The proposed project does not involve any aviation-related uses but is located within two miles of the Sacramento Mather Airport. The project site is not located within the airport safety zones or within the approach and departure paths for aircraft using the airport and *no impacts* are anticipated.

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

There is an existing road, which is consistent with Sacramento County Department of Transportation and Engineering standards, that serves the proposed project parcel. No additional design features are proposed that would potentially increase hazards. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

There is an existing system of roads servicing the project area, which provide adequate emergency access to all parcels; therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

- f) *Less than significant impact* – The proposed project consists of approximately 18,585 square feet of space used for offices, approximately 31,572 square feet of space used for storage, and approximately 46,010 square feet of space used for manufacturing. The City requires a minimum of 4.5 parking spaces for every 1,000 square feet of office, 1 parking space for every 2,000 square feet of warehouse, and 1 parking space for every 500 square feet of manufacturing. Therefore, the project site is required to provide a minimum of 192 total parking spaces. The project proposes to add 208 vehicle parking spaces and 17 motorcycle parking spaces; therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed potential impacts to transit, pedestrian, and bicycle provisions within the City (GP DEIR, pp.

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

---

4.5-49 through 4.5-53). Development of the City's Transit Master Plan and the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan would ensure that impacts of the General Plan to these provisions would be less than significant (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-49 and 4.5-50).

The construction of a new industrial facility within an area zoned for and surrounded by industrial uses would not conflict with any alternative transportation policies, plans or programs. See discussion a), above. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project is located within the boundaries of CSD-1, but would require the construction of private septic system facilities. The development of this project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of CSD-1 or the Sacramento Regional Water Quality Control Board; therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* In addition to required expansion in treatment capacity, the GP-EIR identified potential impacts associated with the construction of additional wastewater conveyance infrastructure (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-45 through 4.12-51). CSD-1 has planned expansion of sewerage infrastructure into the General Plan Planning Area and the environmental effects of this expansion were

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

---

addressed in an EIR (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-46 and 4.12-47). However, increased growth expected with implementation of the General Plan will require more infrastructure than that currently planned by CSD-1. Therefore, the impact of the General Plan was found to be significant and unavoidable (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-51).

Although the project will require the construction of private septic system facilities, and may require the construction of additional water supply lines, all of these facilities would be located on the project site and any impacts associated with their construction have already been addressed in this document as a part of the on-site developments. The California-American Water Company (Cal Am) has agreed to furnish water to the project. There are no additional impacts anticipated associated with the construction of the water lines or septic system facilities; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion c) in checklist VII, Hydrology and Water Quality for information on stormwater drainage facilities and their associated environmental effects. Although the project would require the construction of stormwater drainage facilities and/or retention/detention basin(s), all of these facilities would be located on the project site and any impacts associated with their construction have already been addressed in this document as a part of the on-site developments. There are no additional impacts anticipated associated with the construction of these stormwater facilities; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential environmental impacts related to available water supplies and the increased demand in the City and the General Plan Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.9-43 through 4.9-57). According to the analysis in the GP-EIR, adequate supplies of water exist through buildout of the current incorporated boundaries of the City (GP DEIR, p. 45). However, new sources of water will be required to serve buildout conditions for those portions of the General Plan Planning Area that lie outside current City boundaries. Significant environmental effects may occur from the acquisition of these additional sources. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts of the General Plan are expected (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-57).

The project is located within the service area of the Sacramento District, Security Park system of Cal Am. No new entitlements are needed; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

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

---

The project will be served by Kiefer Landfill, which recently expanded to allow capacity to serve the projected growth in Sacramento County through 2035; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

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

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

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As demonstrated in checklists I through XVI above, the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to air quality, biological resources (i.e., special-status species and wetlands), cultural resources, and hydrology/water quality. Further, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this MND would ensure that the project's impacts are *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Incorporation of the mitigation measures for the project would reduce any environmental impacts to less than significant in both the short-term and long-term. The area is designated by the General Plan for Heavy Industrial, 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/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Section 4.0 of this MND addresses the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts in the cumulative setting. There are no other past, current, or future projects associated with this project that would contribute to a substantial cumulative impact; therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above. The project is located in a heavy industrial area and will be adding more industrial

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

---

uses to parcels that are consistently zoned for industrial uses. Other than employees, there are few human receptors anywhere near the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*