

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

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

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- 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 Incorporation:** The proposed project would result in an environmental impact or effect that is potentially significant, but the incorporation of mitigation measure(s) would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level; or,
- **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed project 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 addressed in previous environmental documents. The discussion will include reference to the previous documents and a summary of the findings of that previous document.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.2 INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** Embassy Suites and Candlewood Suites
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova
2729 Prospect Park Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Cori Resha
Environmental Planner
(916) 851-8750
4. **Project Location:** See Section 2.1 of this MND.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Heritage Hotel Group
Hamid Kazemi
11269 Point East Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742
6. **Current Zoning:** OPMU (Office/Professional Mixed Use)
7. **General Plan and Planning Area:** City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Folsom Boulevard Planning Area
Convention Overlay
8. **APN Number(s):** 058-0280-009
9. **Description of the Project:** See Section 2.4 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) Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
 - 2) County Sanitation District (CSD-1)
 - 3) Golden State Water Company
 - 4) Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
 - 5) Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD)
 - 6) Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)
 - 7) Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and 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 and Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | |

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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 document¹. Discussion will include reference to the previous documents. If the project site has been zoned to accommodate a particular density of development and an EIR was certified for that zoning or planning action (in this case the General Plan and GP-EIR), consideration of a project consistent with that zoning shall be limited to effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or project and those that were not addressed as significant effects in the prior EIR or those impacts that were previously identified and would be more severe with implementation of the proposed project. As such, the following analysis can include a “potentially significant impact” without requiring the preparation of an EIR – providing the significant impact was described in the previous EIR and that impact would not be more severe with implementation of the proposed project, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3. Such impacts will be identified as “Potentially Significant” and “Reviewed Under Previous Document.”
- 7) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, a program environmental impact report, or other CEQA process, an impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.

¹ For this IS/MND, the “previous document” referred to throughout this section is the General Plan Environmental Impact Report, Certified and Adopted by the City Council of Rancho Cordova on June 26, 2006 (State Clearinghouse Number 2005022137).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project would construct two hotels on a vacant parcel adjacent to Folsom Boulevard and US Highway 50. Existing commercial buildings, including a self-storage yard, abut the project site to the east. The project site is within a Special Sign Corridor as described in the City of Rancho Cordova Zoning Code (Title III, Article 3).

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 proposed project is not located within line-of-sight of any scenic vista. While the American River and the associated American River Parkway are located within two miles of the project site, ground features and existing development prevent those aesthetic features from being visible from the project area. A significant barrier to views of the American River from the project site already exists as US-50 is located atop a high earthen berm along the west and north boundaries of the property. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to any scenic vista.

b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR found that there were no highways within or proximate to the Planning Area that were designated by State or local agencies as “scenic highways” (GP DEIR, p. 4.13-6). The GP-EIR included an inventory of known cultural resources within the Planning Area (GP DEIR, pp. 4.11-4 through 4.11-5). According to this inventory, there are no identified historic buildings within the project site. The project site is largely flat and has been previously disturbed. As such, there are no distinctive rock outcroppings within the project site. According to an arborist report prepared for the proposed project, there are seven trees on the project site (Cooke,

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

2008). All on-site trees are directly adjacent to Folsom Boulevard and are “one-sided” due to overhead utility line clearance cutting (ibid). Given the current condition of the trees, the trees do not have significant aesthetic value. Visual impacts from a state scenic highway are, therefore, considered to be *less than significant*.

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

The project site is currently vacant. Commercial development consisting of single-story self-storage units and a retail paint store abut the project site to the east. The proposed project would include development of hotel use on a site surrounded by commercial, office, and retail uses. The ultimate visual style of the proposed project will be required via the City’s Design Review process to conform to the requirements of the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan (FBSP), approved June 16, 2008, as well as the City’s Design Guidelines, adopted July 8, 2005. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to result in *less than significant* impacts on the visual character of the area.

- 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). Adherence to City’s Design Guidelines and 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 construct two hotels in an area of existing commercial development. As the site is currently undeveloped, the proposed project would introduce a new source of light to the surrounding area. The proposed project is located within a Special Sign Corridor, which prevents the installation of new signage within ¼ mile of US 50. As such, the proposed project would not include any lighted signs or billboards that would introduce a substantial source of light or glare that would affect vehicles on US 50 or residential properties on the north side of the highway. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to be consistent with the City’s Design Guidelines. During the Design Review process, the proposed project would be evaluated for substantial compliance with Design Guidelines requirements, including lighting standards. Adherence to City guidelines and requirements for lighting and glare, enforced during the Design Review process, would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with light and glare.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 not located within any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map. The project site is zoned for Office Professional/Mixed Use (OPMU) and the proposed use is allowed by right within this zoning. As the proposed project is allowed by right, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a change in use. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* to these types of farmland.

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 is zoned for urban development and is surrounded by existing urban development. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. The nearest land still under a Williamson Act contract is located over five miles to the south of the project site. No uses, features, or characteristics of the project site are used by or facilitate agricultural operations. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not impact any area under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with agricultural zoning or existing Williamson Act contracts, and *no impact* would result.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- 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.

No uses, features, or characteristics of the project site are used by or facilitate agricultural operations. The project site is surrounded by commercial development and no agricultural operations exist in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on agriculture and agricultural resources in the vicinity.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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

The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). This agency is responsible for bringing air quality in Sacramento County into compliance with federal and State air quality standards. Specifically, SMAQMD has the responsibility to monitor ambient air pollution levels throughout the County and to develop and implement attainment strategies to ensure that future emissions will be within federal and State standards.

Pollutant emissions modeling for the proposed project was conducted by City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department staff in April 2008 using the URBEMIS 2007 version 9.2.4 software provided by SMAQMD (see **Appendix A**). The URBEMIS model utilizes standard emission rates per area of land use and other factors to estimate the likely emissions expected of the proposed project during both construction and operation. 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 | NOx | CO | SO ₂ | PM10 |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|-------|
| Construction Phase (2008) | 8.59 | 75.44 | 37.02 | 0.04 | 38.15 |
| Construction Phase (2009) | 181.14 | 19.34 | 27.65 | 0.02 | 0.07 |
| Operational Phase | 28.88 | 28.30 | 311.76 | 0.22 | 34.76 |

Source: URBEMIS2007 v.9.2.4

Notes: ROG = Reactive Organic Gasses, NOx = Nitrogen Oxides, CO = Carbon Monoxide, SO₂ = Sulfur Dioxide, PM10 = Particulate Matter, 10 Micron. Operational Phase emissions include both area source emissions and operational (vehicle) emission estimates.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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 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 (2004). The Air Quality Guide includes information on significance and mitigation for common air emissions issues with the goal of reducing emissions from development projects and providing information and standards useful in CEQA analyses of such projects. The Air Quality Guide includes thresholds of significance for ozone precursors, shown in **Table 2** below.

TABLE 2
CURRENT SMAQMD EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS (POUNDS PER DAY)

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

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

Construction of the proposed project would be expected to result in a maximum of 75.44 pounds per day of NO_x, as shown in **Table 1**. The current SMAQMD threshold of significance for construction NO_x emissions is 85 pounds of NO_x per day, as shown in **Table 2**. Operation of the proposed project would be expected to result in 28.88 pounds per day of ROG and 28.30 pounds per day of NO_x, as shown in **Table 1**. The current SMAQMD threshold of significance for operational ROG and NO_x are each 65 pounds per day, as shown in **Table 2**. Anticipated emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project are all below the SMAQMD's thresholds of significance. Therefore, the project would be expected to result in *less than significant* impacts to current air quality standards.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential air quality impacts from both construction and operation of new development in the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.6-17 through 4.6-26). While Policies, Actions, and mitigation were 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).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

As shown in **Table 1** above, the proposed project is expected to generate 38.15 pounds per day of 10-micron particulate matter (PM10) during construction. While SMAQMD does not have thresholds of significance for particulate matter emissions, the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND included mitigation measures MM 3.2a, MM 3.2b, MM 3.2c, and MM 3.2d in order to reduce the potential for particulate matter emissions during construction. As the proposed project is within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan, the following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potential particulate matter emissions from construction of the proposed project:

MM 3.1a The project proponent shall require that all exposed surfaces, graded areas, and storage piles are watered at least twice daily during demolition and construction activities.

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department

MM 3.1b The project proponent shall require that the amount of material actively worked, the amount of disturbed ground, and the amount of material stockpiled is minimized throughout demolition and construction of the project. All stockpiles of material shall be covered whenever practical to prevent blowing dust and debris. Storage of soil or other loose fill material shall be limited to no longer than two weeks.

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

MM 3.1c The project proponent shall require that paved streets adjacent to the project site are washed or swept at least once daily to remove accumulated dust.

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

MM 3.1d The project proponent shall require that, when transporting materials by truck during construction activities, two feet of freeboard shall be maintained by the contractor, or that the materials are covered at all times.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.1a through MM 3.1d would reduce particulate matter emissions during construction activities, which would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to air quality.

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

As described in discussion a) above, the proposed project would result in less than significant increases in ozone precursors. The potential operational emissions of the proposed project are below SMAQMD's thresholds of significance (see **Table 1** and **Table 2**) and do not warrant additional study, pursuant to current SMAQMD guidelines provided in the Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento (2004). Furthermore, construction emissions from the proposed project are temporary in nature and will not continue once construction of the project is complete. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative air quality issues in the region is expected to be *less than significant*.

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

The nearest sensitive receptor to air pollution is Kinney Continuation High School, located across Folsom Boulevard on Kilgore Road approximately 0.05 miles south of the project site. The primary source of TAC emissions would be from diesel equipment used during construction of the proposed project, which would cease upon completion of construction. Some minor TAC emissions would be expected during the operation of the proposed project, primarily due to diesel trash collection vehicles and diesel delivery vehicles. These emissions would be slight in quantity and intermittent in timing. Since the project is located adjacent to two major roadways, Folsom Boulevard and US Highway 50, where TACs are already at a relatively high level, the addition of TACs from construction equipment and delivery vehicles would be minimal compared to background levels.

The majority of delivery trucks that would service the proposed project would be subject to State of California - Title 13, Section 2485, Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling. The purpose of this airborne toxic control measure is to reduce public exposure to diesel particulate matter and other air contaminants

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

by limiting the idling of diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles. This regulation applies to diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles that operate in the State of California with gross vehicular weight ratings of greater than 10,000 pounds that are or must be licensed for operation on highways. The regulation applies to vehicles based inside and outside of the State of California. Effective February 1, 2005, all applicable diesel powered vehicles shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than five minutes at any location. The regulations do include certain exceptions. However, typical diesel powered trucks used for delivery of goods to the project site would not be exempted from the regulations.

TAC emissions during construction would be temporary in nature, ceasing upon completion of construction activities. Adherence to regulations limiting vehicle idling during operation of the proposed project would minimize TAC emissions. Considering the existing background TAC levels, the temporary nature of construction TAC emissions, and anti-idling regulations, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts on sensitive receptors from exposure to pollution concentrations

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion d) above. The proposed project would include a restaurant, which would be a potential source of odors. However, odors emitted from a restaurant use are generally not significant nor objectionable. Odors associated with diesel exhaust from construction equipment and delivery vehicles would be limited and temporary in nature. The Sacramento Rendering Plant is located approximately four miles to the south of the proposed project. However, in response to the Master EIR for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan EIR, certified by the County Board of Supervisors on July 17, 2002 (State Clearinghouse Number 97022055), the Sacramento Rendering Plant instituted odor control measures that have reduced their emissions to a less than significant level. Given the distance to the proposed project and the measures implemented at the plant, the Sacramento Rendering Plant is not expected to generate significant odors at the project site. Therefore, the project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with noxious odors.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

EXISTING SETTING

A Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) of the project site was performed in March 2008 by City biologists (City of Rancho Cordova, 2008). This report provided basic information on the current condition of the site, as well as an assessment of the potential for the project site to contain protected biological resources. The BRA identified the presence of on-site native trees and potential raptor nesting habitat. The findings of the BRA are detailed further in the following discussions, as they apply to those topics of concern.

An arborist report was provided to the City, identifying the species, size, and health of on-site native trees (Cooke, 2008). The report assessed the diameter at breast height (dbh), drip line diameter, species, and overall condition of each tree located on the project site. Six black walnut (*Juglans nigra*) were found on the project site, only one of which was determined to be in good condition. All of the black walnut trees were noted as “one-sided” due to utility line clearance trimming. The report also identified one white oak (*Quercus alba*) adjacent to the project site.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified potential direct and indirect impacts to special-status species (those species identified in the checklist above) as a result of the implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48). While City Policies and Action Items would mitigate much of the impact of the General Plan, widespread development of undeveloped portions of the General Plan Planning Area as well as construction of the Circulation Plan would result in a net loss of biological resources. Therefore, the General Plan was found to result in significant and unavoidable impacts to special status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-43 and 4.10-48).

The project site is not located within an area where special-status species have been recorded. However, existing on-site trees could potentially provide nesting habitat for raptors and other birds. The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (42 U.S.C. Sections 703-712) protects several avian species by prohibiting the take of any listed birds or their nests, including any nesting raptors. New trees would be planted on-site that would potentially provide new nesting opportunities.

City Policy NR.1.7 requires surveys be conducted in order to determine if active raptor nesting is taking place, and includes steps to be taken in the event that nesting raptors are discovered. The Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND included mitigation measure MM 4.1 which incorporated City Policy NR.1.7. As the proposed project includes the removal of several on-site trees, nesting raptors and birds could be impacted. Therefore, the following mitigation measure, pursuant to City Policy NR.1.7 and Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND mitigation measure MM 4.1, is included in order to mitigate potential impacts to nesting raptors and special-status species:

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.1 Prior to each phase of grading and construction or any other site disturbance between the dates of March 1 and August 31, a determinate survey shall be conducted to determine if active nesting by birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) or other special-status bird species is taking place. Surveys shall be conducted according to the following requirements:

- The survey(s) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or other equivalent professional.
- The survey(s) shall be conducted no more than 30 days and no less than 14 days prior to site disturbance to occur between March 1 and August 31.
- The survey(s) shall include all areas within 100 feet of the project site.
- A copy of the survey(s) shall be provided to the City of Rancho Cordova no less than 7 business days prior to site disturbance.

If any special-status bird species are found to be nesting within the survey area, the project proponent shall immediately contact the City of Rancho

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Cordova Planning Department in order to determine the appropriate mitigation, if any, required to minimize impacts to nesting birds. No activity of any kind may occur within 100 feet of any nesting activity or as otherwise required following consultation with the City Planning Department and the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) until such time as the young have fledged or the City and/or DFG have determined that construction activities may proceed.

If all construction activities are to be completed outside the nesting season (identified above), determinate surveys shall not be required.

Timing/Implementation: All necessary surveys shall be provided to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department no less than 7 days prior to site disturbance between March 1 and August 31.

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

The BRA prepared for the proposed project identified the project site as potential raptor foraging habitat. However, the project site is completely surrounded by extensive urban development, including a major highway, thereby minimizing the value of the project site as foraging habitat. Any raptors utilizing the site would likely be identified during the pre-construction survey required in mitigation measure MM 4.1 above. Existing development of the project vicinity and implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.1 would ensure that all impacts to special status species from implementation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/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 reasons and in the same intensity as impacts to individuals of any special-status species (GP DEIR, pp. 4.10-34 through 4.10-48).

See discussion a) above. The BRA prepared for the proposed project specifically examined the project site for evidence of sensitive habitats and wetland features. No evidence of any wetland feature or sensitive community was observed during investigations for the BRA. Considering the extent of surrounding urban development and results of site investigations, the proposed project would have *less than significant* impacts on sensitive communities.

- c) *No Impact/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.).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Because of this local loss of Jurisdictional Waters, the impact of the General Plan was found to be significant and unavoidable (Ibid.).

See discussions a) and b) above. The proposed project is located on a parcel that shows evidence of prior disturbance in the form of tire tracks across the site to billboards adjacent to the northern boundary of the project site. Furthermore, the project site was likely disturbed previously during construction of US Highway 50. As determined in the BSA, the project site shows no evidence of wetland features. Considering the lack of wetland features on the project site and the surrounding urban development, it is unlikely that any federally protected waters are present on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on federally protected waters.

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

As shown in discussion a) above, impacts to nursery sites for raptors and other special-status species may occur with the implementation of the proposed project. Impacts to movement corridors and nursery sites are not expected as the project site has been disturbed and is substantially surrounded by urban development. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.1 would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to nursery sites and movement corridors.

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

See discussion a) above. According to the Biological Resources Assessment prepared for the proposed project, California native black walnut trees are present on the project site. The arborist report identified a total of six on-site California black walnut trees (Cooke, 2008). One 15" diameter at breast height (dbh) walnut tree was found to be in good condition, while the remaining walnut trees were found to be in fair condition. The arborist report further stated that all of the on-site trees were "one-sided due to utility clearance trimming" (Cooke, 2008). All of the trees are scheduled for removal as they are located

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

within the future alignment of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk. General Plan Policy NR.4.4 requires mitigation for the removal of native trees of six inches or greater dbh that are determined to be in good condition. Mitigation measure MM 4.3, adopted within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND, reiterates these requirements. As the proposed project would include the removal of one tree requiring mitigation, the following mitigation measure, pursuant to City Policy NR.4.4 and Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND mitigation measure MM 4.3, is included to mitigate potential impacts to trees:

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.2 Prior to the removal of any on-site trees, a Replacement Tree Planting Plan shall be prepared by an arborist or landscape architect and shall be submitted to the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department for review and approval. The Plan shall include adequate mitigation for the removal of one 15" dbh California black walnut tree using native species with replacement inches calculated based on the following size categories:

- One J-pot = ½ inch dbh
- One 15-gallon tree = 1 inch dbh
- One 24-inch box tree = 2 inches dbh
- One 36-inch box tree = 3 inches dbh

Timing/Implementation: Replacement Tree Planting Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department prior to approval of any site disturbance.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.2 would ensure that all impacts to trees from implementation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

As the project site has been previously disturbed, showing evidence of vehicle traffic to the billboard adjacent to the northern boundary of the project site and likely disturbance during the construction of US Highway 50, and surrounding areas have already been developed, it is unlikely that the activities of the proposed project would uncover any unknown resources. The proposed project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land use studied in the GP-EIR. Construction of the proposed project would not create any new or additional significant cultural resources impacts that were not already identified in the GP-EIR, nor would the project cause any project-specific impacts peculiar to the project or parcel. The General Plan includes requirements that would protect any unknown historic resources from impacts occurring as a result of development in the Planning Area. General Plan Action CHR.1.3.2 requires two conditions be placed on discretionary projects in order to protect previously unknown cultural resources. The Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND included mitigation measures MM 5.1b and MM 5.1c to ensure that General Plan Action CHR.1.3.2 was applied to projects within the Specific Plan. To ensure compliance with General Plan Action CHR.1.3.2 and Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND mitigation measures MM 5.1b and MM 5.1c, the following mitigation measures are included in this MND:

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- b) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/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 discussion a) above. Just as with historic resources, archaeological resources would be adequately protected by City Policies, restated in this document as mitigation measures

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

MM 5.1a and MM 5.1b. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to archaeological resources.

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

No human remains are expected on the project site. However, due to the large Native American population known to reside in the general area in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked grave sites. The proposed project area is not expected to contain any such sites. Regardless, implementation of mitigation measure MM 5.1b above would ensure that any impacts related to discovery of human remains during construction of the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a)

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

The proposed project is located within the incorporated boundaries of the City and, as discussed in the GP-EIR, is not expected to be subjected to strong seismic shaking. Minor shaking is a concern as, according to the California Geological

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

- ii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion under i) above. The potential for strong seismic ground shaking on the project site is not a significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic activity of the area. Additionally, as stated in discussion i) above, the project would be required to comply with any seismic standards enforced by the UBC and the CBC. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact from seismic ground shaking.
 - iii) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, is considered minimal due to the infrequency of seismic activity in the area [See discussions i) and ii) above], building and site design, and adherence to the UBC and CBC. According to the GP-EIR, the depth of groundwater in the City is generally greater than 50 feet, rendering the potential for liquefaction low (GP DEIR, p 4.8-9). The potential for other secondary hazards (i.e., ground lurching, differential settlement, or lateral spreading) occurring during or after seismic events in the vicinity of the project site is also considered to be low due to the distance of more than 25 miles to the nearest active faults, the Dunnigan Hills fault and the Rescue Lineament – Bear Mountains fault zone (USGS). Therefore, the project would have *less than significant* impacts from seismic-related ground failure.
 - iv) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is generally flat and does not include any features that would create the possibility of landslide. US Highway 50 is adjacent to the north and west of the project site. The highway is situated above the project site on an earthen berm. The section of the highway from West Sacramento to Sunrise Boulevard, just east of the project site, was constructed in 1962 (50 Corridor). Since that time, significant storms have occurred with no slippage of the slope separating the highway from the project site. Adjacent properties to the south and east are generally flat. The slope separating the project site from the highway is under the jurisdiction of CalTrans. The proposed project does not include any work which would impact the slope. Therefore, *less than impacts* related to landslides would be expected.
- 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 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (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).

Site preparation and construction activities could increase the potential for surface water runoff through the disturbance of the ground surface and modification of the drainage characteristics of the project site. The proposed project would be subject to the City's Erosion Control Ordinance. Also, the project proponent would be required to submit and

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

adhere to a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP). Common best management practices included in the SWPPP would further reduce potential erosion-related impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant impacts* from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- 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 for 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.

As discussed in iii) above, landslides, lateral spreading, and subsidence are not significant threats within the project area. Additionally, adherence to the UBC and CBC requirements as well as the City's Erosion Control Ordinance would ensure that the project's potential to result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be *less than significant*.

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

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

General Plan Action ISF.2.6.3 requires all commercial or industrial development, as well as all residential development with lots smaller than two acres, to connect to a public sewer system (GP DEIR, p. 4.8-26). The proposed project would be served by sewer services provided by Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD), formerly CSD-1. Therefore, the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be required and the proposed project would result in *no impact* from such systems.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 construction phase of the proposed project would require the use of limited amounts of hazardous materials associated with construction activities (including, but not limited to fuels and lubricants). Operation of the proposed project would require the limited use of

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

hazardous materials commonly associated with machinery and cleaning activities (including, but not limited to lubricants, industrial cleaning supplies, refrigerants, landscaping fertilizers and chemicals, and pesticides). The transportation, use, and disposal of these materials would be subject to local, State, and federal laws as well as City Safety Policies. Consistency with these laws and policies would limit hazards to the public from the use of these materials. Because the use of hazardous materials is incidental to the operation of the proposed project, the amount of hazardous materials that would be used is small. While the proposed project would involve the use and storage of hazardous materials, compliance with local, State, and federal regulations and City Safety Policies would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from hazardous materials.

- 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 discussion a) above for a discussion of the project-specific impacts. According to investigations conducted by City staff of the DTSC's EnviroStor database, there are two sites within one-quarter mile of the project site that have exhibited leaking underground storage tanks in the past. Both of these sites are currently open cases with DTSC. The project site does not contain any previously installed underground storage tanks. While the proposed project includes the installation of a new underground storage tank, this tank will be used for the storage of stormwater. Stormwater does not constitute a hazard to soil or groundwater if a leak were to develop in the tank in the future. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from the accidental release of hazardous materials.

- 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).

Kinney Continuation High School is located across Folsom Boulevard on Kilgore Road approximately 0.05 miles south of the project site. As previously discussed, the use of hazardous materials would be incidental to the use of the proposed project and the amounts of hazardous materials stored, used, and disposed of on-site would be limited. As such, the proposed project would not result in significant effects from hazardous substances and the impact to existing or proposed schools would be *less than significant*.

- 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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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).

According to the GP-EIR, the project site is not located on any site identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled under Government Code Section 65962.5. According to investigations conducted by City staff of the Department of Toxic Substance Control's (DTSC) EnviroStor database, there are two sites within one-quarter mile of the project site that have exhibited leaking underground storage tanks in the past. Both of these sites are currently open cases with DTSC. Construction and operation of the proposed project would be contained within the project site and would not interfere with ongoing clean-up efforts of nearby active case sites. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and *less than significant* impacts associated with known hazardous materials sites would result from implementation of the proposed project.

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

The proposed project is partially located within the 150-300 foot conical surface height restriction area for Mather Airport, which limits building height in overflight areas in order to reduce safety-related hazards. The proposed Embassy Suites building would not exceed 100 feet in height. The proposed Candlewood Suites building would not exceed 55 feet in height. Therefore, both buildings proposed by the project would be below the height restriction, ensuring that aircraft related hazards to individuals on the ground are no greater than for any other structure in the City, as described in the GP-EIR. Considering the above factors, hazards to people on the ground from operations at or near Mather Airport would be *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 twelve miles to the southeast of the project area. 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).

Implementation of the proposed project would be mostly contained on the project site, with minimal disturbance to area roadways located in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The only portion of the proposed project that could directly impact roadways is the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

installation of sidewalks and driveways along Folsom Boulevard adjacent to the project site. The City requires that a Traffic Control Plan be submitted by the project proponent prior to approval of improvement plans, as administered by the Public Works Department. The Traffic Control Plan would minimize traffic impacts from construction and thereby reduce any effects on the ability of emergency responders to travel through the City. Formulation and adherence to a Traffic Control Plan for the project would ensure that the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact.

- h) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP EIR identified potential impacts of safety hazards associated with wildland fires due to the construction of residential areas adjacent to open space and natural areas (GP DEIR, pp.4.12-9). Adoption of General Plan policies and action items, as well as required project review by the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD), would ensure minimal impacts to residential areas from wildland fires, resulting in a less than significant impact from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-10).

The proposed project is located in entirely urbanized area. The nearest wildland area is the American River Parkway, located approximately 1.1 miles northwest of the project site. Given the existing development of the area and distance to wildlands, the proposed project would result in *no impact* in respect to wildland fire risks.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create or contribute to the potential for discharge of storm water from material storage areas, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas or loading docks, or other outdoor work areas? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Create or contribute to the potential for discharge of storm water to impair the beneficial uses of the receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Create or contribute to the potential for the discharge of storm water to cause significant harm on the biological integrity of the waterways and water bodies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

EXISTING SETTING

A Drainage Report was prepared for the proposed project by Area West Engineers, Inc. (included as **Appendix B**). The report analyzed the existing drainage patterns on the project site and calculated the likely impacts of development of the proposed project. The report determined that the project site currently functions as a detention basin for stormwater during large storm events and concluded that implementation of the proposed project would result in exacerbation of flooding conditions on adjacent properties. As a result of this conclusion, the proposed project has been designed to accommodate approximately 244,899 cubic feet of stormwater in the underground storage facility. The stormwater would be held in the underground facility until such time that it could drain into the existing drainage infrastructure. The project description includes the underground storage facility, and all analysis of the proposed project contained in this MND considers this feature.

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 construction of the proposed project have the potential to result in limited short-term impacts to surface water quality from dust, debris, and substances associated with heavy machinery, such as gasoline and oil. The proposed project would be subject to a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), California Stormwater Quality Association's Construction Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs), and applicable local ordinances and State requirements designed to protect water quality. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact resulting from water quality or waste discharge.

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

The proposed project would result in new impervious surfaces on a site that has been previously disturbed, though not developed. This increase in impervious surfaces would decrease absorption rates and increase run-off in the project area. However, the project site is substantially surrounded by existing development which has already impeded the greater recharge rate of the area.

The proposed project would be served by the Golden State Water Company. According to the General Plan EIR, Golden State Water Company's supply capacity through 2030 is not expected to exceed demand (GP DEIR, p.4.9-21). Furthermore, Golden State Water Company draw wells are located west of the City, a great enough distance from the proposed project that any effect of the project on absorption and recharge is unlikely to affect the ability of the Golden State Water Company to adequately serve its existing and

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

projected customers. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for additional groundwater supplies, nor would it interfere with existing groundwater recharge in the area. Considering the above factors, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts to groundwater supply and recharge.

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

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by existing urban development with generally flat terrain, excepting the slope which separates the project site from US Highway 50. During large storm events, the project site serves as a detention basin for stormwater from adjacent parcels prior to the water making its way into existing stormwater infrastructure. The proposed project would include an underground stormwater storage facility capable of storing approximately 244,899 cubic feet of water. The underground storage structure would connect to the existing stormwater drainage system, thereby allowing the storage facility to empty as system capacity is available. The underground stormwater storage facility was designed to accommodate the current holding capacity of the project site. As the planned storage capacity is equal to current capacity, the proposed project would not increase runoff to adjacent parcels. Stormwater from the project site would be treated prior to entering the drainage system, pursuant to the requirements of the City's NPDES permit (Rains, 2008). According to Mark Rains, County of Sacramento Department of Water Resources (DWR), the underground facility would be required to include a process for removal of silt prior to approval by DWR (Rains, 2008). No alterations would be made to any rivers or streams by the proposed project, by either direct or indirect methods. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in erosion or siltation impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from erosion or siltation.

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

See discussion c) above. As discussed above, the proposed project would include an underground stormwater storage facility designed to retain water during large storm events until capacity is available within the existing stormwater drainage system. The project site is not adjacent to any rivers or streams, nor is it within the 100-year floodplain. The proposed project would not alter any rivers or streams. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from on- or off-site flooding.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above for information on the proposed project and its operational impacts to water quality. While general stormwater impacts as a result of physical characteristics of the proposed project are not expected to be significant due to adherence to the requirements of the City's NPDES permit, construction impacts to water quality could occur as a result of discharge of

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

stormwater from material storage areas, vehicle or equipment fueling or maintenance (including washing), waste handling, and hazardous materials handling or storage areas on-site. The formation of and adherence to a SWPPP as required by the Public Works Department, and standard best management practices (BMPs) would ensure that the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts from stormwater discharge.

- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions a), b), and d) above.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions a), b), and d) above.
- h) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion c) above. The proposed project includes an underground stormwater storage facility which would connect to the existing stormwater drainage system. The underground stormwater storage facility was designed to accommodate the amount of storage capacity the project site provides in its current state, resulting in no net loss of stormwater storage capacity. As the proposed project would include infrastructure designed to accommodate existing drainage flows, the proposed project would have *less than significant* impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.
- i) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Water quality impacts during the construction phases of the proposed project have been discussed above and found to be less than significant. As demonstrated in discussions b) and h) above, the proposed project would not adversely or significantly impact water quality. Adherence to requirements of the City's NPDES permit and requirements imposed by the County of Sacramento Department of Water Resources for the underground stormwater storage facility would ensure that the proposed project would not degrade water quality. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact to water quality.
- 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 or the placement of housing within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, impacts from the General Plan were found to be less than significant (GP DEIR, p. 4.9-43).

The proposed project does not include any residential development. Additionally, no part of the project site is located within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* related to placing residential structures within the 100-year floodplain.

- k) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion j) above. As the proposed project is located entirely outside the 100-year floodplain, *no impact* would occur.
- l) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR identified the northern portion of the Planning Area, defined as north of US Highway 50, as within the potential inundation zone in the event of a complete failure of the Folsom Dam, Sunriver Levee, or Cordova Meadows Levee (GP-DEIR, p. 4.9-41). However, the GP-EIR concluded that the probability of such an event is extremely low and not considered to be a reasonably foreseeable event (*ibid*). The project site is not located within the northern portion of the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

City. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact associated with flooding.

- m) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project is not located near a large body of water or ocean, precluding the possibility of a tsunami or seiche occurring that could impact the project site. While the adjacent embankment separating the project site from US Highway 50 is relatively steep, there has been no slippage of the slope during heavy storm events. The embankment is under the jurisdiction of CalTrans and the proposed project does not include any alteration of the slope. The historic stability of the adjacent embankment indicates that mudflows are not likely. As the surrounding parcels to the south and east are generally flat and heavily developed, mudflows are not a possibility. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a *less than significant impact* from these types of events.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

The proposed project is located within the Folsom Boulevard Planning Area, as designated by the Rancho Cordova General Plan. The site is also located within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan area and Convention Overlay. The General Plan identifies specific uses for those areas. Refer to Section 2.0 (Project Description) for further information regarding allowed uses in and other planning requirements in those areas.

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 would be located on vacant land within a previously urbanized portion of the City. The proposed project does not include the removal or impedance of any roadways or paths of circulation. The proposed project would include sidewalks with connections to existing sidewalks to the east and west of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact in regards to dividing an existing community.

- 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).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The project site lies within the Folsom Boulevard Planning Area as identified in the Rancho Cordova General Plan. The parcel is zoned Office/Professional Mixed Use (OPMU), as identified in the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan. Hotel uses are permitted by right within the OPMU zoning district. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all City Policies adopted for the purpose of mitigating the environmental effects of the proposed project. Those policies that apply to the proposed project, which were adopted for the purpose of mitigating environmental effects, have been codified as mitigation measures in this MND. As the net result of all mitigation in this MND is wholly less than significant environmental effects, the project would have a *less than significant* impact to existing land use plans and policies.

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The 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 eastern portion of the project site is located within an MRZ-2 zone, an area known to contain mineral deposits, as identified in the GP-EIR (GP DEIR, pp. 4.8-26 and 4.8-27). The project site has been previously disturbed and surrounding areas have been urbanized during the latter half of the 20th century. As mining operations generally take place on sites prior to development due to the substantial effect they can have on adjacent uses, it is unlikely that the project site would be mined in the future given the extensive development surrounding the project site. Furthermore, no part of the project is located within an area identified in the GP-EIR as containing existing or planned mining operations. The City has not received any information or formal application regarding proposed mining operations in the vicinity of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss or impede the mining of regionally or locally important mineral resources and *less than significant* impacts would result.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XI. NOISE. Would the project result in: | | | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a) *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR addressed increases in noise levels as a result of buildout of the General Plan (GP DEIR, pp. 4.7-20 through 4.7-30). Significant and unavoidable impacts were expected due to construction noise, increased traffic noise, and the potential construction of noise generating land uses (GP DEIR, pp. 4.7-22, 4.7-27, 4.7-30). The City's noise standard sets daytime limit of 55 dB for typical noises. 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 operation of the proposed project would result in increased noise from cars entering and exiting the site and HVAC equipment. Kinney Continuation School is located across Folsom Boulevard on Kilgore Road approximately 0.05 miles south of the project site. The nearest residences to the project site are located on the opposite side of US Highway 50. With the intervening noise of existing traffic on Folsom Boulevard and the light rail tracks between the project site and Kinney Continuation School during normal school operating hours, it is unlikely that the school would be adversely affected by noise resulting from the proposed project. Considering the intervening noise of the highway, it is unlikely that residences would be affected by noise resulting from the proposed project. However, the proposed project does include site preparation and construction activities, which would include the use of heavy equipment and trucks and would result in temporary noise increases in the project vicinity. The Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan MND included

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

mitigation measure MM 11.1 in order to ensure that construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant. As the proposed project is within the Folsom Boulevard Specific Plan area, the following mitigation measure is included in order to ensure that construction noise does not exceed City noise standards:

Mitigation Measure

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

- Construction activities shall be limited to between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM on weekends; and,
- The project proponent shall post visible signage providing a name, address, and 24-hour phone number for information and/or complaints regarding the construction activities, as well as the phone number for the City Planning Department.

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/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 discussion a) above. Construction of the proposed project includes excavation, grading, and construction activities that could potentially generate limited groundborne vibration. However, these groundborne vibrations would be minor and temporary in nature, ceasing upon completion of construction activities. Excavation activities associated with the proposed project would not utilize pneumatic hammers, explosives, or deep drilling. These types of excavation are known to create significant groundborne vibration and noise. Considering the proposed project's limited potential for creating significant groundborne vibration, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact from groundborne vibration or noise.

- 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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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 discussion a) above. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a permanent increase in noise levels in the project vicinity due to traffic and HVAC equipment. However, the surrounding area is characterized by existing urban development. The nearest residences to the project site are located on the opposite side of US Highway 50, a previously existing source of significant noise. Kinney Continuation School is located across Folsom Boulevard on Kilgore Road, south of the light rail tracks. With the intervening noise of US-50, roadways, light rail trains, and the ambient noise level of the surrounding area, it is unlikely that residences or Kinney Continuation School would be affected by noise generated by the proposed project. Therefore, permanent increases in noise resulting from the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion b) above. Construction noise impacts are expected to be minor and short in duration, and are therefore not expected to exceed City standards for stationary noise [see discussion a) above]. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 11.1 would ensure that construction related noise impacts would be *less than significant*.
- 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).

The project site is not located within one of the planning areas identified above as having potential airport-related noise impacts. Furthermore, the proposed project is located outside all identified noise contours for Mather Airport, as shown in the Mather Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore, *less than significant* noise impacts to people working at the project site are expected.

- f) *No Impact.* The nearest private airport to the project area is the Rancho Murieta Airport, located more than twelve miles to the southeast. Therefore, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airport and *no impact* would occur.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 site is located within an urbanized area and is currently vacant. The proposed project would construct two hotels totaling 253,419 square feet and 329 rooms. No residential development would be included with the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no impact resulting from the potential for inducing population growth through the construction of new homes. Operation of the proposed project would include hiring of employees, which could bring new residents to the area. However, as the number of jobs created would not be substantial, the proposed project is not likely to contribute to substantial population growth in the area. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to result in *less than significant* impacts to population growth, either directly or indirectly.

- 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.).

The proposed project would involve the construction and operation of two new hotels. The proposed project would not demolish any residential development as the project site is currently vacant. As such, the construction of replacement housing either on-site or elsewhere will not be required, resulting in *no impact*.

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

EXISTING SETTING

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

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

The proposed project would construct 253,419 square feet of hotel use. Fire protection for the project site would most likely be provided by SMFD Station 66 located at 3180 Kilgore Road, approximately 1.05 miles south of the site. General Plan Action ISF.2.3.2 requires that new development fund its fair share portion of impacts related to public infrastructure and facilities, including fire service and facilities. This is enforced by Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District during the plan checking process. As the proposed project would be subject to SMFD fees and requirements, *less than significant* impacts are expected.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

substantial growth predicted in the GP-EIR would require additional police protection infrastructure and facilities (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-16 and 4.12-17). Consistency with City Policies and Action Items would result in less than significant impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan (GP DEIR, p. 4.12-17).

Police equipment and personnel increases are tied to population growth in the City. As the proposed project would not increase the population [see discussion a) in Checklist XII, Population and Housing, above], it is not expected that additional personnel, equipment, or law enforcement facilities will be required. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to result in a *less than significant* impact.

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

The proposed project would not construct any new residences and would not generate any population growth in the vicinity. Impacts to Kinney Continuation High School, located across Folsom Boulevard on Kilgore Road approximately 0.05 miles south of the project site, would be mainly due to construction of the proposed project. These impacts would be temporary in nature, ceasing upon completion of construction activities. As the proposed project would not increase the number of students in the area and impacts from construction would be temporary, *less than significant* impacts to schools are expected.

- d) *No 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).

No additional residents would be generated by the proposed project, resulting in no increase in park usage or demand. Therefore, no additional need for parks is expected and the proposed project would have *no impact*.

- e) *No Impact.* As no new residents and only a small number of new employees would be generated by the proposed project, and no public facilities would be impacted by construction and operation of the proposed project (see discussions above), *no impact* is expected.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XIV. RECREATION | | | | | |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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) *No 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 site is currently vacant and would provide hotel uses upon implementation of the proposed project. No existing parkland would be converted to non-recreational use by the proposed project. Furthermore, because the proposed project includes exclusively hotel and restaurant uses, and as the customers of such establishments are much less likely to visit parks or utilize recreational facilities, no measurable increase in the use of existing parks is expected. Therefore, no additional need for parks or other recreational facilities would be created and *no impact* is expected.
- b) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

A Transportation Impact Study was prepared for the proposed project by Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants (Fehr & Peers, 2008). The report identified intersection levels of service to two nearby intersections (Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard, and Folsom Boulevard/Kilgore Road) for existing, existing plus project, cumulative, and cumulative plus project scenarios. The report also identified trip generation rates that could result from the proposed project. The rates are shown below:

**TABLE 3
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION**

| | ITE Code ¹ | AM Peak | | PM Peak | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----|---------|-----|
| | | In | Out | In | Out |
| Embassy Suites (217 rooms) | 310 | 74 | 47 | 68 | 60 |
| Candlewood Suites (113 rooms) | 310 | 39 | 25 | 35 | 31 |
| Total: | | 113 | 72 | 103 | 91 |
| Total In/Out: | | 185 | | 194 | |

Notes: ¹Trip Generation, 7th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2003) used to estimate the project trip generation.

Source: Fehr and Peers Transportation Consultants, July 2008.

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 were 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 proposed project is expected to generate a limited number of trips during construction as employees of the construction contractor drive to and from the work site. This limited increase in traffic would be temporary in nature. As indicated in **Table 3** above, the proposed project is anticipated to generate 185 AM peak hour trips and 194 PM peak hour trips during project operation (Fehr & Peers, July 2008). The transportation impact study concluded that revised signal timing and the conversion of existing center lanes to turn lanes would result in an improvement in level of service at the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Kilgore Road and no deterioration in level of service at the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard (Fehr & Peers, July 2008). Therefore, the proposed project is expected to have *less than significant* impacts to traffic in the area.

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above. Impacts to level of service for roadways and intersections during construction of the proposed project would be reduced by a Traffic Control Plan, required by the City Public Works Department for any project that would involve impacts to City roadways. Traffic control and other requirements of the Traffic Control Plan would ensure *less than significant* impacts.

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

The southeast portion of the proposed project site is located within the 150-300 foot conical surface height restriction area for Mather Airport, above which it is understood that impacts to air navigation could occur. The proposed project would not construct any structures above 100 feet in height, which is well below the height restrictions. Therefore, the proposed project would not necessitate any change in current air traffic patterns and a *less than significant* impact is expected.

- 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.).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The project site would be served by two driveways directly connecting the public right-of-way to the hotel parking lots. The proposed project would be required by the City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department to dedicate roadway right-of-way to accommodate expansion of Folsom Boulevard to possibly include turn pockets for the project site in order to accommodate traffic entering the project site. The project site has been designed to accommodate the circulation of emergency vehicles. Compliance with Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District requirements for site access would ensure that the project site is able to accommodate emergency response vehicles. Therefore, no hazards would be created as a result of site access or internal circulation and a *less than significant* impact is expected.

- 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.).

The project site would be accessible from two points: a driveway from Folsom Boulevard into the parking lot near the southeastern corner of the site; and the construction of a through-lane onto the project site from Kilgore Road. All site access points would be subject to SMFD requirements which would ensure that emergency vehicle access to the site would not be impeded. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less than significant* impacts resulting from emergency access.

- f) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project includes 330 parking spaces, including 59 spaces in an underground parking garage to be located below the proposed Embassy Suites. The proposed project includes a special review of parking entitlement to allow fewer parking spaces than required by the City Zoning Code. For this entitlement, the project applicant is required to demonstrate that the proposed parking facilities are adequate for the proposed use, pursuant to Zoning Code Section 330-07(d), should the number of parking spaces proposed be less than City standards. The City will enforce these requirements during the Design Review process, which would ensure adequate parking for the proposed project. Therefore, the project would have a *less than significant* impact regarding parking capacity.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The GP-EIR analyzed potential impacts to transit, pedestrian, and bicycle provisions within the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-49 through 4.5-53). Development of the City's Transit Master Plan and the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan would ensure that impacts of the General Plan to these provisions would be less than significant (GP DEIR, pp. 4.5-49 and 4.5-50).

The Sacramento Regional Transit Light Rail station at Sunrise is approximately 0.30 miles northeast of the project site. The Light Rail station at Cordova Town Center is located approximately 0.40 miles southwest of the project site. Both stations are located along Folsom Boulevard, as is the proposed project. As Folsom Boulevard provides adequate access to the stations and as the proposed project will not impede traffic or circulation on Folsom Boulevard, the proposed project's impacts to local transit is negligible.

The proposed project would not restrict access to the light rail stations or any other transit facilities. Further, development of the two ingress and egress points along Folsom Boulevard would not interfere with any transit stops. Additional employees required by the proposed project could possibly increase the amount of riders on local transit systems.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

However, the proposed project would not be expected to generate a substantial increase in ridership to warrant the development of additional transit facilities. The proposed project would not interfere with any existing bike lanes. As part of roadway frontage improvements required by the City Public Works Department, the proposed project would install sidewalk connections with existing sidewalks to the east and west of the project site. The proposed project would provide bike racks near each of the two proposed hotel buildings. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less than significant* impacts on alternative transportation.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

A sewer study was prepared by Kroeker Engineering Consultants in March 2008 for the proposed project (Kroeker, 2008). The study concluded that the proposed project would result in approximately 99,100 gallons per day of wastewater. Further, the report concluded that this amount would not adversely impact existing sewer operations. Analysis of existing wastewater treatment capacity was discussed in the GP-EIR, where it was demonstrated that capacity exists to accommodate growth until approximately 2020. As the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and the sewer study demonstrated adequate capacity, *less than significant* impacts would be expected.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- 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 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).

See discussion a) above. The proposed project would be required to connect to existing sewer lines. The existing sewer system is anticipated to have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project are 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. The GP-EIR identifies the increase in impervious surfaces as the primary contributor to increased stormwater runoff (GP DEIR, p.4.9-41).

The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the area and would increase stormwater runoff from the project site. Construction of new stormwater facilities would be required to reduce impacts to existing stormwater facilities. The proposed project would include an underground stormwater storage facility capable of storing approximately 244,899 cubic feet of water, the approximate capacity as currently exists on the project site. The underground storage structure would connect directly to the existing stormwater drainage system, thereby allowing the storage facility to empty as system capacity is available. Construction of the on-site stormwater facility is included in the analysis of the proposed project. As the project includes specific design features to prevent direct impacts to the stormwater system, a *less than significant* impact is expected.

- 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 proposed project would add 253,419 square feet of hotel and incidental restaurant use to the area, which would result in increased water demand. The project site lies within the service area of the Golden State Water Company. According to the General Plan EIR, Golden State Water Company's supply capacity through 2030 is expected to exceed demand (GP DEIR, p.4.9-21). As the project site is within the incorporated boundaries of the City and is consistent with the general Plan, the proposed project would not result in a significant need for increased water supply and a *less than significant* impact is expected.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- 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).

As identified in the General Plan EIR, all three landfills that receive solid waste from the City have adequate capacity to serve the City (GP DEIR, pp. 4.12-60 through 4.12-63). All solid waste generated during construction or operation of the proposed project would be trucked to local landfills for disposal. Therefore, both construction and operation of the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

- g) *Less than Significant Impact.* The City of Rancho Cordova utilizes an open franchise system for the collection of solid waste from commercial businesses and multi-family developments, wherein there exists seven potential service providers. All service providers are required to operate consistent with applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less than significant* impacts.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | Reviewed Under Previous Document |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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"/> |
| c) 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/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As demonstrated in checklists I through XVI above, the proposed project is not expected to result in any significant impacts related to biological or cultural resources. Further, adherence to City policies and the mitigation measures presented above would ensure that the project's impacts are *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See Section 4.0 of this IS/MND for an analysis of the proposed project's cumulative impact.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.