

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This executive summary highlights the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed Rio del Oro Specific Plan project, as required by Section 15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines) and 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1502.12 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As stated in Section 15123(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, “[a]n EIR shall contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” As stated in NEPA Section 1502.12, “each environmental impact statement shall contain a summary which adequately and accurately summarizes the statement. The summary shall stress the major conclusions, areas of controversy (including issues raised by agencies and the public), and the issues to be resolved (including the choice among alternatives).” As required by the State CEQA Guidelines and NEPA regulations, this executive summary includes (1) a summary description of the proposed project, (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (Table ES-1), (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated, and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult Chapter 2, “Alternatives”; Chapter 3, “Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures”; and Chapter 4, “Other Statutory Requirements.”

## ES.2 LEAD AGENCIES

This document is a joint draft environmental impact report/draft environmental impact statement (DEIR/DEIS) prepared for the Rio del Oro Specific Plan project (the “proposed action” for purposes of NEPA and the “proposed project” for purposes of CEQA, hereinafter referred to as “the project”).

The City of Rancho Cordova (City) is the lead agency for the project under CEQA, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Sacramento District, is the federal lead agency under NEPA.

## ES.3 TYPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This EIR/EIS contains both program-level and project-level components. Phase 1 (Elliott Homes) includes relatively precise development plans, so it may be evaluated at a detailed project-level analysis. The remaining phases, Phases 2–5 (GenCorp Realty Investments [GenCorp]), may require further environmental analysis and additional agency approvals following adoption of the specific plan when tentative maps are submitted, particularly if site-specific issues peculiar to certain parcels were not addressed at the broader program level of analysis found in this document.

## ES.4 REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS

Elliott Homes and GenCorp (hereinafter referred to as “the project applicant[s]”) are seeking approval of various discretionary approvals in support of a specific plan. The following entitlements are requested from the City for the project:

- ▶ adoption and implementation of the specific plan,
- ▶ adoption of a public facilities financing plan,
- ▶ adoption of a public facilities infrastructure/phasing plan,
- ▶ approval of the Phase 1 tentative subdivision map, and
- ▶ approval of a development agreement between the City and the project applicant(s).

The project applicant(s) are also seeking from USACE an individual permit, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, for the proposed discharge of dredged or fill material into 30.33 acres of waters of the United States.

In addition to the authorizations and approvals requested from the City and USACE, permits and other approval actions from the following federal, state, regional, and local agencies may be required:

- ▶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- ▶ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- ▶ California Department of Education
- ▶ California Department of Fish and Game
- ▶ California Department of Transportation
- ▶ Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 5)
- ▶ Sacramento County Local Agency Formation Commission
- ▶ Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

## **ES.5 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

### **ES.5.1 PROJECT LOCATION**

The project site is located in eastern Sacramento County, south of U.S. Highway 50, within the city of Rancho Cordova (see Exhibits 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3). The property is located south of White Rock Road, north of Douglas Road, and east of Sunrise Boulevard.

### **ES.5.2 ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECT**

The Rio del Oro project would permit a mixed-use development on approximately 3,828 acres in Rancho Cordova. Elliott Homes is seeking specific development entitlements (e.g., tentative subdivision maps) as part of the project. GenCorp is seeking overall development entitlements, but has not proposed specific development entitlements necessary for immediate or short-term development as part of this proposal.

Buildout of the project would be split into five phases and is anticipated to occur over a 25- to 30-year period. The project provides for construction of approximately 11,601 residential dwelling units in three residential land use classifications on 1,920 acres. Commercial land uses would include Village Commercial, Local Town Center, and Regional Town Center (totaling 153 acres of shopping centers); Business Park (86 acres); and Industrial Park (282 acres). Various neighborhood parks totaling 63 acres would be developed. There would also be 54 acres of Private Recreation land uses, 9.5 acres of Public/Quasi Public Use, 44 acres of Landscape Corridor, and 50 acres of Greenbelt land uses. Two elderberry preserve areas, consisting of 10 acres and 14 acres, respectively, have been designated on the project site in areas with the greatest concentration of elderberry shrubs. In addition to 155 acres of drainage parkways, 39 acres of stormwater detention basins would be created in three separate locations. A 507-acre wetland preserve area is also proposed in the southern portion of the project site. Designated school uses include a combined high school/middle school (78 acres) with an adjacent 87-acre community park, a separate middle school (20 acres), and six elementary schools (54 acres). The project also includes new water, sewer, electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications services. Approximately 227 acres of roadways and associated landscaping, along with a network of bicycle and pedestrian trails, would be constructed. In addition, the project includes various on- and off-site infrastructure improvements.

Information regarding the location, design, and operation of the various project components is presented in detail in Chapter 2, "Alternatives."

## **ES.6 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Table ES-1 displays a summary of significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid, eliminate, minimize, or reduce potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance of the impact following implementation of each mitigation measure is identified. Effects that would occur under each alternative development scenario on Table ES-1 are identified as follows: PP (Proposed Project), HD (High Density), IM (Impact Minimization), NF (No Federal Action), NP (No Project). In Table ES-1 the impact and its significance conclusion is followed by the mitigation requirement. For detailed descriptions of project impacts and mitigation measures, please see Sections 3.1 through 3.16 in Chapter 3, “Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.”

## **ES.7 ALTERNATIVES**

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6) and the NEPA Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (40 CFR 15012.14) require that an EIR/EIS describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid and/or lessen the environmental effects of the project. Chapter 2 of this DEIR/DEIS provides a comparative analysis between the proposed project/action (i.e., the Proposed Project/Proposed Action Alternative, hereinafter referred to as the “Proposed Project Alternative”), a High Density Alternative, and an Impact Minimization Alternative. The No Project Alternative (hereinafter referred to as the “No Project Alternative”) as required under CEQA and NEPA and a No Federal Action Alternative as required by USACE under NEPA is also evaluated in Chapter 2.

### **ES.7.1 HIGH DENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative was designed to further embrace the concept of “Smart Growth.” Under Smart Growth principles, areas that are planned for development are developed at higher densities. Although these higher densities may result in greater localized impacts on resources, the overall area of disturbance is reduced by concentrating development in particular locations. The High Density Alternative envisions a greater density of residential development on a footprint similar to that of the Proposed Project Alternative, resulting in more residential dwelling units per acre. The total acreage of residential development would be the same, but the density would be increased such that approximately 3,800 additional residential units would be constructed. The acreage of commercial and industrial development as well as the wetland preserve would be the same. The types of land uses would remain the same as under the Proposed Project Alternative.

### **ES.7.2 IMPACT MINIMIZATION ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative was formulated to reduce environmental impacts, while still meeting some of the project goals and objectives. Under the Impact Minimization Alternative, project components would be reconfigured on the project site so as to reduce impacts on waters of the United States, including wetlands and high-quality biological habitat. Under this alternative, the level of residential development would be decreased such that the amount of project-generated traffic, air quality emissions, and noise would be reduced. An additional 485 acres in the southern portion of the project site would be designated as part of the wetland preserve. Thus, a total of 994.5 acres, approximately 25% of the project site, would become a protected wetland preserve. The total acreage of residential development would be reduced by approximately 470 acres and approximately 1,040 fewer residential units would be constructed, although overall density would increase (a greater proportion of residential acreage would be developed with medium and high density). Commercial and industrial development sites would be reduced by approximately 30 acres.

### **ES.7.3 NO FEDERAL ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative was designed to allow some development of the project site while avoiding the placement of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, thus eliminating the need for a USACE Section 404 permit. A land use map showing development areas and jurisdictional wetlands with a 50-foot avoidance buffer is

provided on Exhibit 2-19 in chapter 2 of this DEIR/DEIS. Under this alternative, 872 acres of the project site would be designated “Natural Resources” under the City of Rancho Cordova’s General Plan. Land with this use designation is set aside as natural habitat with no urban development. Open space trails would be located adjacent to areas designated as Natural Resources and the City of Rancho Cordova would prohibit public access into the area. The types of land uses would remain the same as under the Proposed Project Alternative.

#### **ES.7.4 No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the project would not be developed, and the majority of the project site would remain under the jurisdiction of the City. The No Project Alternative assumes that aggregate mining operations to remove portions of the existing dredge tailings at the project site would continue under existing Conditional Use Permits—one originally issued by the County of Sacramento (County), and the other issued by the City—and possibly under one or more future individual Implementation Permits expected to be issued by the City.

Aggregate mining operations are not part of the Rio del Oro project. This is an unlikely long-term alternative for the Rio del Oro project site because, according to the Land Use Map Book for the *City of Rancho Cordova Draft General Plan*, it is located in an area planned for urban development. Entitlements are actively being sought for development in the vicinity of the project site, and infrastructure planning is also occurring for the area. The No Project Alternative would not meet the purpose, need, or objectives of the proposed Rio del Oro project as described in Chapter 1 of this DEIR/DEIS.

#### **ES.7.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

The State CEQA Guidelines require identification of an environmentally superior alternative from among the proposed project and the alternatives evaluated. If the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior, CEQA requires identification of the “environmentally superior alternative” other than the No Project Alternative from among the proposed project and the alternatives evaluated. Federal NEPA guidelines also recommend that an environmentally preferred alternative be identified; however, under NEPA, that alternative does not need to be identified until the final record of decision is published. Therefore, the discussion in this section of the environmentally superior alternative is intended to satisfy only the state CEQA requirements.

The No Project Alternative would have the fewest environmental impacts of the alternatives under consideration, and therefore would be considered environmentally superior. The following discussion identifies the environmentally superior alternative among the four action alternatives (Proposed Project, Impact Minimization, High Density, and No Federal Action) carried forward with an equal level of detailed analysis in the EIR/EIS.

The No Federal Action Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts related to land use, drainage, hydrology, and water quality, which are greater than impacts that would occur under the Proposed Project, Impact Minimization, and High Density Alternatives. While this alternative would reduce direct impacts on some biological resources such as vernal pools, the No Federal Action Alternative would not avoid indirect, potentially significant, and significant impacts related to biological resources. This alternative would also result in more significant and unavoidable traffic and transportation impacts than would occur under the other three action alternatives. Therefore, among the four action alternatives, the No Federal Action Alternative would have the greatest level of adverse impacts on the environment.

The High Density Alternative would provide certain long-term benefits to the environment by locating a higher density of residential housing in the same mixed-use community where job opportunities would be provided, thus reducing development pressure on other undeveloped lands in the surrounding area. However, by using land more efficiently in dealing with projected long-term population increases in the greater Sacramento region, the High Density Alternative, compared to the Proposed Project Alternative, could lead to the preservation of approximately 500 more acres of land that would otherwise be lost to development over time; it would also provide 3,887 additional residential units. This long-term avoidance of development would likely have the effect of reducing impacts that would otherwise occur with a more traditional, lower density footprint. However, in

general, the High Density Alternative would have a greater level of impacts on the environment than the Proposed Project Alternative or the Impact Minimization Alternative because land would be developed at a higher level of intensity; thus, more residential housing, retail and commercial development, roadways, schools, fire and police services, and demand for water, sewer, and other infrastructure would be necessary, and a greater level of impacts to biological resources would occur.

The Impact Minimization Alternative would have a lesser level of impacts on the environment than any of the other action alternatives, including the Proposed Project Alternative, because nearly 500 fewer acres of land would be developed, which would be made part of a managed wetland preserve, and the land would be developed a lower level of intensity. Although impacts would still be significant, this alternative would result in the lowest level of significant impacts among the four action alternatives related to demand for water and wastewater infrastructure; construction-related erosion; loss and degradation of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the United States, riparian habitat, special-status wildlife, special-status plants, and associated habitat; degradation of visual character and new skyglow and light and glare effects; increases to traffic volumes and temporary obstruction of roadways during construction; generation of short-term and long-term pollutant emissions; and exposure to on-site and off-site noise sources.

Although both the High Density and Impact Minimization Alternatives would preserve approximately 500 acres of land, the Impact Minimization Alternative would be developed at a lesser intensity than the High Density Alternative and would thus result in less impacts on the environment overall.

Thus, among the four action alternatives carried forward for analysis in this DEIR/DEIS, the Impact Minimization Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative for CEQA purposes.

## **ES.8 KNOWN AREAS OF CONTROVERSY**

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines and 40 CFR Section 1502.12 of the NEPA regulations require that a summary of an EIR/EIS identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. During the public comment period for the notice of preparation/notice of intent, various comment letters were received regarding the project. Appendix B of the DEIR/DEIS includes a summary of the public scoping process as well as summaries of the comments received in writing and at the public meetings held on February 26, 2004. In general, areas of potential controversy known to the City and the project applicant(s) include biological resources, circulation (traffic and alternative transportation methods), air quality, noise, land use concerns related to the location of the project site near Mather Airport, hydrology and water quality, hazardous materials, water supply, provision of public services, and provision of public utilities. These issues were considered in the preparation of this DEIR/DEIS and, where appropriate, are addressed in the environmental impact analyses presented in Chapters 3 and 4.

## **ES.9 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND ADDITIONAL STEPS IN THE CEQA/NEPA REVIEW PROCESS**

This DEIR/DEIS is being distributed to interested agencies, stakeholder organizations, and individuals. This distribution ensures that interested parties have an opportunity to express their views regarding the environmental effects of the project, and to ensure that information pertinent to permits and approvals is provided to decision makers for the lead agencies, NEPA cooperating agencies, and CEQA responsible agencies. This document is available for review by the public during normal business hours at Rancho Cordova City Hall, 2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670. The DEIR/DEIS is being distributed for a 60-day review period that will end on February 5, 2007.

Written comments postmarked no later than February 5, 2007, should be sent to the following addresses:

Patrick Angell  
City of Rancho Cordova  
2729 Prospect Park Drive  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670  
Fax: (916) 361-1574  
E-mail: PAngell@pacificmunicipal.com

Anna Sutton  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch  
1325 J Street, Room 1480  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922  
Fax: (916) 557-6877  
E-mail: Anna.M.Sutton@spk01.usace.army.mil

If comments are provided via e-mail, please include the project title in the subject line, attach comments in MS Word format, and include the commenter's U.S. Postal Service mailing address.

A public hearing on the DEIR will be conducted by the City and USACE at 6 p.m. on January 11, 2007, at Rancho Cordova City Hall, 2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova. It is not necessary to provide testimony during the public hearing; comments on the DEIR/DEIS will be accepted throughout the meeting and will be recorded at the public comment table. Comments may also be submitted throughout the comment period as described above.

Once all comments have been assembled and reviewed, responses will be prepared to address significant environmental issues that have been raised in the comments. The responses will be included in an FEIR/FEIS.

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>3.1 LAND USE</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<p><b>3.1-1: Consistency with Sacramento County LAFCo Guidelines for Annexation of the Project Site to SRCSD and CSD-1.</b> Annexation of the project site into the service area of SRCSD and CSD-1 would require approval by the County LAFCo before these districts could provide wastewater service to the project.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.1-2: Compatibility with the Mather Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</b> The Mather Airport CLUP prohibits new residential development in those areas subject to noise levels of 65 db CNEL or above.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.1-3: Conflict with the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint.</b> Project implementation could result in conflicts between the project and the SACOG Sacramento Region Preferred Blueprint Scenario.</p> <p><b>IM, NF, NP:</b> No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the conflict between the Impact Minimization, No Federal Action, and No Project Alternatives and the SACOG Preferred Blueprint Scenario to a less-than-significant level. The City would determine whether conflicts between the Impact Minimization, No Federal Action, and No Project Alternatives and Blueprint policies and assumptions may translate into potentially significant environmental effects. In determining whether any particular conflict translates into such an effect, the City would carefully consider whether implementation of the Impact Minimization, No Federal Action, or No Project Alternative, compared with implementation of a Blueprint-based plan, would yield either a lost opportunity to accomplish a long-term environmental benefit, or a lost opportunity to minimize a long term environmental impact (Public Resources Code Section 21001[g]). Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><b>PP, HD:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	Direct & Indirect SU	Direct & Indirect SU	Direct & Indirect SU

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.1-4: Compatibility with Sacramento County LAFCo Guidelines for Annexation of the Project Site to SRCSD and CSD-1.</b> Annexation of Phase 1 into the service area of SRCSD and CSD-1 would require approval by the County LAFCo before these districts could provide wastewater service to the project.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.1-5: Consistency with the Mather Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</b> The Mather Airport CLUP prohibits new residential development in those areas subject to noise levels of 65 dB CNEL or above.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.1-6: Conflict with the SACOG Sacramento Region Blueprint.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could result in conflicts between the project and the SACOG Sacramento Region Preferred Blueprint Scenario.</p> <p><b>IM, NF, NP:</b> For the same reasons as described for Impact 3.1-3 above, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce Impact 3.1-6 to a less-than-significant level under the Impact Minimization, No Federal Action, and No Project Alternatives. Refer to the mitigation discussion for Impact 3.1-3 for further discussion. This impact remains significant and unavoidable under the Impact Minimization, No Federal Action, and No Project Alternatives.</p> <p><b>PP, HD:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	Direct & Indirect SU	Direct & Indirect SU	Direct & Indirect SU
<p><b>3.1-7: Potential Land Use Conflict with California Department of Education Minimum Site Criteria for Siting the Proposed Elementary School.</b> A combined elementary school is proposed as part of Phase 1 development. CDE minimum site criteria identify various factors that must be considered in selecting a school site to protect the health and safety of students and staff. Aggregate mining operations adjacent to the site and other factors may require additional assessment based on CDE's evaluation of the minimum site criteria.</p>	Direct impact may be SU, but no impact conclusion can be reached because additional studies are required; no Indirect				No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1                      Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> No feasible mitigation measures can be identified at this time as discussed below.</p> <p>Because a conceptual site plan was developed and provided by FCUSD, details of this school were available to conduct a project-specific analysis. However, no other conceptual site plans for the remaining designated school sites are available. Despite the absence of a school district as lead agency, the DEIR/DEIS discusses the elementary school site (for which a conceptual site plan was provided) because the project applicant(s) and the City, in identifying school sites within the Rio del Oro Specific Plan area, have tried to be cognizant of school siting requirements and criteria. The intent of analyzing the proposed elementary school was not for FCUSD to rely solely on the Rio del Oro Specific Plan EIR/EIS for project-level review of Phase 1 schools. Rather, the analysis was intended to identify potential issues with CDE criteria early in the planning process and expedite FCUSD's preparation of its site-specific environmental review document. The same would be true for the proposed elementary schools, although without conceptual site plans it is difficult to conduct a project-level analysis.</p> <p>The process for school site approval in California would also require DTSC and CDE to review the appropriate environmental documentation (for DTSC, the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment; for CDE, the DEIR/DEIS and applicable forms) to determine whether the proposed school site meets CDE siting criteria after their review. Often, CDE will require additional risk assessments as part of the site approval process; these risk assessments may identify portions of a site for which some types of use may be restricted to ensure student safety.</p> <p>In addition, DTSC could require FCUSD to conduct a PEA to identify specific risks and appropriate mitigation, based on the results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. These additional levels of agency review and approval are outside the CEQA/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process; although some of these determinations may take place before the EIR/EIS is certified, the process is separate and distinct from environmental review. CDE will not grant final site approval until site-level environmental review is completed.</p> <p>The risk assessments required under certain conditions may identify constraints within which the school district must work to obtain CDE approval of a site. If CDE requires additional assessments, the district would obtain and implement any identified mitigation to reduce risks or constraints at the site to an acceptable level as determined by CDE.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.1-8: Potential Land Use Conflict with California Department of Education Minimum Site Criteria for Siting the Proposed High School/Middle School.</b> A combined middle school/high school is proposed as part of development Phase 1. CDE minimum site criteria identify various factors that must be considered in selecting a school site to protect the health and safety of students and staff. Aggregate mining operations adjacent to the site and other factors may require additional assessment based on CDE's evaluation of the minimum site criteria.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> No feasible mitigation measures can be identified at this time for the reasons described below.</p>	<p>Direct impact may be SU, but no impact conclusion can be reached because additional studies are required; no Indirect</p>		<p>No Direct, No Indirect</p>		

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Because a conceptual site plan was developed and provided by FCUSD, details of this school were available to conduct a project-specific analysis. Despite the absence of a school district as lead agency, the DEIR/DEIS discusses the high school/middle school site because the project applicant(s) and the City, in identifying school sites within the Rio del Oro Specific Plan area, have tried to be cognizant of school siting requirements and criteria. The intent of analyzing the proposed high school/middle school was not for FCUSD to rely solely on the Rio del Oro Specific Plan EIR/EIS for project-level review of Phase 1 schools. Rather, the analysis was intended to identify potential issues with CDE criteria early in the planning process and expedite FCUSD's preparation of its site-specific environmental review document. The same would be true for the proposed elementary schools, although without conceptual site plans it is difficult to conduct a project-level analysis.</p> <p>The process for school site approval in California would also require DTSC and CDE to review the appropriate environmental documentation (for DTSC, the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment; for CDE, the DEIR/DEIS and applicable forms) to determine whether the proposed school site meets CDE siting criteria after their review. Often, CDE will require additional risk assessments as part of the site approval process; these risk assessments may identify portions of a site for which some types of use may be restricted to ensure student safety.</p> <p>In addition, DTSC could require FCUSD to conduct a PEA to identify specific risks and appropriate mitigation, based on the results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. These additional levels of agency review and approval are outside the CEQA/NEPA process; although some of these determinations may take place before the EIR/EIS is certified, the process is separate and distinct from environmental review. CDE will not grant final site approval until site-level environmental review is completed.</p> <p>The risk assessments required under certain conditions may identify constraints within which the school district must work to obtain CDE approval of a site. If CDE requires additional assessments, the district would obtain and implement any identified mitigation to reduce risks or constraints at the site to an acceptable level as determined by CDE.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<b>3.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<p><b>3.2-1: Temporary Increase in Population and Housing Demand during Construction.</b> Project implementation would generate a temporary increase in employment and subsequent housing demand in Rancho Cordova from construction jobs.</p>					
	Direct & LTS; indirect impacts are addressed in each issue area as direct impacts.				No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.2-2: Increased Population Growth.</b> Project implementation would result in the development of new residential units, which would cause a direct increase in population.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS; indirect impacts are addressed in each issue area as direct impacts.				No Direct, No Indirect
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.2-3: Temporary Increase in Population and Housing Demand during Construction of Development Phase 1.</b> The project would generate a temporary increase in employment and subsequent housing demand in Rancho Cordova from construction jobs during the peak construction periods for development Phase 1.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS; indirect impacts are addressed in each issue area as direct impacts.				No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.2-4: Increased Population Growth.</b> Development Phase 1 would include construction of new residential units, which would result in a direct increase in population.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS; indirect impacts are addressed in each issue area as direct impacts.				No Direct, No Indirect
<b>3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<p><b>3.3-1: Potential Effects on Low-Income Populations.</b> Project implementation would not create a disproportionate placement of adverse environmental impacts on low-income populations.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.3-2: Potential Effects on Minority Populations.</b> Project implementation would not create a disproportionate placement of adverse environmental impacts on minority communities.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.3-3: Potential Effects on Low-Income Populations.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would not create a disproportionate placement of adverse environmental impacts on low-income populations.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.3-4: Potential Effects on Minority Populations.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would not create a disproportionate placement of adverse environmental impacts on minority communities.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>3.4 DRAINAGE, HYDROLOGY, AND WATER QUALITY</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<p><b>3.4-1: Potential Increased Risk of Flooding from Increased Stormwater Runoff.</b> Project implementation would increase the amount of impervious surface on the project site, thereby increasing surface runoff. This increase in surface runoff would result in an increase in both the total volume and the peak discharge rate of stormwater runoff, and therefore could result in greater potential for on- and off-site flooding.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Prepare and Submit Final Drainage Plans and Implement Requirements.</b> Before the approval of grading plans and building permits, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall submit final drainage plans to the City demonstrating that off-site upstream runoff would be appropriately conveyed through the project site, and that project-related on-site runoff would be appropriately contained in detention basins to reduce flooding impacts. Furthermore, the</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>project applicant(s) for all project phases may be required to participate in drainage improvements along Sunrise Boulevard; this will be determined through continuing consultation with the Sacramento County Department of Water Resources.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans and building permits for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.4-2: Exposure of People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Flooding as a Result of the Failure of a Levee.</b> Project implementation could expose people or structures to a significant risk of flooding as a result of the failure of a levee.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.4-3: Potential Temporary Construction-Related Drainage and Water Quality Effects.</b> Drainage and water quality impacts could result from construction activities at the project site.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Measures or Best Management Practices to Reduce Water Quality Effects of Temporary Construction Activities.</b> Before the approval of grading permits and improvement plans project applicant(s) for all project phases shall consult with the City, the SWRCB, and the Central Valley RWQCB to acquire the appropriate regulatory approvals that may be necessary to obtain Section 401 water quality certification, an SWRCB statewide NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, and any other necessary site-specific WDRs or waivers under the Porter-Cologne Act.</p> <p>The project applicant(s) shall prepare and submit the appropriate NOIs and prepare the SWPPP and any other necessary engineering plans and specifications for pollution prevention and control. The SWPPP and other appropriate plans shall identify and specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ the use of erosion and sediment-control BMPs, including construction techniques that will reduce the potential for runoff and other measures to be implemented during construction;</li> <li>▶ the means of waste disposal;</li> <li>▶ the implementation of approved local plans, nonstormwater-management controls, permanent postconstruction BMPs, and inspection and maintenance responsibilities;</li> </ul>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ the pollutants that are likely to be used during construction that could be present in stormwater drainage and nonstormwater discharges, and other types of materials used for equipment operation;</li> <li>▶ spill prevention and contingency measures, including measures to prevent or cleanup spills of hazardous waste and of hazardous materials used for equipment operation, and emergency procedures for responding to spills;</li> <li>▶ personnel training requirements and procedures that will be used to ensure that workers are aware of permit requirements and proper installation methods for BMP's specified in the SWPPP; and</li> <li>▶ the appropriate personnel responsible for supervisory duties related to implementation of the SWPPP.</li> </ul> <p>Where applicable BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be in place throughout all site work and construction and shall be used in all subsequent site development activities. BMPs may include such measures as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Implementing temporary erosion-control measures in disturbed areas to minimize discharge of sediment into nearby drainage conveyances. These measures may include silt fences, staked straw bales or wattles, sediment/silt basins and traps, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary vegetation.</li> <li>▶ Establishing permanent vegetative cover to reduce erosion in areas disturbed by construction by slowing runoff velocities, trapping sediment, and enhancing filtration and transpiration.</li> <li>▶ Using drainage swales, ditches, and earth dikes to control erosion and runoff by conveying surface runoff down sloping land, intercepting and diverting runoff to a watercourse or channel, preventing sheet flow over sloped surfaces, preventing runoff accumulation at the base of a grade, and avoiding flood damage along roadways and facility infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>All construction contractors shall retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on the construction site.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading permits and improvement plans and throughout all site work and construction for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department, SWRCB, and Central Valley RWQCB.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.4-4: Long-Term Water Quality Effects from Urban Runoff.</b> The project would convert a large area of undeveloped land to residential and commercial uses, thereby changing the amount and timing of potential long-term waste discharges in stormwater runoff to Morrison Creek and other drainage courses on-site.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.4-5: Effects on Groundwater Recharge.</b> Shallow and deep percolation of rainwater and related runoff and consequent depth to groundwater could be affected locally by the development of additional impervious surface, which may limit infiltration and recharge.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<b>3.4-6: Potential Increased Risk of Flooding from Increased Stormwater Runoff.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on this portion of the project site, thereby increasing surface runoff. This increase in surface runoff would result in an increase in both the total volume and the peak discharge rate of stormwater runoff, and therefore could result in greater potential for on- and off-site flooding.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.					
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.4-7: Exposure of People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Flooding as a Result of the Failure of a Levee.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could expose people or structures to a significant risk of flooding as a result of the failure of a levee.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.4-8: Potential Temporary Construction-Related Drainage and Water Quality Effects.</b> Drainage and water quality impacts could result from construction activities at the project site with implementation of development Phase 1.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-3.					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.4-9: Long-Term Water Quality Effects of Urban Runoff.</b> Development Phase 1 would convert a large area of undeveloped land to residential uses, thereby changing the amount and timing of potential waste discharges in stormwater runoff to drainage courses on-site.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.					
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.4-10: Effects on Groundwater Recharge.</b> Shallow and deep percolation of rainwater and related runoff and consequent depth to groundwater could be affected locally by the development of additional impervious surface, which may limit infiltration and recharge.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.5 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<b>3.5-1: Increased Demand for Initial Water Supplies and Infrastructure.</b> Project implementation would result in increased demand for water supply. Because permanent water supply facilities would not be available until 2010, initial transmission facilities and an initial water supply would be required to convey water for implementation of development phases or projects before 2010.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF: 3.5-1a: Submit Proof of Gap Water Availability and Implement On- and Off-Site Infrastructure Delivery System or Assure that Adequate Financing is Secured.</b> Before the approval of any small-lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of more than 500 dwelling units, the City shall comply with Government Code Section 66473.7. Before the approval of any small-lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of 500 or fewer units, the City need not comply with Section 66473.7, or formally consult with any public water system that would provide water to the affected area; nevertheless, the City shall make a factual showing or impose conditions similar to those required by Section 66473.7 to ensure an adequate water supply for development authorized by the map.					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Before recordation of any final small-lot subdivision map, or before City approval of any similar project-specific discretionary approval or entitlement required for nonresidential uses, the project applicant(s) of that project phase shall demonstrate the availability of a long-term, reliable water supply from a public water system for the amount of development that would be authorized by the final subdivision map or project-specific discretionary nonresidential approval or entitlement. Such a demonstration shall consist of information showing that either existing sources are available or needed supplies and improvements will be in place before occupancy.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of final small-lot maps or, for nonresidential projects, before issuance of use permits, building permits, or other entitlements.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Building Department</p> <p><b>NF: Mitigation Measure 3.5-1b: Identify Alternative Water Supply Pipeline Alignments and Implement Measures to Mitigate Impacts.</b></p> <p>To implement the No Federal Action Alternative, the project applicant(s) must identify alternative water supply pipeline alignments and their connection to existing infrastructure on Sunrise Boulevard and/or Douglas Road. Implementation of alternative water pipeline alignments would be subject to separate CEQA compliance.</p> <p>It is possible that water supply pipelines could still be installed along what would have been the southern ends of Rancho Cordova Parkway and Americanos Boulevard following the same alignment shown in Exhibits 2-9a through 2-9c.</p> <p>Other potential water supply pipeline alignments could be designed to travel west from the southern portion of the project site to Sunrise Boulevard and/or travel east to Douglas Road. This alignment would connect to existing infrastructure on Sunrise Boulevard and/or Douglas Road.</p> <p>Alternative alignments have not been subject to CEQA compliance, and therefore, the full extent of impacts cannot be estimated. However, it is assumed that implementation of alternative pipeline alignments would result in significant biological resource impacts, as well as significant construction-related impacts (i.e., construction-related traffic, emission, water quality, and noise impacts). Mitigation identified in this DEIR/DEIS to reduce construction-related impacts would need to be implemented, as well as any specific permit conditions.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of the Rio del Oro Specific Plan.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Building Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.5-2: Increased Demand for Permanent Water Supplies.</b> Project implementation would increase demand on the existing water supply available to the City of Rancho Cordova.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS, No Indirect</p>	<p>No Direct, No Indirect</p>

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.5-3: Need for Permanent Water Facilities and Infrastructure.</b> Project implementation would result in increased demand for water supply. Permanent water facilities would be required to provide water to support project development.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> No further mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><i>[Note: Regarding indirect impacts, the environmental impacts of constructing facilities that would serve the Rio del Oro project were evaluated in the EIR for the 2002 Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan prepared by SCWA (2004). Measures to mitigate environmental impacts were included in the EIR, which was certified and the master plan was approved. Certain impacts would remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation measures were implemented.]</i></p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-4: Increased Demand for Interim Wastewater Conveyance Facilities.</b> Project implementation would result in increased generation of wastewater. Because permanent interceptor facilities would not be available until 2024, interim interceptor facilities would be required to convey wastewater flows for implementation of development phases or projects before 2024.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Submit Proof of Adequate Wastewater and Implement On- and Off-Site Infrastructure Service or Assure that Adequate Financing is Secured.</b> Before the approval of building permits for all project phases, the project applicant(s) shall submit proof to the City that an adequate wastewater conveyance system either has been constructed or is assured through the use of bonds or other sureties to the City's satisfaction. Both on- and off-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure sufficient to provide adequate service to Rio del Oro subdivisions shall be in place before the approval of the final map, or their financing shall be assured to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before final map approval and before issuance of building permits for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Building Department</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-5: Increased Demand for Permanent Wastewater Conveyance Facilities.</b> Project implementation would result in increased generation of wastewater. Permanent trunk and interceptor facilities would be required to convey wastewater flows to support project development.</p>	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> No further mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><i>[Note: Regarding indirect impacts, the environmental impacts of constructing trunk and interceptor sewers that would serve the project were evaluated in the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Expansion Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (County of Sacramento 2004a) and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Interceptor Master Plan 2000, Final Program Environmental Impact Report (County of Sacramento 2003). Mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts were contained in these EIRs. Both EIRs were certified and the master plans were approved. Certain impacts would remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation measures were implemented.]</i></p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.5-6: Increased Demand for Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities.</b> Project implementation would generate additional wastewater, increasing the demand for wastewater treatment facilities.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Demonstrate Adequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall demonstrate adequate capacity at the SRWTP for new wastewater flows generated by the project. This shall involve preparing a tentative map-level study and paying connection and capacity fees as identified by SRCSD and CSD-1. Approval of the final project map shall not be granted until the City verifies adequate SRWTP capacity.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of building permits for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Building and Safety, and Public Works Departments.</p> <p><i>[Note: Regarding indirect impacts related to expansion of the SRWTP, implementation of mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts is the responsibility of SRCSD. Such measures and would be implemented in accordance with the certified SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Final EIR. Impacts on air quality would remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation measures.]</i></p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.5-7: Increased Generation of Solid Waste.</b> Project implementation would increase solid-waste generation.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.5-8: Increased Demand for Electricity and Infrastructure.</b> Project implementation would increase the demand for electricity and associated infrastructure and would include the extension of existing electrical lines.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-9: Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Infrastructure.</b> Project implementation would increase the demand for natural gas and infrastructure and would include the extension of existing natural-gas pipelines.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-10: Increased Demand for Communications Service and Infrastructure.</b> Project implementation would increase the demand for communications service and infrastructure and would include the extension of communication lines.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.5-11: Increased Demand for Initial Water Supplies.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in increased demand for water supply. Because permanent water supply facilities would not be available until 2010, initial transmission facilities would be required to convey water supply for implementation of development phases or projects before 2010.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-1(a) <b>NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-1(b). <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.5-12: Increased Demand for Permanent Water Supplies.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase demand on the existing water supply available to the city of Rancho Cordova.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-13: Need for Permanent Water Facilities and Infrastructure.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in increased demand for water supply. Permanent water facilities would be required to provide water to support the Phase 1 development area.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> No further mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><i>[Note: Regarding indirect impacts, the environmental impacts of constructing facilities that would serve the Rio del Oro project were evaluated in the EIR for the 2002 Zone 40 Water Supply Master Plan prepared by SCWA (2004). Measures to mitigate environmental impacts were included in the EIR, which was certified and the master plan was approved. Certain impacts would remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation measures were implemented.]</i></p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-14: Increased Demand for Interim Wastewater Conveyance Facilities.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in increased generation of wastewater. Because permanent interceptor facilities would not be available until 2024, interim interceptor facilities would be required to convey wastewater flows from the Phase 1 development area.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-4.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-15: Increased Demand for Permanent Wastewater Conveyance Facilities.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in the need for permanent wastewater conveyance facilities to convey wastewater flows after 2024 when the Laguna Creek Interceptor is complete.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> No further mitigation measures are required.</p>	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><i>[Note: Regarding indirect impacts, the environmental impacts of constructing trunk and interceptor sewers that would serve the project were evaluated in the CSD-1 Sewerage Facilities Expansion Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (County of Sacramento 2004a) and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Interceptor Master Plan 2000, Final Program Environmental Impact Report (County of Sacramento 2003). Mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts were contained in these EIRs. Both EIRs were certified and the master plans were approved. Certain impacts would remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation measures were implemented.]</i></p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.5-16: Increased Demand for Wastewater Treatment Facilities.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would generate additional wastewater, increasing the demand for wastewater treatment facilities.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-6.</p> <p><i>[Note: Regarding indirect impacts related to expansion of the SRWTP, implementation of mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts is the responsibility of SRCSD. Such measures would be implemented in accordance with the certified SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Final EIR. Impacts on air quality would remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation measures.]</i></p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.5-17: Increased Generation of Solid Waste.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase solid-waste generation.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.5-18: Increased Demand for Electricity and Infrastructure.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase the demand for electricity and associated electrical infrastructure and would include the extension of existing electrical lines.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.5-19: Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Infrastructure.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase the demand for natural gas and associated infrastructure and would include the extension of existing natural-gas pipelines.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.5-20: Increased Demand for Communications Service and Infrastructure.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase the demand for communications service and infrastructure and would include the extension of existing communication lines.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>3.6 PUBLIC SERVICES</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<p><b>3.6-1: Temporary Obstruction of Roadways during Construction.</b> Project implementation could obstruct roadways in the project vicinity during construction, potentially obstructing or slowing emergency vehicles attempting to access the area.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Prepare and Implement Traffic Control Plans.</b> The project applicant(s) and/or project contractor(s) for all project phases shall prepare and implement traffic control plans for construction activities that may affect road rights-of-way. The traffic control plans must follow standards of the agency responsible for the affected roadway and must be signed by a professional engineer. Measures typically used in traffic control plans include advertising of planned lane closures, warning signage, a flagperson to direct traffic flows when needed, and methods to ensure continued access by emergency vehicles. During project construction, access to existing land uses shall be maintained at all times, with detours used as necessary during road closures. Traffic control plans shall be submitted to the City Public Works Department for review and approval before the approval of all project plans or permits for all project phases where implementation may cause impacts to traffic.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of all relevant plans and/or permits and during construction for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.6-2: Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.</b> Project development would result in increased demand for fire protection facilities and services, potentially resulting in the need for additional staff and equipment to maintain an adequate level of service.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Incorporate California Fire Code and SMFD Fire Prevention Standards into Project Design and Submit Project Design to SMFD for Review and Approval.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall incorporate into their project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code, SMFD Fire Prevention Standard 441.1051, and other applicable requirements based on SMFD fire prevention standards. Approved plans showing access design shall be provided to SMFD as described by Fire Prevention Standard 444.302 (“Fire Apparatus Access Roads”). These plans shall describe access-road length, dimensions, and finished surfaces for firefighting equipment.</p> <p>Improvement plans showing hydrant locations shall be submitted to the SMFD Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval. Fire hydrant details and SMFD notes shall be shown on the plans or improvement drawings as detailed in Fire Prevention Standard 441.1051. A letter from the Sacramento County Water Agency shall be obtained verifying that adequate water is available for fire flow.</p> <p>In addition, as required by the City General Plan, new commercial and industrial development, as well as multi-family residential development with five or more units must incorporate on-site fire suppression systems into project designs</p> <p>If security gates are installed at the project site, the project applicant(s) shall obtain a copy of the County Fire Code, Amendment VII, “Emergency Access Gates and Barriers.” The design of the entry shall conform to this standard.</p> <p>The City shall not authorize the occupancy of any structures until the project applicant(s) has obtained a Certificate of Release (Standard 441.105, “Certificate of Release—Residential”) from SMFD verifying that all fire prevention items have been addressed on-site to the satisfaction of SMFD.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of improvement plans and issuance of occupancy permits or final inspections for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District and City of Rancho Cordova Department of Building and Safety.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.6-3: Increased Demand for Fire Flow.</b> Project implementation would include the development of residential, commercial, school, and other uses that would require adequate available water flow for fire suppression. Lack of adequate fire flow would impede the ability of SMFD to provide effective fire suppression at the project site.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-2.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.6-4: Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities, Services, and Equipment.</b> Project development would increase the demand for police protection facilities and services, resulting in the need for additional staff and equipment to maintain an adequate level of service.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.6-5: Increased Demand for Public Elementary School Facilities and Services.</b> Project implementation would increase demand for elementary schools (grades K–5) to serve the project site.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.6-6: Increased Demand for Public Middle School and High School Facilities and Services.</b> Project implementation would increase demand for middle schools (grades 6–8) and high schools (grades 9–12) to serve the project site.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.6-7: Temporary Obstruction of Roadways during Construction.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could obstruct roadways in the project vicinity during construction activities, which could obstruct or slow emergency vehicles attempting to access the area.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-1. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.6-8: Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in increased demand for fire protection facilities, systems, equipment, and services, potentially resulting in the need for additional staff and equipment to maintain an adequate level of service.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-2. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.6-9: Increased Demand for Fire Flow.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would include the construction of residential, commercial, school, and other uses that would require adequate available water flow for fire suppression. Lack of adequate fire flow would impede the ability of SMFD to provide effective fire suppression at the project site.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-2. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.6-10: Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities, Services, and Equipment.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase the demand for police protection facilities, services, and equipment, resulting in the need for additional staff and equipment to maintain an adequate level of service.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.6-11: Increased Demand for Public Elementary School Facilities and Services.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase demand for elementary schools (grades K–5) to serve the project site.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.6-12: Increased Demand for Public Middle School and High School Facilities and Services.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would increase demand for middle schools (grades 6–8) and high schools (grades 9–12) to serve the project site.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.7 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<b>3.7-1: Potential Temporary, Short-Term Construction-Related Erosion.</b> Construction activities during project implementation would involve extensive grading and movement of earth, which could expose soils to erosion and result in the loss of topsoil.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Prepare and Implement a Grading and Erosion Control Plan.</b> A grading and erosion control plan shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer retained by the project applicant(s) for all project phases. The grading and erosion control plan shall be submitted to the City Department of Public Works before the issuance of grading permits for all new development within the project site. The plan shall be consistent with the City’s Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance as well as the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and shall include the site-specific grading associated with development for all project phases. The plan shall include the location, implementation schedule, and maintenance schedule of all erosion and sediment control measures, a description of measures designed to control dust and stabilize the construction-site road and entrance, and a description of the location and methods of storage and disposal of construction materials. Erosion and sediment control measures could include the use of detention basins, berms, swales, wattles, and silt fencing. Stabilization of construction entrances to minimize trackout (control dust) is commonly achieved by installing filter fabric and crushed rock to a depth of approximately 1 foot. The project applicant(s) shall ensure that the construction contractor is responsible for securing a source of					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>transportation and deposition of excavated materials. Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 (discussed in Section 3.4, “Drainage, Hydrology, and Water Quality”) will help reduce erosion related impacts.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the issuance of grading permits for all project phases, and throughout project construction.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department, Building and Safety Department, and Planning Departments.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.7-2: Potential Damage to Structures from Seismic Activity and Related Geologic Hazards.</b> The project site is located in an area of low seismic activity and structures at the site would be designed in accordance with CBC standards.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.7-3: Potential Damage to Structures from Construction on Unstable Soils.</b> Portions of the project site are underlain by soils that have a moderate to high potential for expansion when wet, or are underlain by piles of unstable cobbles and slickens soils from dredge mining activities. Construction in any of these soils can cause damage to overlying structures.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: 3.7-3a: Prepare a Geotechnical Study and Implement All Applicable Recommendations.</b> Before the approval of grading plans for all project phases, a final geotechnical subsurface investigation report shall be prepared by the project applicant(s) for the proposed development and shall be submitted to the City. The final geotechnical engineering report shall address and make recommendations on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ site preparation;</li> <li>▶ appropriate sources and types of fill;</li> <li>▶ potential need for soil amendments;</li> <li>▶ road, pavement, and parking areas;</li> <li>▶ structural foundations, including retaining wall design;</li> <li>▶ grading practices;</li> <li>▶ erosion/winterization;</li> <li>▶ special problems discovered on-site (e.g., groundwater and expansive/unstable soils); and</li> <li>▶ slope stability.</li> </ul>	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>The geotechnical investigation shall include subsurface testing of soil and groundwater conditions and determine appropriate foundation designs that are consistent with the CBC. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive soils or other soil problems that would lead to structural defect if not corrected, additional investigations may be required for subdivisions before building permits are issued. This shall be so noted on the project grading plans. Recommendations contained in the geotechnical engineering report shall be noted on the grading plans and implemented as appropriate before the issuance of building permits. Design and construction of all new development in all phases of the proposed project shall be in accordance with the CBC and the County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance. It is the responsibility of the project applicant(s) to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: 3.7-3b: Ensure On-Site Monitoring by a Geotechnical Engineer.</b> All earthwork shall be monitored by a geotechnical engineer retained by the project applicant(s) for all project phases. The geotechnical engineer shall provide oversight during all excavation, placement of fill, and disposal of materials removed from and deposited on the subject site and other sites. Before export/import of any soil to/from an off-site location, the project applicant(s) shall obtain a grading permit from the City Department of Public Works.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before issuance of grading permit and during construction activities for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.7-4: Loss of Mineral Resources.</b> The project site is located within the Sacramento-Fairfield Production-Consumption Region designated by CDMG and is classified as MRZ-2, an area containing significant mineral deposits (including Portland Cement concrete-grade aggregate).</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, & Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.7-5: Potential Temporary Short-Term Construction-Related Erosion.</b> Construction activities during development Phase 1 would involve extensive grading and movement of earth, which could expose soils to erosion and result in the loss of topsoil.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 and Mitigation Measure 3.4-3. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.7-6: Potential Damage to Structures from Seismic Activity and Related Ground Failure.</b> The Phase 1 development area is located in an area of low seismic activity and structures at the site would be designed in accordance with CBC standards.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.7-7: Potential Damage to Structures from Construction on Expansive Soils.</b> The Phase 1 development area is underlain by soils that have a moderate to high potential for expansion when wet. Expansive soils may cause differential and cyclical foundation movements that can cause damage and/or distress to overlying structures.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-3a and 3.7-3b. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, Indirect & LTS(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.7-8: Loss of Mineral Resources.</b> The Phase 1 development area is within the Sacramento-Fairfield Production-Consumption Region designated by CDMG, and is classified as MRZ-2, an area containing significant mineral deposits (including Portland Cement concrete-grade aggregate).</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, & Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>3.8 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<b>3.8-1: Potential Disturbance of Previously Unknown Paleontological Resources During Earthmoving Activities.</b> Construction activities could disturb previously unknown paleontological resources at the project site.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<b>3.8-2: Potential Disturbance of Previously Unknown Paleontological Resources During Earthmoving Activities.</b> Construction activities within the Phase 1 development area could disturb previously unknown paleontological resources.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<b>3.9-1: Loss or Damage to Recorded Cultural Resource Sites.</b> Construction activities during project implementation could result in the loss of known cultural resources.	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.9-2: Loss of or Damage to Historic Sites, Buildings, and Structures.</b> Construction activities during project implementation would result in the loss of known historic sites, buildings, and structures.	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Record Eligible Historic Resources to Historic American Building Survey Standards and on Appropriate State Forms.</b> If the Solid Propellant Assembly Area and the Sigma Test Area structures and their earthen berms must be demolished for project implementation, built elements of the eligible districts shall be documented by the project applicant(s) according to Historic American Building Survey (HABS) standards and recorded as cultural resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) Series 523 Primary and Archaeological Site records, and other appropriate forms from State Parks. The project applicant(s) shall have this documentation completed before approval of demolition permits for any of the historic structures or features.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of demolition permits for the historic structures.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.9-3: Potential Damage to As-Yet-Undiscovered Prehistoric Sites or Native American Burials.</b> Construction and earthmoving activities during project implementation could result in damage to as-yet-unknown cultural resources, including prehistoric sites or Native American burials.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Provide Preconstruction Worker Education and Stop Potentially Damaging Work if Human Remains are Uncovered during Construction.</b> Before initiation of construction or ground-disturbing activities associated with the project, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall require all construction personnel to be alerted to the possibility of buried cultural resources. The general contractor and its supervisory staff shall be responsible for monitoring the construction project for disturbance of cultural resources. Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during any development activities, work shall be suspended and the City shall be notified immediately. The project applicant(s) shall retain a City-approved qualified archaeologist who shall conduct a field investigation of the specific site and recommend mitigation deemed necessary for the protection or recovery of any cultural resource concluded by the archaeologist to represent historical resources or unique archaeological resources. The City shall be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation if it is determined by the City to be feasible in light of approved land uses. The project applicant(s) shall implement the approved mitigation before the resumption of construction activities at the construction site.</p> <p>In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during construction at the project site, work within 50 feet of the remains shall be suspended immediately, and the City and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined by the County Coroner to be Native American, the NAHC shall be notified within 24 hours of that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]), and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The NAHC will then assign a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to serve as the main point of Native American contact and consultation. Following the coroner's findings, the MLD and the archaeologist shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The project applicant(s) shall be required to implement any feasible, timely-formulated mitigation deemed necessary for the protection of the burial remains. Construction work in the vicinity of the burials shall not resume until the mitigation is completed. This measure shall be included in all grading and improvement plans for all project phases.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans and during all ground-disturbing activities for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.9-4: Loss of or Damage to Recorded Cultural Resource Sites.</b> Construction activities during development Phase 1 could result in the loss of known cultural resources.</p>	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, Indirect & LTS	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.9-5: Loss of or Damage to Historic Sites, Buildings, and Structures.</b> Construction activities during development Phase 1 could result in the loss of known historic sites, buildings, and structures.</p>	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.9-6: Potential Damage to As-Yet-Undiscovered Prehistoric Sites or Native American Burials.</b> Construction and other earthmoving activities during Phase 1 of the project could result in damage to as-yet-unknown cultural resources, including prehistoric sites or Native American burials.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Monitor Construction in Culturally Sensitive Areas and Stop Potentially Damaging Work if Archaeological Sites or Human Remains are Uncovered during Construction.</b> Because areas of increased cultural sensitivity have been identified as a result of Native American contacts, the project applicant(s) of Phase 1 shall retain a City-approved qualified professional archaeologist to provide on-site monitoring during construction activities in these sensitive areas, as depicted in Exhibit 3.9-1. If the archaeologist notes unusual amounts of bone, stone, shell, burned soils, or other possible indications of buried archaeological resources, construction in the vicinity shall be halted until the find can be assessed. The archaeologist shall conduct a field investigation of the specific site and shall recommend mitigation deemed necessary for the protection or recovery of any cultural resource concluded by the archaeologist to represent historical resources or unique archaeological resources. The City shall be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation if it is determined by the City to be feasible in light of approved land uses. The project applicant(s) shall implement the approved mitigation before the resumption of construction activities at the construction site.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during construction at the project site, work within 50 feet of the remains shall be suspended immediately, and the City and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined by the County Coroner to be Native American, the NAHC shall be notified within 24 hours of that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]), and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The NAHC will then assign an MLD to serve as the main point of Native American contact and consultation. Following the coroner’s findings, the MLD and the archaeologist shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and shall take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The project applicant(s) of Phase 1 shall be required to implement any feasible, timely-formulated mitigation deemed necessary for the protection of the burial remains. Construction work in the vicinity of the burials shall not resume until the mitigation is completed. Implementation of Mitigation measure 3.9-3 will help reduce potential impacts to cultural resources.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading and improvement plans and during all ground-disturbing activities in the sensitive areas of Phase 1.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<b>3.10 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Project Level for the Entire Site)</b>					
<p><b>3.10-1: Loss and Degradation of Jurisdictional Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States, and Waters of the State.</b> Implementation of the project would result in fill of jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands subject to USACE jurisdiction under the federal Clean Water Act, and the substantial loss and degradation of nonjurisdictional wetland habitats protected under state and local regulations. Wetlands and other waters of the United States that would be affected by project implementation include vernal pools, seasonal wetland swales, ponds, and seasonal drainages.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect & SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: 3.10-1a: Secure Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit and Implement All Permit Conditions, and Ensure No Net Loss of Wetlands, Other Waters of the United States, and Associated Functions and Values.</b> Before the approval of grading and improvement plans and before any groundbreaking activity associated with each distinct project phase, the project applicant(s) for each project phase requiring the fill of wetlands or other waters of the United States or waters of the state shall obtain all necessary permits under Sections 401 and 404 of the CWA or the State’s Porter-Cologne Act for the respective phase. The project applicant(s) shall commit to replace, restore, or enhance on a “no net loss” basis (in accordance with USACE, the Central Valley RWQCB, and the Natural Resources Element of the City General Plan) the acreage of all wetlands and other waters of the United States subject to USACE jurisdiction and waters of the state subject to RWQCB jurisdiction and the City General Plan that would be removed, lost, and/or degraded with implementation of project plans for that phase. Wetland habitat shall be restored, enhanced, and/or replaced at an acreage and location and by methods agreeable to USACE, the Central Valley RWQCB, and the City, as appropriate depending on agency jurisdiction, and as determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1                      Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>To accomplish this mitigation, the project applicant(s) shall take the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ As part of the Section 404 permitting process, a draft wetland mitigation and monitoring plan has been developed for the project (Appendix C) by ECORP on behalf of the project applicant(s). Before any ground-disturbing activities that would adversely affect wetlands, and before engaging in mitigation activities associated with each phase of development, the project applicant(s) shall submit the draft wetland mitigation and monitoring plan to USACE, the Central Valley RWQCB, and the City for review and approval of those portions of the plan over which they have jurisdiction. Once the mitigation and monitoring plan is approved and implemented, mitigation monitoring will continue for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the performance standards identified in the approved mitigation and monitoring plan have been met, whichever is longer.</li> </ul> <p>The plan shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the City, in accordance with the City’s Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, as well as to the satisfaction of those agencies with jurisdiction over all or portions of the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ In conjunction with preparation and implementation of an approved wetland mitigation and monitoring plan, the project applicant(s) shall prepare and submit plans for the creation of jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, at an adequate mitigation ratio to offset the aquatic functions and values that would be lost at the project site, account for the temporal loss of habitat, and contain an adequate margin of safety to reflect anticipated success. The mitigation and monitoring plans must demonstrate how the aquatic functions and values that would be lost through project implementation will be replaced. The habitat mitigation and monitoring plan for jurisdictional wetland features will need to be consistent with USACE’s December 30, 2004, <i>Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Proposal Guidelines</i>. The wetland mitigation and monitoring plan shall also mitigate impacts on vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat, and shall describe specific method(s) to be implemented to avoid and/or mitigate any off-site project-related impacts. The wetland creation section of the habitat mitigation and monitoring plan shall include the following:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• target areas for creation;</li> <li>• a complete biological assessment of the existing resources in the target areas;</li> <li>• specific creation and restoration plans for each target area;</li> <li>• performance standards for success that will illustrate that the compensation ratios are met; and</li> <li>• a monitoring plan, including schedule and annual-report format.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ For each phase of development, including off-site project-related impacts, the project applicant(s) shall secure the permits and regulatory approvals described below and shall implement all permit conditions. For each respective phase, all permits, regulatory approvals, and permit conditions for effects on wetland habitats shall be secured before implementation of any grading activities within 250 feet of waters of the United States or wetland habitats, including waters of the state, that potentially support federally listed species. The setback may be reduced to a distance approved by the City and USFWS if a wetland avoidance plan is developed and implemented by a qualified biologist. The wetland avoidance plan must be approved by USFWS and the City and shall demonstrate that all direct and indirect impacts on wetlands will be avoided. Project phases in upland areas with no wetlands or waters of the United States within 250 feet, and no overland hydrologic flow patterns, the disturbance of which may affect such waters, may begin construction before these particular permits are obtained. Buffers around wetlands that do not support federally listed species shall be a minimum of 50 feet from the edge of these features in accordance with conditions of the NPDES permit and associated best</li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>management practices (BMPs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorization to place dredged or fill material into waters of the United States shall be secured from USACE through the CWA Section 404 permitting process before any fill is placed in jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the United States. USACE has determined that the project will require an individual permit. In its final stage and once approved by USACE, the proposed mitigation and monitoring plan for the project is expected to detail proposed wetland restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement activities that would ensure no net loss of aquatic functions and values in the project vicinity. Approval and implementation of the wetland mitigation and monitoring plan shall fully mitigate all impacts on jurisdictional waters of the United States, including jurisdictional wetlands. In addition to USACE approval, approval by the City and the Central Valley RWQCB, as appropriate depending on agency jurisdiction, and as determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes, will also be required. To satisfy the requirements of the City and the Central Valley RWQCB, mitigation of impacts on nonjurisdictional wetlands beyond the jurisdiction of USACE shall be included in the same mitigation and monitoring plan. All mitigation requirements determined through this process shall be implemented before grading plans are approved. Wetland mitigation must be approved before any impacts on wetlands commence.</li> <li>Water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA will be required before issuance of a Section 404 permit. Before construction in any areas containing wetland features, the project applicant(s) shall obtain water quality certification for the applicable phase of the project. Any measures required as part of the issuance of water quality certification shall be implemented.</li> </ul> <p>If Section 401 and 404 permit requirements ensure no net loss of all wetland features, including vernal pools, and these requirements are addressed before any ground-disturbing activities, no additional mitigation will be required by the City. Written approval from the City indicating that these requirements fulfill all no-net-loss obligations must be obtained before the approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activities in any project phase containing wetland features.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activities for any project development phase containing wetland features. The mitigation and monitoring plan must be approved before any impact on wetlands can occur. Mitigation shall be implemented on an ongoing basis throughout and after construction, as required.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board; and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, as appropriate depending on agency jurisdiction, and as determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes and in compliance with the City's Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance.</p> <p><b>NF:</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall commit to replace, restore, or enhance on a "no net loss" basis (in accordance with the Central Valley RWQCB and the Natural Resources Element of the City General Plan) the acreage of all waters of the state. Waters of the state include all nonjurisdictional wetlands that would be removed, lost, and/or degraded with implementation of project plans for that phase that require permitting from the resource agencies. Wetland habitat shall be restored, enhanced, and/or replaced at an acreage and location and by methods agreeable to the Central Valley RWQCB and the City.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF 3.10-1b: Include in Drainage Plans All Wetlands that Remain On-Site.</b> To minimize indirect effects on water quality and wetland hydrology, the project applicant(s) of each project phase shall include drainage plans in their improvement plans and shall submit the drainage plans to the City Public Works</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1                      Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Department for review and approval. Before approval of these improvement plans, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall commit to implement all measures in its drainage plans to avoid and minimize erosion and runoff into Morrison Creek and all wetlands that would remain on-site. Appropriate runoff controls such as berms, storm gates, detention basins, overflow collection areas, filtration systems, and sediment traps shall be implemented to control siltation and the potential discharge of pollutants. For runoff during construction, see Section 3.4, "Drainage, Hydrology, and Water Quality," for a further discussion of NPDES (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan).</p> <p>The project shall result in no net change to peak flows into Morrison Creek and associated tributaries. The project applicant(s) shall establish a baseline of conditions for drainage on-site. The baseline-flow conditions will be established for 2-, 5-, 10-, and 20-year storm events. These baseline conditions shall be used to develop monitoring standards for the stormwater system on the project site. The baseline conditions, monitoring standards, and a monitoring program shall be submitted to USACE and the City for their approval. The engineered channel and detention basins shall be designed and constructed to ensure that the performance standards are met. The discharge site into Morrison Creek and associated tributaries shall be monitored to ensure that preproject conditions are being met. Corrective measures shall be implemented as necessary. The mitigation measures will be satisfied when the monitoring standards are met for 5 consecutive years without undertaking corrective measures to meet the performance standard.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of improvements and drainage plans, and on an ongoing basis throughout and after project construction, as required for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; and City of Rancho Cordova Public Works and Planning Departments.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.10-2: Loss and Degradation of Sensitive Natural Communities.</b> Implementation of the project would result in the substantial loss and degradation of riparian habitat and other natural communities considered sensitive by state and local resource agencies and requiring consideration under CEQA. Sensitive natural communities that would be affected by implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative or the High Density Alternative include willow scrub, mixed riparian scrub, willow woodland, and cottonwood-willow riparian forest.</p>	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & LTS(m), Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect LTS	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: 3.10-2a: Secure and Implement Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement.</b> A Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from DFG will be required for construction affecting the bed and bank of Morrison Creek. As a condition of issuance of the Streambed Alteration Agreement, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall prepare a habitat mitigation plan. The wetland mitigation and monitoring plan currently being developed may be suitable to DFG, if it is expanded to adequately cover impacts on the stream channel of Morrison Creek and impacts on on-site riparian habitat at adequate ratios as determined by DFG, subject to limitations on its authority set forth in Fish and Game Code section 1600 et seq.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Any conditions of issuance of the Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be implemented as part of project construction activities that adversely affect the bed and bank and current and historic riparian habitat associated with Morrison Creek that is within the area subject to DFG jurisdiction. The agreement shall be executed by the project applicant(s) and DFG before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any construction activities in any project phase that could potentially affect the bed and bank of Morrison Creek and its associated current and historic riparian habitat.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading or improvement plans or any construction activities (including clearing and grubbing) that affect the bed and bank or current and historic riparian habitat associated with Morrison Creek.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> California Department of Fish and Game.</p> <p><b>NF:</b> No mitigation measures are required because the No Federal Action Alternative would not result in alteration to the bed or bank of Morrison Creek. Therefore, a Streambed Alteration Agreement from DFG would not be needed as it would under the action alternatives.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: 3.10-2b: Preserve, Restore, or Create Riparian Habitat at Satisfactory Ratio to Fulfill Local Planning Framework Requirements.</b> Goal NR.1 of the City General Plan calls for the protection and preservation of the diverse wildlife and plant habitats in Rancho Cordova and incorporation of “large interconnected wooded open space corridors in new development areas to provide movement corridors, and nesting sites for migratory songbirds and raptors.” Portions of the on-site riparian habitat such as the 57 acres of cottonwood willow riparian woodland and 4 acres of willow scrub have been determined to provide important habitat for wildlife, both at present and in the long term, because of existing conditions that support the perpetuation of these habitats. To implement Goal NR.1, a habitat mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed and implemented to replace the 57 acres of cottonwood willow riparian woodland and 4 acres of willow scrub at no-net-loss acreage to preserve the overall habitat functions and values. Elements of the habitat mitigation and monitoring plan may include habitat preservation on-site, enhancement of on-site riparian habitat types, or enhancement or protection of habitat off-site. The specific ratios of habitat lost to habitat created shall be determined by the City in consultation with DFG as a trustee agency protecting the wildlife resources of the state. The ratios shall be consistent with the City’s policy and shall be adequate to protect and preserve the diverse resources in the City.</p> <p>Any conditions of issuance of the riparian mitigation and monitoring plan shall be implemented as part of project construction activities that adversely affect riparian habitat. The riparian habitat mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed by the project applicant(s) and submitted to the City before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any construction activities in any project phase that could potentially affect the cottonwood willow riparian woodland and willow scrub on-site. The cottonwood-willow riparian forest habitat and willow woodland shall be either preserved or replaced on- or off-site on a no-net-loss basis because it provides functioning riparian habitat that is self-sustaining at the present time. If preservation of this on-site habitat type is chosen, the hydrology that supports this habitat must also be preserved to ensure the long-term viability of this habitat type.</p> <p>The remainder of the riparian habitat on the project site consists mostly of old senescent trees and shrubs and does not appear to be regenerating. It is likely that portions of these communities would not persist at the site under the current environmental conditions even without project implementation. Because of the poor quality of the majority of the riparian habitat on the project site, the project mitigation for this riparian habitat shall be limited to the replacement and/or restoration of</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>its current function and value (which consists of nesting and foraging habitat for raptors and other birds, as well as foraging habitat and shelter for numerous common wildlife species) as determined acceptable to the City in consultation with DFG as a trustee agency.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading or improvement plans or any construction activities and before removal of any riparian vegetation as required for any project phase.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department in consultation with California Department of Fish and Game.</p> <p><b>NF:</b> No mitigation measures are required because the No Federal Action Alternative would not result in adverse effects on riparian habitat in addition to those habitats protected and addressed under City policy.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.10-3: Loss of Oak Woodland and Individual Oak Trees.</b> Project implementation would result in the loss of 3 acres of oak woodland habitat and would include the removal of 47 individual native oak trees with a diameter at breast height (dbh) of 6 inches or greater.</p>	<p>Direct and LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct and LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct and LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct and LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>No Direct, No Indirect</p>
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Perform Tree Survey and Avoid or Replace Native Oak Trees and Other Native Trees Scattered Throughout the Project Site.</b> Before the approval of any development in areas identified to contain trees, the City shall require that a determinate survey of tree species and size be performed. If any native oaks or other native trees of 6 inches or greater dbh, multitrunk native oaks or native trees of 10 inches or greater dbh, or nonnative trees of 18 inches or greater dbh that have been determined by a qualified professional to be in good health are found to exist in the development area, such trees shall be avoided if feasible. If such trees cannot feasibly be avoided, the project applicant(s) for all project phases containing trees shall do one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ All such trees that will be removed or otherwise damaged by project implementation shall be replaced at an inch-for-inch ratio. A replacement tree planting plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional or licensed landscape architect and shall be submitted to the City for approval before removal of trees; OR</li> <li>▶ The project applicant(s) shall submit a mitigation plan that provides for complete mitigation of the removal of such trees in coordination with the City. The mitigation plan shall be subject to City approval.</li> </ul> <p>Trees mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures associated with riparian habitat impacts shall not be subject to this mitigation measure. If the City adopts a tree preservation ordinance at any time in the future, any future development activities shall be subject to that ordinance instead.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any development in any project phase that contains areas that have been identified to contain trees.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.10-4: Loss and Degradation of Habitat for Special-Status Wildlife.</b> Implementation of the project would result in the loss and degradation of habitat for a number of special-status wildlife species, including vernal pool invertebrates, VELB, Swainson’s hawk, and other raptors.	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: 3.10-4a: Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Implement Permit Conditions.</b> No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for federally listed vernal pool invertebrates, or within adequate buffer areas (250 feet or lesser distance deemed sufficiently protective by a qualified biologist with approval from USFWS), until a biological opinion (BO) has been issued by USFWS and the project applicant(s) have abided by conditions in the BO (including conservation and minimization measures) intended to be completed before on-site construction. Conservation and minimization measures are likely to include preparation of supporting documentation describing methods to protect existing vernal pools during and after project construction, a detailed monitoring plan, and reporting requirements.</p> <p>The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall identify mitigation for the impacts on vernal pools and other seasonal wetland habitats that support or potentially support federally listed vernal pool invertebrates that will ensure no net loss of habitat (acreage and function) for these species in the Laguna Formation. The project applicant(s) shall complete and implement a habitat mitigation and monitoring plan that will compensate for the loss of acreage, function, and value of affected vernal pool habitat. The habitat mitigation and monitoring plan shall be consistent with guidance provided in <i>Programmatic Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on Issuance of 404 Permits for Projects with Relatively Small Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office, California</i> (USFWS 1996) and the SSCHCP or shall provide an alternative approach that is acceptable to the City, USACE, and USFWS and accomplishes no net loss of habitat.</p> <p>The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall ensure that there is sufficient upland habitat within the target areas for creation and restoration of vernal pools and vernal pool complexes to provide ecosystem health. The land used to satisfy this mitigation measure shall be protected through a conservation easement acceptable to USACE, the City, and USFWS.</p> <p>The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall identify the extent of indirectly affected vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat, either by identifying all such habitat within 250 feet of project construction activities or by providing an alternative technical evaluation. If a lesser distance is pursued, this distance shall be approved by USFWS. The project applicant(s) shall preserve 2 wetted acres of vernal pool habitat for each wetted acre of any indirectly affected vernal pool habitat. This mitigation shall occur before the approval of any grading or improvement plans for any project phase that would allow work within 250 feet of such habitat, and before any ground-disturbing activity within 250 feet of the habitat. The project applicant(s) will not be required to complete this mitigation measure for direct or indirect impacts that have already been mitigated to the satisfaction of USFWS through another BO or mitigation plan.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>A standard set of BMPs shall be applied to construction occurring in areas within 250 feet of off-site vernal pool habitat, or within any lesser distance deemed adequate by a qualified biologist (with approval from USFWS) to constitute a sufficient buffer from such habitat. Refer to Section 3.4, “Drainage, Hydrology, and Water Quality,” for the details of BMPs to be implemented.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities within 250 feet of said habitat, and on an ongoing basis throughout construction as applicable for all project phases as required by the mitigation plan, BO, and/or BMPs.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NF:</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall obtain an incidental take permit under Section 10(a) of ESA. No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for federally listed vernal pool invertebrates, or within adequate buffer areas (250 feet or lesser distance deemed sufficiently protective by a qualified biologist with approval from USFWS), until a BO has been issued by USFWS and the project applicant(s) have abided by conditions in the BO (including all conservation and minimization measures). Conservation and minimization measures are likely to include preparation of supporting documentation describing methods to protect existing vernal pools during and after project construction.</p> <p>Under the No Federal Action Alternative, interagency consultation under Section 7 of ESA would not occur; therefore, the project applicant(s) would be required to develop a habitat conservation plan to mitigate impacts on federally listed vernal pool invertebrates, or participate in the SSCHCP, if available. The project applicant(s) shall complete and implement, or participate in, a habitat conservation plan that shall compensate for the loss of acreage, function, and value of affected vernal pool habitat. The habitat conservation plan shall be consistent with the goals of the <i>Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon</i> (USFWS 2005) and must be approved by USFWS.</p> <p>The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall ensure that there is sufficient upland habitat within the target areas for creation and restoration of vernal pools and vernal pool complexes to provide ecosystem health. The land used to satisfy this mitigation measure shall be protected through a fee title or conservation easement acceptable to the City and USFWS.</p> <p>The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall identify the extent of indirectly affected vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat, either by identifying all such habitat within 250 feet of project construction activities or by providing an alternative technical evaluation in support of a lesser indirect impact distance. If a lesser distance is pursued, this distance shall be approved by USFWS. The project applicant(s) shall preserve 2 wetted acres of vernal pool habitat for each wetted acre of any indirectly affected vernal pool habitat. This mitigation shall occur before the approval of any grading or improvement plans for any project phase that would allow work within 250 feet of such habitat, and before any ground-disturbing activity within 250 feet of the habitat. The project applicant(s) will not be required to complete this mitigation measure for direct or indirect impacts that have already been mitigated to the satisfaction of USFWS through another BO or mitigation plan.</p> <p>A standard set of BMPs shall be applied to construction occurring in areas within 250 feet of off-site vernal pool habitat, or within any lesser distance deemed adequate by a qualified biologist (with approval from USFWS) to constitute a sufficient buffer from such habitat. Refer to Section 3.4, “Drainage, Hydrology, and Water Quality,” of this DEIR/DEIS for the details of BMPs to be implemented.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities within 250 feet of said habitat, and on an ongoing basis throughout construction as applicable for all project phases as required by the habitat conservation plan, BO, and/or BMPs.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Implement Mitigation Measures 3.10-1a and 3.10-1b.</b></p> <p><b>NF, NP: No mitigation measures are required.</b></p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM 3.10-4b: Obtain Incidental Take Permit for Impacts on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.</b> No project construction shall proceed in areas containing VELB habitat (i.e., elderberry shrubs) until a BO has been issued by USFWS, and the project applicant(s) for all project phases have abided by all pertinent conditions in the BO relating to the proposed construction, including conservation and minimization measures, intended to be completed before on-site construction. Conservation and minimization measures are likely to include preparation of supporting documentation that describes methods for relocation of existing shrubs and maintaining existing shrubs and other vegetation in the preserve.</p> <p>Relocation of existing elderberry shrubs and planting of new elderberry seedlings shall be implemented on a no-net-loss basis. Detailed information on monitoring success of relocated and planted shrubs and measures to compensate (should success criteria not be met) would also likely be required in the BO. Ratios for mitigation of VELB habitat will ultimately be determined through the ESA Section 7 consultation process with USFWS, but shall be a minimum of “no net loss.” A VELB mitigation plan is currently being developed through ESA Section 7 consultation with USFWS. The mitigation plan will also address the proposed delisting of VELB and any mitigation to be implemented if the delisting occurs prior to project implementation due to requirements under CEQA. Implementation of this plan would satisfy mitigation requirements for the removal of elderberry savanna, a sensitive habitat as identified by DFG, as well as single elderberry shrubs. A copy of the USFWS-approved mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of VELB habitat for all project phases.</p> <p>Should delisting of VELB occur, a mitigation plan that would compensate for the removal of elderberry savanna, a sensitive habitat as identified by DFG, would still be required. The mitigation plan shall be submitted to and approved by DFG and the City before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activities that would affect elderberry savanna for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of VELB habitat as applicable for all project phases, and on an ongoing basis as required by the mitigation plan and/or BO.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Game (if VELB delisted); and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NF:</b> As long as VELB remains a species protected under ESA, the project applicant(s) shall obtain an incidental take permit under Section 10(a) of ESA for VELB. No project construction shall proceed in areas containing VELB habitat (i.e., elderberry shrubs) until a BO has been issued by USFWS, and the project applicant(s) for all project phases have abided by all pertinent conditions in the BO relating to the proposed construction, including all conservation and</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>minimization measures. Conservation and minimization measures are likely to include preparation of supporting documentation that describes methods for relocation of existing shrubs and maintaining existing shrubs and other vegetation in the preserve.</p> <p>Under the No Federal Action Alternative, interagency consultation under Section 7 of ESA would not occur; therefore, the project applicant(s) would be required to develop a habitat conservation plan to mitigate impacts on VELB, or participate in the SSCHCP, if available. If participation in the SSCHCP is not available or not chosen, the project applicant(s) shall complete and implement, or participate in, a habitat conservation plan that will compensate for the loss of VELB habitat. Relocation of existing elderberry shrubs and planting of new elderberry seedlings shall be implemented on a no-net-loss basis. Detailed information on monitoring success of relocated and planted shrubs and measures to compensate (should success criteria not be met) would also likely be required in the BO. Ratios for mitigation of VELB habitat will ultimately be determined through the ESA Section 10(a) consultation process with USFWS, but shall be a minimum of “no net loss.” Based on the current (dated) knowledge of the number of shrubs on-site and the latest VELB preservation guidelines, it is expected that approximately 3,088 seedlings would need to be planted over an area of approximately 25 acres to fulfill VELB mitigation requirements and no net loss of habitat.</p> <p>Should delisting of VELB occur, a mitigation plan that would compensate for the removal of elderberry savanna, a sensitive habitat as identified by DFG, would still be required. The mitigation plan shall be submitted to and approved by DFG and the City before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activities that would affect elderberry savanna for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of VELB habitat as applicable for all project phases, and on an ongoing basis as required by the habitat conservation plan and/or BO.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> California Department of Fish and Game (if VELB delisted), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF 3.10-4c: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Nesting Raptors and, if Found, Establish Appropriate Buffers.</b> To mitigate impacts on Swainson’s hawk and other raptors (including burrowing owl) for all project phases, the project applicant(s) shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys and to identify active nests on and within 0.5 mile of the project site and active burrows on the project site. The surveys shall be conducted before the approval of grading and/or improvement plans (as applicable) and no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction for all project phases. To the extent feasible, guidelines provided in <i>Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson’s Hawk Nesting Surveys in the Central Valley</i> (Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000) shall be followed. If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>If active nests are found, impacts on nesting Swainson’s hawks and other raptors shall be avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers around the nests. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that any young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. DFG guidelines recommend implementation of 0.25- or 0.5-mile buffers, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and the City, in consultation with DFG, determine that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities will be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.</p> <p>If active burrows are found, a mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval before any ground-disturbing activities. The City shall consult with DFG. The mitigation plan may consist of installation of one-way doors on all burrows to allow owls to exit, but not reenter, and construction of artificial</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>burrows within the project vicinity, as needed. If active burrows contain eggs and/or young, no construction shall occur within 50 feet of the burrow until young have fledged. Once it is confirmed that there are no owls inside burrows, these burrows may be collapsed.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities, and during project construction as applicable for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: 3.10-4d: Prepare and Implement a Swainson’s Hawk Mitigation Plan.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall implement one of the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Before the approval of grading and improvement plans or before any ground-disturbing activities, whichever occurs first, the project applicant(s) shall preserve, to the satisfaction of the City, suitable Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to ensure 1:1 mitigation of habitat value for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat lost as a result of the project, as determined by the City in consultation with DFG and a qualified biologist.</li> </ul> <p>The 1:1 habitat value shall be based on Swainson’s hawk nesting distribution and an assessment of habitat quality, availability, and use within the City’s Planning Area. If specific data for Rancho Cordova’s Swainson’s hawk habitat is not available at the time that this mitigation measure is being implemented, the mitigation ratio shall be consistent with the 1994 DFG Swainson’s Hawk Guidelines included in the <i>Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks (Buteo swainsoni) in the Central Valley of California</i>. Such mitigation shall be accomplished through either the transfer of fee title or perpetual conservation easement. The mitigation land shall be located within the known foraging area and within Sacramento County. The City, in consultation with DFG, will determine the appropriateness of the mitigation land.</p> <p>Before approval of such proposed mitigation, the City shall consult with DFG regarding the appropriateness of the mitigation. If mitigation is accomplished through conservation easement, then such an easement shall ensure the continued management of the land to maintain Swainson’s hawk foraging values, including but not limited to ongoing agricultural uses and the maintenance of all existing water rights associated with the land. The conservation easement shall be recordable and shall prohibit any activity that substantially impairs or diminishes the land’s capacity as suitable Swainson’s hawk habitat.</p> <p>The project applicant(s) shall transfer said Swainson’s hawk mitigation land, through either conservation easement or fee title, to a third-party, nonprofit conservation organization (Conservation Operator), with the City and DFG named as third-party beneficiaries. The Conservation Operator shall be a qualified conservation easement land manager that manages land as its primary function. Additionally, the Conservation Operator shall be a tax-exempt nonprofit conservation organization that meets the criteria of Civil Code Section 815.3(a) and shall be selected or approved by the City, in consultation with DFG. The City, in consultation with DFG and the Conservation Operator, shall approve the content and form of the conservation easement. The City, DFG, and the Conservation Operator shall each have the power to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. The Conservation Operator shall monitor the easement in perpetuity to assure compliance with the terms of the easement.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>The project applicant(s), in consultation with the City, DFG, and the Conservation Operator, shall establish an endowment or some other financial mechanism that is sufficient to fund in perpetuity the operation, maintenance, management, and enforcement of the conservation easement. If an endowment is used, the endowment funds shall either be submitted to the City to be distributed to an appropriate third-party nonprofit conservation agency, or they shall be submitted directly to the third-party nonprofit conservation agency in exchange for an agreement to manage and maintain the lands in perpetuity. The Conservation Operator shall not sell, lease, or transfer any interest of any conservation easement or mitigation land it acquires without prior written approval of the City and DFG.</p> <p>If the Conservation Operator ceases to exist, the duty to hold, administer, manage, maintain, and enforce the interest shall be transferred to another entity acceptable to the City and DFG. The City Planning Department shall ensure that mitigation habitat is properly established and is functioning as habitat by conducting regular monitoring of the mitigation site(s) for the first 10 years after establishment of the easement. OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The project applicant(s) may participate in a future City Swainson’s Hawk Foraging Habitat Ordinance (once adopted) as an alternative to the measure above. OR</li> <li>▶ The project applicant(s) may participate in a future habitat conservation plan (once adopted) as an alternative to the above measures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading, improvement, or construction plans and before any ground-disturbing activity in any project development phase that would affect Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.10-5: Loss and Degradation of Special-Status Plants and Habitat for Potential Special-Status Plants.</b> Implementation of the project would result in direct and/or indirect impacts on three populations of Greene’s legenera and in the removal of vernal pool grassland, seasonal wetland, and riparian habitat on the project site that have the potential to support special-status plant species.</p>	Direct & Indirect LTS(m)	Direct & Indirect LTS(m)	Direct & Indirect LTS(m)	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Incorporate Measures to Protect Greene’s Legenera in the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.</b> Direct impacts on the population of Greene’s legenera located within the wetland preserve shall be avoided to the maximum extent feasible.</p> <p>A mitigation and monitoring plan for Greene’s legenera is being developed on behalf of the project applicant(s) by ECORP. Before the approval of grading plans or any ground-breaking activity within 250 feet of any Greene’s legenera population, the mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The plan shall be submitted concurrently to DFG and USFWS for review and comment, and the City may consult with these entities before approval of the plan. The plan is required to maintain viable plant populations on-site and shall include avoidance measures for the existing population to be retained and mitigation</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>measures for the populations to be directly affected. Possible avoidance measures include fencing of the population before construction and exclusion of project activities from the fenced-off areas, and construction monitoring by a qualified botanist to keep construction crews away from the population. Indirect impacts (i.e., changes in hydrology) shall be minimized by placing culverts to the vernal pool where this population occurs, if necessary. Possible mitigation for the two populations of Greene’s legenera that would be removed during construction of the drainage parkway includes the collection of seeds from the existing populations and inoculation of the collected seeds into existing or compensatory vernal pools within the wetland preserve.</p> <p>It is proposed in the mitigation plan that the best option for the successful germination of seeds would be to inoculate existing pools that are similar in size and depth and hydration period, and with similar associated species as the pools that currently support Greene’s legenera. Mitigation for the populations of legenera proposed to be directly affected shall commence before the approval of any plans for, or any ground-breaking activities near, the locations of such legenera populations. Monitoring of the existing population of Greene’s legenera and the seeded populations shall be conducted in conjunction with monitoring of vernal pools for a minimum period of 5 years, as specified in Mitigation Measure 3.10-1.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground-breaking activity within 250 feet of any Greene’s legenera population, including grubbing and clearing, for any development phase. Ongoing monitoring shall occur for a minimum of 5 years following the completion of all construction activities.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<b>Cumulative</b>					
<p><b>3.10-6: Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts.</b> Implementation of the project together with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would result in a cumulatively significant loss of biological resources in the region. The project’s incremental contribution to this significant cumulative impact is cumulatively considerable.</p>					
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measures 3.10-1a, 3.10-1b, 3.10-2a, 3.10-2b, 3.10-3, 3.10-4a, 3.10-4b, 3.10-4c, 3.10-4d, and 3.10-5.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>3.11 VISUAL RESOURCES</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<b>3.11-1: Alteration of a Scenic Vista.</b> Project implementation would result in the potential for project-related construction of new homes and businesses to degrade the visual quality of a scenic vista.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.11-2: Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway.</b> Project implementation could result in the potential for adverse changes to an outstanding scenic resource visible from a state scenic highway.	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.11-3: Degradation of Visual Character.</b> Project implementation could substantially alter the visual character of the project site through conversion of an expanse of primarily undeveloped land to developed urban uses.	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Require Development to Conform to City General Plan Design Guidelines</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall include design, architectural, development, and maintenance standards in the Rio del Oro Specific Plan that will ensure minimization of impacts to the existing visual character of the site. Through this process the project applicant(s) shall ensure that urban development at the project site is substantially consistent with the Design Guidelines adopted as part of the Rancho Cordova General Plan.					
OR					
Before the approval of building permits, all structures and facilities shall adhere the City’s design review process.					
<b>Timing:</b> Before approval of building permits for all structures within all project phases.					
<b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.					
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.11-4: Temporary Degradation of Visual Character for Developed Project Land Uses Caused by Construction Staging Areas.</b> Project implementation would involve five phases of construction over a 25- to 30-year buildout period. Construction activity would involve the temporary use of staging areas for construction equipment and materials, which would be visible to adjacent project land uses that have already been developed.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Screen Construction Staging Areas.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall locate staging and material storage areas as far away from sensitive land uses (i.e., residential areas, schools, parks) and/or nearby roadways as possible. Staging and material storage areas shall be approved by the City before the approval of grading plans and building permits for all project phases, and shall be screened from adjacent occupied land uses in earlier development phases to the maximum extent practicable. Screens may include berms or fences. The screen design shall be approved by the City to reduce further visual effects to the extent possible.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans and building permits, and during all phases of construction for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.11-5: Temporary Degradation of Visual Character for Future Project-Related Land Uses from Ongoing Mining Activities.</b> Aggregate mining activities could occur on the project site concurrently with project development, which could result in a temporary degradation of visual character for portions of development that are occupied.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Screen Mining Areas.</b> Before the issuance of certificates of occupancy and final inspections for facilities where mining activities will be visible, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall visually screen project-related development from mining activities to the maximum extent practicable. If mining activities, including reclamation activities, are anticipated to occur for more than one year after project approval, a combination of fast-growing shrubs and trees shall be planted around mining project boundaries to provide screening. Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-5.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the issuance of certificates of occupancy and final inspections for facilities where mining activities will be visible for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.11-6: New Light and Glare Effects.</b> Project implementation would require lighting of new development that could inadvertently cause increased light and glare effects.</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; LTS(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>No Direct, No Indirect</p>
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Establish and Require Conformance to Lighting Standards and Prepare and Implement a Lighting Plan.</b> To reduce impacts associated with light and glare, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall conform to the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Meet the minimum City lighting standards for all project-related lighting. All lighting fixtures shall be designed to be consistent with the Design Guidelines contained in the City General Plan.</li> <li>▶ Shield or screen lighting fixtures to direct the light downward and prevent light spill on adjacent properties.</li> <li>▶ Place and direct flood or area lighting needed for construction activities or for nighttime sporting activities to not disturb adjacent residential areas and passing motorists.</li> <li>▶ Prohibit the use of harsh mercury vapor, low-pressure sodium, or fluorescent bulbs for public lighting in residential neighborhoods.</li> <li>▶ Use appropriate building materials, lighting, and signage in the office/commercial areas to prevent light and glare from adversely affecting motorists on nearby roadways.</li> <li>▶ Design exterior lighting as an integral part of the building and landscape design in the Rio del Oro Specific Plan area. Lighting fixtures shall be architecturally consistent with the overall site design and character and shall be consistent with the City’s Design Guidelines.</li> <li>▶ Establish standards for outdoor lighting to reduce high-intensity nighttime lighting and glare as part of the Rio del Oro Specific Plan design guidelines/standards. Consideration shall be given to design features, namely directional shielding for street lighting, parking lot lighting, and other significant light sources, that will reduce effects of nighttime lighting. In addition, consideration shall be given to the use of automatic shutoffs or motion sensors for lighting features to further reduce excess nighttime light. All nighttime lighting shall be shielded to prevent the light from shining off of the surface intended to be illuminated.</li> </ul> <p>A lighting plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval which shall include the above elements. The lighting plan may be submitted concurrently with other improvement plans, and shall be submitted before the installation of any lighting or the approval of building permits for all phases. The project applicant(s) of all future phases shall implement the approved lighting plan.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of building permits for all phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning and Public Works Departments.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.11-7: New Skyglow Effects.</b> Project implementation would require lighting of new development which could inadvertently cause increased skyglow effects.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.11-6.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.11-8: Alteration of a Scenic Vista.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in the potential for project-related construction of new homes and businesses to degrade the visual quality of a scenic vista.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.11-9: Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could result in the potential for adverse changes to an outstanding scenic resource visible from a state scenic highway.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.11-10: Degradation of Visual Character.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would substantially alter the visual character of the project site through conversion of an expanse of primarily undeveloped land to developed urban uses.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.11-3.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.11-11: Temporary Degradation of Visual Character from Construction Activity and Staging Areas.</b> Implementation of the project would involve several phases of construction over a 25- to 30-year project horizon. Construction activity would involve the temporary use of staging areas for construction equipment and materials. In addition, construction activities would be visible to adjacent sensitive land uses.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.11-4.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.11-12: Temporary Degradation of Visual Character for Future Project-Related Land Uses from Ongoing Mining Activities.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would temporarily occur concurrently with mining operations, which could result in temporary visual character impacts on new residents.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measures 3.11-5 and 3.16-5.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.11-13: New Light and Glare Effects.</b> Development Phase 1 would require lighting of new development that could inadvertently cause light and glare for motorists on White Rock Road, Sunrise Boulevard, and Douglas Road.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.11-6.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.11-14: New Skyglow Effects.</b> Development Phase 1 would require lighting of new development which could inadvertently cause nighttime skyglow that would obscure views of stars, constellations, and other features of the night sky.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.11-6.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>3.12 PARKS AND RECREATION</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<p><b>3.12-1: Sufficiency of Project Site Parkland to Meet Increased Demand and Potential Increased Use and Deterioration of Existing Facilities.</b> Residential development proposed for the project site would require 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents to meet the newly adopted City standards. Project implementation could not increase the demand on existing neighborhood and community parks such that the physical deterioration of the existing facilities would occur or be accelerated.</p> <p><b>HD: Develop a Parkland Plan and Comply with Parkland Requirements.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases except Phase 1 shall comply with CRPD’s parkland requirements of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. To satisfy the parkland shortfall that would be created with project implementation, the project applicant(s) shall develop a parkland plan for review and approval by CRPD and the City. The parkland plan shall identify options to meet the standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents, which may include dedication of additional parkland acreage either on- or off-site, payment of in-lieu fees, or expansion/improvement of existing park facilities.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approvals of tentative maps for all project phases except Phase 1.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Cordova Recreation &amp; Park District and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>PP, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Direct &amp; B, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; Indirect LTS(m)</p>	<p>Direct &amp; B, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; B, No Indirect</p>	<p>No Direct, Indirect &amp; B</p>
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.12-2: Sufficiency of Project Site Parkland to Meet Increased Demand and Potential Increased Use and Deterioration of Existing Facilities.</b> Residential development proposed for the project site would require 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents to meet newly adopted CRPD standards. Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in a surplus of parkland. This surplus would provide much-needed parkland and would reduce or eliminate additional demand on existing neighborhood and community parks such that the physical deterioration of the existing facilities would not occur or be accelerated.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Direct &amp; B, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; B, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; B, No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; B, No Indirect</p>	<p>No Direct, Indirect &amp; B</p>

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>3.13 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<b>3.13-1: Possible Exposure to Contaminated Soil or Groundwater.</b> Construction workers or future residents would not be exposed to contaminated soil or groundwater.	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.13-2: Possible Delays in Development of Future Land Uses from Remediation Activities.</b> Ongoing remediation activities could delay or limit the availability of proposed land uses at or near the site of those remedial activities.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: 3.13-2a: Require the Project Applicant(s) to Cooperate with Aerojet and Regulatory Agencies to Preserve, Modify, or Close Existing Groundwater Monitoring Wells.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall submit copies of tentative maps for residential subdivisions and for nonresidential uses to Aerojet, DTSC, and the Central Valley RWQCB or any successor in interest for review and approval. Aerojet, DTSC, and the Central Valley RWQCB or any successor shall work with the project applicant(s) to establish the preservation, modification, or closure of existing groundwater wells. If necessary, Aerojet, MDC, or any successor may purchase lots from the project applicant(s) to maintain access to monitoring wells. Development shall not proceed until DTSC and the Central Valley RWQCB have approved Aerojet's or a successor's plan for well preservation, modification, or closure.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of tentative maps for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Aerojet General Corporation, and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>3.13-2b: Coordinate Development Activities to Avoid Interference with Remediation Activities.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall provide notice to Aerojet or any successor in interest and DTSC, the Central Valley RWQCB, and the City of the location, nature, and duration of construction activities within each phase of development at least 1 month before the construction activities begin in areas on or near property with current or planned remediation activities. Before the approval of grading plans for all project phases, the project applicant(s) shall work with Aerojet, DTSC, and the Central Valley RWQCB or any successor to schedule the timing of construction activities to prevent potential conflicts with remediation activities.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans and during construction activities for all project phases.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>Enforcement:</b> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Aerojet General Corporation, and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>3.13-2c: Notify the City in Writing that DTSC-Required Notification Obligations Regarding Deed Restrictions and/or Easements Have Been Fulfilled.</b> Pursuant to its oversight over investigations of hazardous substances and determination of remedial action, DTSC establishes, as appropriate, deed restrictions (e.g., restrictions on future groundwater uses or future land uses) or easements (e.g., continued access to groundwater wells and pipelines) on property with associated notice requirements. The project applicant(s) for all such affected project phases shall provide notification in writing to the City that said required DTSC notification obligations have been fulfilled. Evidence of the method of notification required by DTSC shall be submitted to the City before approval of final maps and/or the issuance of permits for sales trailers and model homes. The project applicant(s) for such affected project phases shall coordinate with the City to include this provision as part of tentative map approval.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of final maps and/or issuance of permits for sales trailers and model homes for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.13-3: Possible Exposure to Hazardous Building Materials.</b> Project implementation could result in potential exposure of construction workers to asbestos and/or lead-based paint as a result of demolition of existing on-site structures.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Conduct a Hazardous-Building-Materials Study and Implement all Applicable Regulations.</b> Before the approval of demolition permits for any existing on-site buildings, the project applicant(s) for all project phases, except development Phase 1 shall hire a qualified consultant to investigate whether any of the existing on-site structures contain lead or ACMs that could become friable or mobile during demolition activities. If lead-containing materials or ACMs are found, the project applicant(s) shall coordinate with the County Environmental Management Department to ensure that such materials are properly removed (i.e., by an accredited inspector in accordance with EPA and Cal-OSHA standards). In addition, all activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal-OSHA standards related to exposure of workers to asbestos and lead. The lead-containing materials and ACMs shall be handled properly and transported to an appropriate off-site disposal facility.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of demolition permits for existing on-site structures and during all demolition activities for all project phases, except development Phase1.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> County of Sacramento Environmental Management Department and City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.13-4: Use of Hazardous Materials On-Site.</b> Project implementation would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during demolition, construction, and operation activities.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.13-5: Potential Safety Hazards from Construction Activities and Mining Operations.</b> Ongoing project-related construction activities and nonproject-related mining operations could disrupt the surrounding residential and commercial uses and result in potential safety hazards to construction workers and residents.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Public-Safety Features during Construction Activities and Mining Operations.</b> The following public-safety protection features shall be implemented before the approval of grading plans and building permits for all project phases, and before issuance of future mining permits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Temporary fencing shall be installed around construction areas with signage indicating the presence of an active construction zone, and warning the public to keep out.</li> <li>▶ Temporary fencing shall be installed around mining areas with signage indicating the presence of active mining operations, and warning the public to keep out.</li> <li>▶ Mining equipment shall not be operated and mining activities shall not occur within 1,100 feet of any noise-sensitive receptor, or within 375 feet if a temporary barrier is constructed in accordance with the following specifications:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The barrier shall be located as close to the noise source or as close to the receptor as possible and shall break the line of sight between the source and receptor.</li> <li>• The barrier shall be constructed with three-quarter-inch Medium Density Overlay (MDO) plywood sheeting, or other acceptable material having a surface weight of 2 pounds per square foot (lb/sf) or greater, and a demonstrated Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 25 or greater as defined by American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Test Method E90.</li> <li>• Weather- and abuse-resistant material shall be used for a temporary acoustical curtain. The material shall exhibit superior hanging and tear strength during construction with a surface weight of at least 1 lb/sf. The material shall have a minimum breaking strength of 120 pound per inch (lb/in) per Federal Test Method Standard (FTMS) 191 A-M5102 and minimum tear strength of 30 lb/in per ASTM Test Method D117. Based on the same test procedures, the absorptive material facing shall have a minimum breaking strength of 100 lb/in and minimum tear strength of 7 lb/in. The material shall have a STC rating of 25 or greater, based on certified sound transmission loss data taken according to ASTM Test Method E90. It shall also have a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) rating of 0.70 or greater, based on certified sound absorption coefficient data according to ASTM Test Method C423.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mating surfaces of the barrier sides shall be installed flush with each other. Gaps between barrier units, and between the bottom edge of the barrier panels and the ground, shall be closed with material that will completely close the gaps, and be dense enough to attenuate noise.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of grading plans and building permits for all project phases, and before issuance of future mining permits, and during all project construction for all project phases and mining activities.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department and Building and Safety Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.13-6: Human Health Hazards Associated with Mosquitoborne Diseases.</b> Construction workers or future residents could be exposed to an increased risk of mosquito-borne diseases.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	LTS
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Develop and Implement Site-Specific Wetland Mosquito Management Guidelines.</b> Before the start of construction activities for all project phases, the project applicant(s) shall develop a set of site-specific Wetland Mosquito Management Guidelines. The guidelines shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The project applicant(s) shall implement the guidelines once they have been approved.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the start of construction activities and as specified in the guidelines for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department and Building and Safety Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.13-7: Possible Exposure to Contaminated Soil or Groundwater.</b> Construction workers or future residents would not be exposed to contaminated soil or groundwater during Phase 1 development.</p>	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.13-8: Possible Delays in Development of Future Land Uses from Remediation Activities.</b> Ongoing remediation activities could delay or limit the availability of proposed development Phase 1 land uses at or near the site of those remedial activities.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measures 3.13-2a, 3.13-2b, and 3.13-2c. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.13-9: Possible Exposure to Hazardous Building Materials.</b> Construction workers could be exposed to asbestos and/or lead-containing materials as a result of demolition of existing on-site structures during implementation of development Phase 1.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.13-10: Use of Hazardous Materials On-Site.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would involve the storage, use, and transport of hazardous materials at the project site during construction and operation activities.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.13-11: Potential Safety Hazards from Construction Activities and Mining Operations.</b> Ongoing project-related construction activities and nonproject-related mining operations could result in disruption of the surrounding residential and commercial uses and result in potential safety hazards to construction workers and residents during implementation of development Phase 1.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.13-5. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.13-12: Human Health Hazards Associated with Mosquitoborne Diseases.</b> Construction workers or future residents associated with development Phase 1 could be exposed to an increased risk of mosquito-borne diseases.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	LTS

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.13-6. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.	Indirect				
<b>3.14 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION</b>					
<b>Program Level and Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>*Note: No Federal Action Alternative</b>—This alternative reflects the Proposed Project Alternative as it would be if no Section 404 of the Clean Water Act permits were issued for development of the project site. Land use totals under the No Federal Action Alternative are consistent with those under the Proposed Project Alternative (with higher densities of land use), but roadway network connectivity is dramatically different. Rancho Cordova Parkway and Americanos Boulevard would terminate within the Rio del Oro project site and would not extend southward to Douglas Road. The lack of roadway connectivity for this alternative would decrease traffic volumes on most roadways within the project. However, Sunrise Boulevard, Grant Line Road, White Rock Road, and Rio del Oro Parkway would incur additional traffic burdens, such that significant impacts on these facilities would occur. Additionally, a similar effect would occur at the interchanges with U.S. 50 in the project study area. It should be noted that this alternative is inconsistent with the City General Plan Circulation Element/Plan. This alternative would result in increased impacts on transportation infrastructure outside the Rio del Oro Specific Plan area. Implementation of this alternative would result in <b>significant and unavoidable</b> impacts. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce impacts under this alternative to a less-than-significant level because the project would not provide an internal roadway network that would be feasible, nor would project roadways connect appropriately to the City’s planned circulation network under the City Circulation Element/Plan, thus resulting in additional traffic burden on transportation infrastructure outside of the project site.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1: Increases to Peak-Hour and Daily Traffic Volumes, Resulting in Unacceptable Levels of Service.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 (i.e., the Baseline Plus Phase 1 scenario) and buildout of the specific plan (i.e., the Baseline Plus Full Buildout scenario) would cause an increase in a.m. peak-hour, p.m. peak-hour, and/or daily traffic volumes on area roadways, resulting in unacceptable levels of service (LOS) and warranting the need for improvements such as traffic signals and additional lanes.</p>	See below for Direct; No Indirect	See below for Direct; No Indirect	See below for Direct; No Indirect	See Note above for Direct & Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>Mitigation Measure Common to All Impacts under Impact 3.14-1</b></p> <p>To avoid repetition, the information contained in the following mitigation measure applies to all other mitigation measures required under Impact 3.14-1. Note that no mitigation measures are required for the No Project Alternative because, as described above, no direct or indirect impacts would occur.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM:</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall participate in the necessary improvements identified in all of the following mitigation measures. The project’s fair-share participation and the associated timing of the improvements shall be identified in the project conditions of approval and in the mitigation</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>monitoring and reporting program for the project or in conjunction with and as an appendix to the specific plan (see mitigation measures following each identified impact).</p> <p>The timing and enforcement (described below) would be the same for all identified mitigation measures associated with Impact 3.14-1.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> As a condition of project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p>Please note that the improvements described in each of the following mitigation measures have not been designed, and therefore, project-specific impacts resulting from these improvements cannot be precisely identified or quantified.</p> <p>If need be, the site-specific impacts of the identified improvements will be assessed pursuant to CEQA requirements when specific intersection and roadway improvement plans are developed, separate from the Rio del Oro DEIR/DEIS. Any such necessary environmental review will be completed before final approval of the improvements identified in the mitigation measures. No such additional review may be necessary, however, if the effects of such improvements are consistent with what can generally be expected of such improvements, as set forth immediately below.</p> <p>Based on review of existing available environmental documentation, field review at a reconnaissance level, and review of aerial photography, it is anticipated that, at worst, the construction of these intersection and roadway improvements could directly adversely affect wetland resources and associated grassland habitat area and could result in construction-related environmental effects, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ impacts related to construction traffic, noise, air quality, water quality, and drainage;</li> <li>▶ impacts on cultural resources; and</li> <li>▶ impacts on special-status plants and animals and their habitats.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to construction-related impacts, implementation of these improvements could result in long-term effects on water quality and drainage. The impacts that could arise from the planned improvements would be measured using the significance thresholds identified in each section of Chapter 3 of this DEIR/DEIS.</p> <p>Once a planned roadway is designed, the City would retain a qualified biologist to conduct a reconnaissance survey to determine the type(s) of habitat to be removed, and whether wetlands or special-status species are present. The City would also conduct a cultural resources records search to determine whether any known cultural resources are present.</p> <p>The mitigation measures recommended in Chapter 3 of this DEIR/DEIS would be applied (where applicable) to mitigate any such effects, if significant, to less-than-significant levels. For example, measures would be implemented to ensure no net loss of wetlands. Best management practices and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District measures would be implemented for water and air quality effects, and preconstruction surveys would be performed where sensitive habitat is present (and if special-status species or habitat is present, the biological resources protection measures would be implemented). The relocation of any utility pole or other utilities would be coordinated with the appropriate service provider to ensure that there would be no impact on the service provider. Additionally, if permits or other authorizations are required, they would be secured and the conditions would be followed.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1                      Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>For improvements to the following intersections and roadway improvements, the following impacts (in addition to the above) could result from implementation of required improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Direct impacts on the Folsom South Canal from implementation of the Zinfandel Drive and International Drive Extensions—Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road, Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road, and Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard intersections (Intersections 9, 18, and 19, respectively)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from the required grade separation structure—Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive intersection (Intersection 22)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from potential widening of the structure across U.S. 50—Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps and Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersections (Intersections 24 and 25, respectively)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts on the Folsom South Canal from implementation of the International Drive Extension—Kilgore Road/White Rock Road intersection (Intersection 27)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from required widening of the existing crossing of the Folsom South Canal—Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard (Roadway Segment 5)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from potential removal of approximately 40 large trees (primarily oak trees) and associated (primarily grassland) vegetation, and approximately 100 power poles, resulting from improvements to White Rock Road between Sunrise Boulevard and Grant Line Road (Roadway Segment 9)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from required new river crossings of the American River—Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road and Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps (Roadway Segments 17 and 18, respectively)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from potential removal of approximately 80 utility poles, 60 street lights, approximately 50 large trees, and commercial/industrial property, resulting from improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 20)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from potential removal of approximately 60 utility poles, 100 street lights, approximately 40 large trees (primarily oak trees and landscaped trees), and commercial/industrial property, resulting from improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 21)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from potential removal of approximately 35 utility poles and two trees, as well as other vegetation, resulting from improvements to Douglas Road between Jaeger Road and Sunrise Boulevard (Roadway Segment 31)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from potential removal of approximately 50 power poles, resulting from improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Douglas Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Roadway Segment 33)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts on an already congested Sunrise Boulevard corridor.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the Sunrise Boulevard corridor, phasing of circulation improvements, consistent with the City’s Infrastructure Phasing Plan, would aid in minimizing impacts on intersections and roadway segments on Sunrise Boulevard and should be considered when prioritizing improvements for implementation.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1a: Unacceptable LOS at the SR 16/Excelsior Road Intersection (Intersection 1).</b> Signalized intersection operations at SR 16/Excelsior Road would degrade from LOS E to LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project-related traffic both under both development Phase 1 and full project buildout</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the SR 16/Excelsior Road Intersection (Intersection 1).</b> To ensure that the SR 16/Excelsior Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>These improvements would require widening of SR 16 east and west of the intersection to accommodate the additional lanes.</p> <p>Improvements to the SR 16/Excelsior Road intersection are contained within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i> and zoning conditions. The CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan Project state that physical improvement of this intersection is feasible. Implementation of the improvements described above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection by providing acceptable operations. If these improvements are completed concurrent with development of the SunRidge Specific Plan and implemented before development Phase 1 of the Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1b: Unacceptable LOS at the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road Intersection (Intersection 2).</b> The unsignalized intersection of SR 16/Eagles Nest Road would operate at LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with and without project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. Project-related traffic would increase the delay for the worst-case approach at this intersection by more than 5 seconds during the peak traffic hours.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements at the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road Intersection (Intersection 2).</b> To ensure that the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, a traffic signal must be installed at this intersection, and the eastbound and westbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of one</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane.</p> <p>These improvements would require widening of SR 16 for 1,000 feet on both sides of this intersection to accommodate the additional through lanes.</p> <p>Improvements to the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road intersection are contained within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i> and zoning conditions. The CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan Project state that physical improvement of this intersection is feasible. Implementation of the improvements described above, including the necessary widening of SR 16, would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection. If these improvements are completed concurrent with development of the SunRidge Specific Plan and implemented before development Phase 1 of the Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1c: Unacceptable LOS at the SR 16/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 3).</b> The signalized intersection of SR 16/Sunrise Boulevard would operate at LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with and without project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. Project-related traffic would increase the critical V/C ratio by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the SR 16/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 3).</b> To ensure that the SR 16/Sunrise Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane; and the southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</p> <p>An additional through lane would be needed in the eastbound and westbound directions, which would require widening of SR 16 on both sides of the intersection for a minimum of 1,000 feet in both directions. With these improvements, this intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS.</p> <p>Improvements to the SR 16/Sunrise Boulevard intersection are contained within the County Development Fee Program, are scheduled for Measure A funding, and are within the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Financing Plan</i>. Implementation of the improvements described above, including the necessary widening of SR 16, would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection. If these improvements are completed concurrent with development of the Mather Field Specific Plan and implemented before development Phase 1 of the Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.					
<p><b>3.14-1d: Unacceptable LOS at the SR 16/Grant Line Road Intersection (Intersection 4).</b> The signalized intersection of SR 16/Grant Line Road would operate at LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with and without project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. However, project-related traffic would also increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the SR 16/Grant Line Road Intersection (Intersection 4).</b> To ensure that the SR 16/Grant Line Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ Protected left-turn signal phasing must be provided on the northbound and southbound approaches.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound and westbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>These improvements would require widening of SR 16 1,000 feet on both sides of the intersection.</p> <p>Improvements to the SR 16/Grant Line Road intersection are contained within the County Development Fee Program, are scheduled for Measure A funding, and are within the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Financing Plan</i>. Implementation of the improvements described above, including the necessary widening of SR 16, would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection; with them, this intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS. If these improvements are completed concurrent with development of the Mather Field Specific Plan and implemented before development Phase 1 of the Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1e: Unacceptable LOS at the Florin Road/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 5).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Florin Road/Sunrise Boulevard would degrade from LOS C to LOS E during the p.m. peak traffic hour with project-related traffic from development Phase 1, and from LOS C to LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour with the traffic under full project buildout.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Florin Road/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 5).</b> To ensure that the Florin Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one through lane and one dedicated right-turn lane. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1f: Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 6).</b> Unsignalized intersection operations at Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard would degrade from an acceptable LOS E during the a.m. peak traffic hour and an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour, to an unacceptable LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project-related traffic from development Phase 1 and full project buildout. In addition, project traffic would increase delay on the worst-case approach by more than 5 seconds during the p.m. peak traffic hour.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 6).</b> To ensure that the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A traffic signal must be installed at this intersection.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and two dedicated right-turn lanes.</li> <li>▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ Protected left-turn phases must be provided on the northbound and southbound approaches.</li> <li>▶ A second eastbound left-turn lane must be added.</li> <li>▶ Adequate receiving lanes must be provided on Sunrise Boulevard and Grant Line Road to accommodate the identified intersection geometrics.</li> </ul> <p>Interim improvements to the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection are contained within the Elk Grove West Vineyard Plan, with ultimate improvements within the <i>Vineyard Springs Comprehensive Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i>. Implementation of the improvements described above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection. If the improvements are completed concurrent with development of the West Vineyard Specific Plan and implemented before development Phase 1 of the Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1g: Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 8).</b> Unsignalized intersection operations at Grant Line Road/Douglas Road would degrade from LOS E during the a.m. peak traffic hour and LOS D during the p.m. peak traffic hour to LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project-related traffic from development Phase 1 and full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Grant Line Road/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 8).</b> To ensure that the Grant Line Road/Douglas Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, a traffic signal must be installed at this intersection.</p> <p>Improvements to the Grant Line Road/Douglas Road intersection are contained within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i>. Implementation of the improvement described above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection. If this improvement is completed concurrent with development of the SunRidge Specific Plan and implemented before development Phase 1 of the Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1h: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 9).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road would degrade from LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour and LOS E during the p.m. peak traffic hour, to LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project-related traffic from development Phase 1 and full project buildout. In addition, project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 9).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. Specifically, all approaches must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane. However, with implementation of this improvement, the intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS E or LOS F.</p> <p>To further improve operations at the intersection, additional roadway connectivity is required. To achieve this connectivity, the Zinfandel Drive Extension must be implemented (to accommodate traffic generated within the SunRidge Specific Plan area), International Drive must be extended to Sunrise Boulevard and into and through the Rio del Oro project site, and Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50) must be implemented.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection are contained within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i>. The extension of Zinfandel Drive is identified as part of the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i>. Funding has been identified for Rancho Cordova Parkway and the interchange and for the extension of International Drive to Sunrise Boulevard within the City's CIP program. Implementation of the improvements identified above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the Zinfandel Drive Extension falls under the jurisdiction of the County, and Rancho Cordova Parkway and the associated interchange fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation of these improvements.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1i: Unacceptable LOS at the Mather Field Road/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps (Intersection 12).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Mather Field Road/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps would degrade from LOS D during the a.m. peak traffic hour to LOS F during both the a.m. peak traffic hour with project-related traffic from full project buildout.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Mather Field Road/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 12).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Mather Field Road/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. Specifically, the eastbound ramp needs modification to make the eastbound right turn a “free” movement. This would require a receiving lane on Mather Field Road, south of the intersection.</p> <p>To further improve operations at the intersection, additional roadway connectivity is required. To achieve this connectivity, the Zinfandel Drive Extension must be implemented (to accommodate traffic generated within the SunRidge Specific Plan area), International Drive must be extended to Sunrise Boulevard and into and through the Rio del Oro project site, and Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50) must be implemented.</p> <p>The extension of Zinfandel Drive is identified as part of the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i>. Funding has been identified for Rancho Cordova Parkway and the interchange and for the extension of International Drive to Sunrise Boulevard within the City’s CIP program. Implementation of the improvements identified above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements are ultimately under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The Zinfandel Drive Extension falls under the jurisdiction of the County, and Rancho Cordova Parkway and its associated interchange falls under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of these improvements.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1j: Unacceptable LOS at the Zinfandel Drive/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 15).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Zinfandel Drive/White Rock Road would degrade from an unacceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour with project-related traffic from development Phase 1 and full project buildout. This intersection would operate at an unacceptable level both with and without project traffic. However, the V/C ratio at the intersection would increase by more than 0.05 with project traffic.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM:</b> Participate in Improvements to the Zinfandel Drive/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 15). To offset project-related impacts at the Zinfandel Drive/White Rock Road intersection, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one free right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>Although these improvements offset the impacts of the project, this intersection would still operate at an unacceptable LOS. Additional improvements must be made to satisfy the City’s LOS D threshold, including additional roadway connectivity such as the extension of International Drive to Sunrise Boulevard, extension of Kiefer Boulevard, and implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50).</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection are identified in the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and included in the City’s CIP. Implementation of the improvements identified above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1k: Unacceptable LOS at the Zinfandel Drive/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 16).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Zinfandel Drive/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour with project-related traffic from development Phase 1 and full project buildout. Although the intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour both with and without project traffic, the V/C ratio at this intersection would increase by more than 0.05 with project traffic.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Zinfandel Drive/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 16).</b> To ensure that the Zinfandel Drive/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of four through lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one free right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three right-turn lanes.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three through lanes and a free right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>Improvements to this intersection are identified in the City’s CIP. Implementation of the improvements identified above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on the intersection. These improvements must be coordinated with Caltrans and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because these identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation</p>					
<p><b>3.14-11: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 18).</b> The signalized intersection of Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours both with and without project-related traffic, both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. However, the addition of project traffic would also increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by more than 0.05 during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 18).</b> With two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane currently on all approaches, the Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS as a result of sufficiently high volumes from traffic generated by the SunRidge Specific Plan and Rio del Oro Specific Plan. Therefore, to ensure that this intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, additional improvements must be made, such as grade separation of the intersection (consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan) and/or additional roadway facilities such as the Zinfandel Drive Extension, International Drive Extension into and through the Rio del Oro project site, and implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50).</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection and identified additional roadway connectivity are identified in the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i> (Zinfandel Drive Extension) or the City’s CIP. Implementation of the improvements identified above would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection. If these improvements are completed concurrent with development of the Mather Field Specific Plan or City’s Public Facilities Financing Plan and implemented before development Phase 1 of Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.					
<p><b>3.14-1m: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 19).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard would degrade from an acceptable LOS B during the a.m. peak traffic hour and LOS D during the p.m. peak traffic hour to an unacceptable LOS E and LOS F, respectively, with traffic from development Phase 1. The addition of project traffic under full buildout would cause a degradation to an unacceptable LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 19).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS both with implementation of development Phase 1 and at buildout of the specific plan under any of the development alternatives. Specifically, to reduce impacts of development Phase 1, two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane should be added on the northbound and southbound approaches; and the westbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes. To reduce impacts associated with specific plan buildout, all of the following improvements should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane should be added on the southbound approach.</li> <li>▶ Two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane should be added on the northbound approach.</li> <li>▶ Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes should be added on the westbound approach.</li> </ul> <p>Implementing the improvements described above would provide acceptable operations at this intersection. However, doing so would require Sunrise Boulevard to expand to eight or more lanes, which is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires roadway cross sections of six or fewer lanes.</p> <p>An alternative to these improvements is to implement parallel capacity improvements, such as implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50), Zinfandel Drive Extension, International Drive Extension into and through the Rio del Oro project site, and realignment of International Drive with Old Placerville Road (with associated roadway improvements). Implementing these alternative improvements would improve operations at and assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection.</p> <p>Some of the improvements described above are identified in the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i> (Zinfandel Drive Extension) and the City’s CIP. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the required expansion of Sunrise Boulevard is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan. Some of the identified parallel capacity improvements fall under their jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1n: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 21).</b> The signalized intersection of Sunrise Boulevard/U.S. 50 westbound ramps would have sufficient capacity to serve expected demands during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours without project-related traffic. With traffic at full project buildout, operations during the p.m. peak hour are expected to degrade to LOS E, an unacceptable level within the City of Rancho Cordova.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 21).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. Specifically, the westbound approach would need to consist of three left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes.</p> <p>Improvements to this interchange are identified in the City’s CIP program.</p> <p>An alternative to these improvements is to implement parallel capacity improvements, such as implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50), Zinfandel Drive Extension, International Drive Extension into and through the Rio del Oro project site, and realignment of International Drive with Old Placerville Road (with associated roadway improvements). Implementing these alternative improvements would improve operations at and assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection.</p> <p>Some of the improvements described above are identified in the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i> (Zinfandel Drive Extension) and the City’s CIP. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the intersection falls under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1o: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive Intersection (Intersection 22).</b> The signalized intersection of Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive would operate at LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. However, the addition of project traffic would also increase the V/C ratio by 0.05 or more during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive Intersection (Intersection 22).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. Specifically, all of the following improvements should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane should be added on the northbound approach.</li> <li>▶ One left-turn lane, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane (with treatment to increase capacity such as a receiving lane or pork-chop island) should be added on the southbound approach. (A pork-chop island is a triangular island placed adjacent to a free right-turn lane. It separates right-turning vehicles from through lanes and provides a refuge for pedestrians to cross the right-turn lane before crossing the through lanes.)</li> <li>▶ One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane should be added on the eastbound approach.</li> <li>▶ One left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane should be added on the westbound approach.</li> </ul> <p>These at-grade improvements are consistent with the County Mobility Study; however, they would be inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, which identifies the segment as a six-lane facility.</p> <p>An alternative to this set of improvements that is consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan is to implement grade separation at the intersection. Either improvement would increase capacity at this intersection and would assist in improving intersection operations.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the required expansion of Sunrise Boulevard is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, and because the required structure for the alternative improvement (grade separation) would likely have other significant impacts that have not been identified.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1p: Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 23).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard would degrade from an acceptable LOS D during the p.m. peak traffic hour to LOS E both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 23).</b> To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and two right-turn lanes.</p> <p>An alternative to this improvement that is consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan is to implement parallel capacity improvements, such as Easton Valley Parkway and upgrades to White Rock Road.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because most of the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1q: Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 24).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps would degrade from LOS E to LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 24).</b> To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, an additional eastbound left-turn lane must be installed, with an appropriate receiving lane. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because some of the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1r: Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 25).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps would degrade from LOS D to LOS E during the p.m. peak traffic hour with the addition of project traffic, both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 25).</b> To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, an additional westbound right-turn lane must be installed on the off-ramp. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans, the County, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because some of the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1s: Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 26).</b> Unsignalized intersection operations at Grant Line Road/White Rock Road would degrade from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour, and would continue to operate at LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour with the addition of project-related traffic, both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. The addition of project traffic during the p.m. peak traffic hour would increase control delay by more than 5.0 seconds.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 26).</b> To ensure that the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A traffic signal must be installed at this intersection.</li> <li>▶ One through lane and one dedicated right-turn lane must be added on the southbound approach.</li> <li>▶ One left-turn lane and one shared left/through/right-turn lane must be added on the eastbound approach.</li> <li>▶ One left-turn lane and one through lane must be added on the northbound approach.</li> </ul> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1t: Unacceptable LOS at the Kilgore Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 27).</b> Signalized intersection operations at Kilgore Road/White Rock Road would degrade from LOS D to LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. Although this intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour both with and without project traffic, project traffic would also increase the V/C ratio by 0.05 or more.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Kilgore Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 27).</b> To ensure that the Kilgore Road/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS with implementation of development Phase 1, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A free right-turn lane must be added on the northbound approach with an associated receiving lane (which would require widening of the White Rock Road crossing of the Folsom South Canal).</li> <li>▶ One through lane must be added on the eastbound approach.</li> <li>▶ Two left-turn lanes must be provided on the westbound approach.</li> </ul> <p>For buildout of the specific plan under the three development alternatives, the improvements described above are required. In addition, one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane must be added to the southbound approach. Alternatively, International Drive could be extended into and through the Rio del Oro project site if desired, to provide parallel capacity to White Rock Road (see discussion of the International Drive realignment under “Impact Analysis” above and in Impact 3.14-5 below).</p> <p>Although these required improvements would offset impacts associated with the project under buildout of the specific plan, this intersection would not operate acceptably. For this intersection to operate acceptably under buildout of all three development alternatives, International Drive would have to be extended into and through the project site in conjunction with the identified improvements.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>The crossing of the Folsom South Canal must be coordinated with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and appropriate oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified extension of International Drive into and through the project site would require crossing the Folsom South Canal. Because the required canal crossing would involve other regulatory agencies; neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of the identified improvement.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1u: Unacceptable LOS on Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 4).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F with project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 4).</b> To ensure that Mather Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road, Femoyer Street must be widened to four lanes between Mather Boulevard and the proposed Zinfandel Drive extension, and the future Zinfandel Drive extension must be constructed as a four-lane facility from Femoyer Street to Douglas Road. Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because some of the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1v: Unacceptable LOS on Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard (Roadway Segment 5).</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F both with and without project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. However, project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard (Roadway Segment 5).</b> To ensure that Douglas Road operates at an acceptable LOS between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, Douglas Road must be widened to four lanes. Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of the County and other regulatory agencies because of the Folsom South Canal crossing, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1w: Unacceptable LOS on White Rock Road between Sunrise Boulevard and Grant Line Road (Roadway Segment 9).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from LOS A to an unacceptable LOS E with traffic from development Phase 1, and would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F with traffic at full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to White Rock Road between Sunrise Boulevard and Grant Line Road (Roadway Segment 9).</b> To ensure that White Rock Road operates at an acceptable LOS between Sunrise Boulevard and Grant Line Road, White Rock Road must be widened to four lanes. Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the eastern portion of this roadway segment falls under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of this improvement.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1x: Unacceptable LOS on Zinfandel Drive between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 15).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from LOS E to LOS F with project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout, and the V/C ratio would increase by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Zinfandel Drive between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 15).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that Zinfandel Drive operates at an acceptable LOS between the U.S. 50 eastbound ramps and White Rock Road; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. This improvement would allow the segment to operate at an acceptable LOS; however, it is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.</p> <p>An alternative to this identified improvement is implementation of parallel capacity improvements, such as implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50), extension of International Drive into and through the project site, and connectivity between International Drive and Old Placerville Road.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because widening this segment is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, and because the alternative improvements fall partially under the jurisdiction of the County, meaning that neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can ensure their implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1y: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road (Roadway Segment 17).</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F both with and without project-related traffic, both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. However, the addition of project traffic would also cause the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road (Roadway Segment 17).</b> Improvements must be made to improve operations on Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. This improvement would offset the impacts of the project, but the segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Additionally, although this improvement is consistent with the County Mobility Study, it is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes. Furthermore, without additional river crossings, there are no parallel capacity improvements to relieve Sunrise Boulevard on this segment. For these reasons, the impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1z: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 18).</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F both with and without project-related traffic, both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. However, the addition of project traffic would also cause the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 18).</b> Improvements must be made to improve operations on Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. This improvement would offset the impacts of the project, but the segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Additionally, although this improvement is consistent with the County Mobility Study, it is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes. Furthermore, without additional river crossings, there are no parallel capacity improvements to relieve Sunrise Boulevard on this segment. For these reasons, the impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1aa: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and Folsom Boulevard (Roadway Segment 19).</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F both with and without project-related traffic, both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. However, the addition of project traffic would also cause the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and Folsom Boulevard (Roadway Segment 19).</b> Improvements must be made to improve operations on Sunrise Boulevard between the U.S. 50 eastbound ramps and Folsom Boulevard; specifically, this roadway</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>segment should be widened to eight lanes. This improvement would offset the impacts of the project, but the segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Additionally, although this improvement is consistent with the County Mobility Study, it is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.</p> <p>An alternative to this identified improvement is implementation of parallel capacity improvements, such as implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50), which could improve operations on this segment and reduce the project’s impact.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with Caltrans, Sacramento RT, and other potentially affected oversight agencies.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, and because implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50) falls under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans, meaning that neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee implementation of either the identified improvement or its alternative.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1bb: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 20).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from an unacceptable LOS E to LOS F, and the V/C ratio would increase by more than 0.05, with project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 20).</b> Improvements must be made to improve operations on Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. This improvement would offset the impacts of the project, but the segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Additionally, this improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.</p> <p>An alternative to this identified improvement is implementation of parallel capacity improvements, such as implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50), which could improve operations on this segment and reduce the project’s impact.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, and because implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway falls under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee implementation of either the identified improvement or its alternative.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1cc: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 21).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS B to an unacceptable LOS F with project traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 21).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that Sunrise Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS between White Rock Road and Douglas Road; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. With this improvement, this segment would operate at an acceptable LOS for the Baseline Plus Phase 1 and Baseline Plus Full Project Buildout scenarios under all three development alternatives. However, this improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan.</p> <p>An alternative to this identified improvement is implementation of parallel capacity improvements, such as implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway (and its connection to U.S. 50), which could improve operations on this segment and reduce the project’s impact.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, and because implementation of Rancho Cordova Parkway falls under the jurisdiction of the County and Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee implementation of either the identified improvement or its alternative.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1dd: Unacceptable LOS at Sunrise Boulevard between SR 16 and Grant Line Road (Roadway Segment 22).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F with project-related traffic both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between SR 16 and Grant Line Road (Roadway Segment 22).</b> To ensure that Sunrise Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS between SR 16 and Grant Line Road, this roadway segment must be widened to four lanes. This improvement is included within the County’s development fee program. If this improvement is implemented before development Phase 1 of the Rio del Oro project, then the project impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because this improvement falls under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee its implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1ee: Unacceptable LOS at Hazel Avenue between Winding Way and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 23).</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F both with and without project-related traffic, both under Phase 1 and at full project buildout. The addition of project traffic would exacerbate these unacceptable operations. Project traffic would also increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Hazel Avenue between Winding Way and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 23).</b> To improve operations on Hazel Avenue between Winding Way and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is included within the County’s development fee program and is expected to receive Measure A funding.</p> <p>With the identified improvement, this segment would still operate at an unacceptable LOS for the Baseline Plus Phase 1 and Baseline Plus Full Project Buildout scenarios under all three development alternatives, but the improvement would offset the amount of traffic the project adds to the segment and would reduce the project impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because this improvement falls under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee its implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1ff: Unacceptable LOS at U.S. 50 between Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive (Freeway Segment 27), and between Sunrise Boulevard and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 29).</b> These freeway segments would operate at an unacceptable LOS F both with and without project-related traffic, both under development Phase 1 and at full project buildout. The addition of project traffic would exacerbate these unacceptable operations.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to U.S. 50 between Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive (Freeway Segment 27) and U.S. 50 between Sunrise Boulevard and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 29).</b> To ensure that U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive and between Sunrise Boulevard and Hazel Avenue, the following improvements to the U.S. 50 corridor are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Ramp metering must be added on the Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive eastbound on-ramps.</li> <li>▶ An auxiliary lane must be constructed from Mather Field Road and Sunrise Boulevard.</li> <li>▶ Traffic-signal timing at freeway interchanges must be coordinated with adjacent City intersections to minimize impacts of vehicle queue spillback onto U.S. 50.</li> </ul>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Parallel facilities to U.S. 50 must be constructed, including improvements to SR 16, extension of International Drive into and through the project site, extension of Kiefer Boulevard, construction of Easton Valley Parkway, and connectivity of International Drive to Old Placerville Road.</li> <li>▶ HOV lanes must be extended from Sunrise Boulevard to downtown Sacramento (or, as an interim project, to Watt Avenue).</li> <li>▶ HOV enhancements to existing interchanges must be provided, such as bypass lanes at existing metered on-ramps.</li> </ul> <p>Improvements to these freeway segments must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because several of the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans or the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee their implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-1gg: Unacceptable LOS at Douglas Road between Sunrise Boulevard and Jaeger Road (Roadway Segment 31).</b> This roadway segment would operate at an acceptable LOS A without the project and unacceptable LOS E with project-related traffic at full project buildout under the High Density Alternative.</p> <p><b>HD: Participate in Improvements to Douglas Road between Sunrise Boulevard and Jaeger Road (Roadway Segment 31).</b></p> <p>To improve operations on Douglas Road between Sunrise Boulevard and Jaeger Road, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/ Plan.</p> <p>This improvement is included within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i> and zoning conditions as well as the City’s CIP.</p> <p><b>PP, IM, NP:</b> The roadway segment would operate at an acceptable level.</p>	LTS	LTS(m)	LTS	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1hh: Unacceptable LOS at Sunrise Boulevard between Douglas Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Roadway Segment 33).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS B to an unacceptable LOS E with project-related traffic under development Phase 1. Project-related traffic at full project buildout would cause the intersection to degrade to an unacceptable LOS F.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Douglas Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Roadway Segment 33).</b> To ensure that Sunrise Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS between Douglas Road and Kiefer Boulevard, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and CIP.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-1ii: Unacceptable LOS at Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16 (Roadway Segment 34).</b> This roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS B to an unacceptable LOS E with project-related traffic under full project buildout.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM:</b> Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16 (Roadway Segment 34). To ensure that Sunrise Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes consistent with the City's Circulation Element/Plan and CIP.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-1jj: Unacceptable LOS at Various Merge and Diverge Segments of U.S. 50.</b> With the exception of the Mather Field Road loop on-ramp, merge, the following merge and diverge segments of U.S. 50 would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with and without project-related traffic under development Phase 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Eastbound U.S. 50                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mather Field Road direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Sunrise Boulevard direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Sunrise Boulevard loop/direct on-ramp, merge</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Westbound U.S. 50                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Zinfandel Drive direct on-ramp, merge</li> <li>• Mather Field Road loop on-ramp, merge (would degrade from LOS D to LOS F)</li> <li>• Mather Field Road direct on-ramp, merge</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The addition of project-related traffic at full buildout would cause the following level of operations at U.S. 50 merge and diverge segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Eastbound U.S. 50                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mather Field Road direct off-ramp, diverge—LOS F with and without project traffic, both a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours</li> <li>• Zinfandel Drive direct off-ramp, diverge—would degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the a.m. peak traffic hour under the Proposed Project and Impact Minimization Alternatives; would degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the a.m. and LOS B to LOS F in the p.m. peak traffic hour under the High Density Alternative</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sunrise Boulevard direct off-ramp, diverge—LOS F with and without project traffic during the p.m. peak traffic hour</li> <li>• Sunrise Boulevard loop/direct on-ramp, merge—would degrade from LOS E to LOS F with project traffic during the p.m. peak traffic hour</li> <li>▶ Westbound U.S. 50                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp, diverge—LOS F with and without project traffic during the a.m. peak traffic hour</li> <li>• Zinfandel Drive direct on-ramp, merge—LOS F with and without project traffic during both a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours</li> <li>• Mather Field Road direct off-ramp, diverge – would degrade from LOS E to LOS F in both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours under the Proposed Project Alternative; would degrade from LOS E to LOS F in the a.m. peak hour under the High Density and Impact Minimization Alternatives.</li> <li>• Mather Field Road loop on-ramp, merge – would degrade from LOS D to LOS F in the p.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic under all three development alternatives</li> <li>• Mather Field Road direct on-ramp, merge – would operate at LOS F in the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with and without project traffic</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Various Merge and Diverge Segments of U.S. 50.</b> To ensure that the U.S. 50 merge and diverge areas operate at an acceptable LOS, the following improvements to the U.S. 50 corridor are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Ramp metering must be added on the Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive eastbound on-ramps.</li> <li>▶ An auxiliary lane must be constructed from Mather Field Road and Sunrise Boulevard.</li> <li>▶ Traffic-signal timing at freeway interchanges must be coordinated with adjacent City intersections to minimize impacts of vehicle queue spillback onto U.S. 50.</li> <li>▶ Parallel facilities to U.S. 50 must be constructed, including improvements to SR 16, extension of International Drive into and through the project site, extension of Kiefer Boulevard, construction of Easton Valley Parkway, and connectivity of International Drive to Old Placerville Road.</li> <li>▶ HOV lanes must be extended from Sunrise Boulevard to downtown Sacramento (or, as an interim project, to Watt Avenue).</li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>► HOV enhancements to existing interchanges must be provided, such as bypass lanes at existing metered on-ramps.</p> <p>Improvements to these merge and diverge segments of U.S. 50 must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because several of the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans or the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee that these improvements would be completed.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-2: Increased Demand for Single-Occupant Automobile Travel in the Project Area.</b> Project implementation would increase demand for single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections.</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>No Direct, No Indirect</p>
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Develop Commercial Support Services and Mixed-use Development Concurrent with Housing Development, and Develop and Provide Options for Alternative Transportation Modes.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall develop commercial and mixed-use development concurrent with housing development, to the extent feasible in light of market realities and other considerations, to internalize vehicle trips. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Public Works Department. To further minimize impacts from the increased demand on area roadways and intersections, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall develop and implement safe and secure bicycle parking at schools and commercial centers to promote alternative transportation uses and reduce the volume of single-occupancy vehicles using area roadways and intersections.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the project would continue to add single-occupant vehicles in the area despite the potential of the mitigation measure to substantially reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-3: Increased Demand for Alternative Modes of Transportation.</b> Implementation of the project would create demand for alternative transportation mode facilities such as buses, LRT, and carpools in Rancho Cordova.</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>No Direct, No Indirect</p>
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: 3.14-3a: Participate in Capital Improvements for Transit Service.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall participate in capital improvements for transit service. The project's fair-share participation and the associated timing of the improvements shall be identified in the project conditions of approval and/or the project's development agreement. Improvements shall be coordinated, as necessary, with Sacramento RT.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> As a condition of project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all project phases.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p><b>3.14-3b: Coordinate with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association and Comply with the City of Rancho Cordova Transportation System Management Ordinance.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall coordinate with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association and comply with the City of Rancho Cordova transportation system management ordinance.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Concurrent with construction for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because neither the City nor the project applicant(s) can guarantee implementation of increased transit service within Rancho Cordova.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-4: Inconsistency of the Rio del Oro Specific Plan with the City’s Adopted General Plan.</b> The proposed project is inconsistent with the City’s adopted General Plan.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	SU	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Modify Rio del Oro Specific Plan to be Consistent with the City’s Adopted General Plan.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall modify the Rio del Oro Specific Plan to be consistent with the City’s General Plan.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> As a condition of project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-5: Potential Impacts Associated with Alternative Land Uses within the Overflight Zone of the Rio del Oro Specific Plan Area.</b> Land uses in the overflight zone were assumed to be industrial in nature. However, project implementation could result in alternative uses in this area, such as a sports field complex or amphitheater, which may create traffic impacts at greater intensities than the assumed industrial land uses.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	SU	No Direct or Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Require Individual Transportation Impact Studies for Alternative Land Uses in the Overflight Zone and Implement All Identified Transportation Improvements.</b> As development occurs in the overflight zone, the project applicant(s) for any proposed alternative land use shall complete specific transportation impact studies to the satisfaction of the City’s Public Works Department. Impacts shall be identified using methodologies adopted by the City or consistent with those identified in this DEIR/DEIS. Improvements identified as a result of the individual transportation impact studies shall be implemented by the</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>project applicant(s) for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> As development applications come forth for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p>					
<b>Cumulative</b>					
<p>*Note that all cumulative impacts of the NF Alternative (No Federal Action) would be inconsistent with the City General Plan Circulation Element/Plan. This alternative would result in greater impacts on transportation infrastructure outside the Rio del Oro Specific Plan area. No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts resulting from implementation of the NF Alternative to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts under the NF Alternative would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-6: Potential Impacts Associated with the City’s Transportation Impact Fee Program.</b> The City of Rancho Cordova has a transportation impact fee program to implement roadway facilities (those identified in the City General Plan for Implementation before Year 2030) within the city limits. However, currently this program is only 67% funded.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NP: Pay Fair-Share Cost of Identified Improvements that Are Not Fully Funded by the City’s Fee Program.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall provided fair-share contributions to the City’s transportation impact fee program to aid in bridging the program’s funding shortfall. However, ultimate funding of the improvements cannot be guaranteed (as it would require funding from other developments in the area).</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> As a condition of project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p>	Direct & SU, No Indirect	Direct & SU, No Indirect	Direct & SU, No Indirect	SU	Direct & PS, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-7: Increases to Peak-Hour and Daily Traffic Volumes, Resulting in Unacceptable Levels of Service, under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Implementation of the project and other reasonably foreseeable development would cause an increase in a.m. peak traffic hour, p.m. peak traffic hour, and/or daily traffic volumes on area roadways, resulting in unacceptable LOS and warranting the need for improvements such as traffic signals and additional lanes under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure Common to All Impacts under Impact 3.14-7</b></p> <p>To avoid repetition, the information contained in the following mitigation measure applies to all other mitigation measures required under Impact 3.14-7. Note that no mitigation measures are required for the No Project Alternative because, as described above, no direct or indirect impacts would occur.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM:</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall participate in the necessary improvements identified in all of the following mitigation measures. The project's fair-share participation and the associated timing of the improvements shall be identified in the projects conditions of approval and in the mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the project or in conjunction with and as an appendix to the Rio del Oro Specific Plan (see mitigation measures following each identified impact).</p> <p>The timing and enforcement (described below) would be the same for all identified mitigation measures associated with Impact 3.14-7.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> As a condition of project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works Department.</p> <p>Please note that the improvements described in each of the following mitigation measures have not been designed, and therefore, project-specific impacts as a result of these improvements cannot be precisely identified or quantified.</p> <p>If need be, site-specific impacts of the identified improvements would be assessed pursuant to CEQA requirements when specific intersection and roadway improvement plans are developed, separate from the Rio del Oro DEIR/DEIS. Any such necessary environmental review would be completed before final approval of the improvements identified in the mitigation measures. No such additional review may be necessary, however, if the effects of such improvements are consistent with what can generally be expected of such improvements, as set forth immediately below.</p> <p>Based on review of existing available environmental documentation, field review at a reconnaissance level, and review of aerial photography, it is anticipated that, at worst, the construction of these intersection and roadway improvements could directly adversely affect wetland resources and associated grassland habitat area and could result in construction-related environmental effects, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ impacts related to construction traffic, noise, air quality, water quality, and drainage;</li> <li>▶ impacts on cultural resources; and</li> <li>▶ impacts on special-status plants and animals and their habitats.</li> </ul>	Direct & S, No Indirect	Direct & S, No Indirect	Direct & S, No Indirect	SU	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>In addition to construction-related impacts, implementation of these improvements could result in long-term effects on water quality and drainage. The impacts that could arise from the planned improvements will be measured using the significance thresholds identified in each section of Chapter 3 of this DEIR/DEIS.</p> <p>Once a planned roadway is designed, the City will retain a qualified biologist to conduct a reconnaissance survey to determine type(s) of habitat to be removed, and whether wetlands or special-status species are present. The City will also conduct a cultural resources records search to determine whether any known cultural resources are present.</p> <p>The mitigation measures recommended in Chapter 3 of this DEIR/DEIS would be applied (where applicable) to mitigate any such effects, if significant, to less-than-significant levels. For example, measures will be implemented to ensure no net loss of wetlands. Best management practices and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District measures will be implemented for water and air quality effects, and preconstruction surveys would be performed where sensitive habitat is present (and if special-status species or habitat is present, the biological resources protection measures would be implemented). The relocation of any utility pole or other utilities will be coordinated with the appropriate service provider to ensure that there would be no impact on the service provider. Additionally, if permits or other authorization are required, they will be secured and the conditions will be followed.</p> <p>For improvements to the following intersections and roadway improvements, the following impacts (in addition to the above) could result from implementation of required improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Direct impacts on LRT service in the area—Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard (Intersection 19)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from required grade separation structure—Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive and Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersections (Intersections 22 and 23, respectively)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts on the Folsom South Canal—Eagles Nest Road/Kiefer Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard/International Drive intersections (Intersections 28 and 29, respectively)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from required new river crossings of the American River—Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road and Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps (Roadway Segments 17 and 18, respectively)</li> <li>▶ Direct impacts from potential removal of approximately 80 utility poles, 60 street lights, approximately 50 large trees, and commercial/industrial property, resulting from improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 20)</li> </ul> <p>Direct impacts from potential removal of approximately 60 utility poles, 100 street lights, approximately 40 large trees (primarily oak and landscaped trees), and commercial/industrial property, resulting from improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 21)</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1                      Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-7a: Unacceptable LOS at the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road Intersection (Intersection 2) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an acceptable level during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with traffic from the Proposed Project, Impact Minimization, and No Project Alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. However, operations would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E during the a.m. peak traffic hour with traffic from the High Density Alternative.</p> <p><b>HD: Participate in Improvements to the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road Intersection (Intersection 2).</b> To ensure that the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, the northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one dedicated right-turn lane. Improvements to the SR 16/Eagles Nest Road intersection are contained within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan</i> and zoning conditions. The CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan Project state that physical improvement of this intersection is feasible. Implementation of these improvements would reduce traffic impacts on this intersection. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p><b>PP, IM, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the improvements identified above fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	<p>No Direct or Indirect</p>	<p>SU(m)</p>	<p>No Direct or Indirect</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>No Direct or Indirect</p>
<p><b>3.14-7b: Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 6) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project-related traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 6).</b> To ensure that the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and two right-turn lanes with overlap right-turn signal phase.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane.</li> </ul>	<p>SU(m)</p>	<p>SU(m)</p>	<p>SU(m)</p>	<p>SU</p>	<p>No Direct or Indirect</p>

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Interim improvements to the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Boulevard intersection are contained within the Elk Grove West Vineyard Plan, with ultimate improvements contained within the <i>Vineyard Springs Comprehensive Plan Public Financing Plan</i>. These intersection improvements must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the improvements identified above fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7c: Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/Kiefer Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 7) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This unsignalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase delay at this intersection by more than 5 seconds during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Grant Line Road/Kiefer Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 7).</b>To ensure that the Grant Line Road/Kiefer Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A traffic signal must be installed at this intersection. The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one dedicated right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one dedicated right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because portions of the identified improvements of this intersection fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7d: Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 8) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This unsignalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase delay on the worst-case approach by more than 5 seconds during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Grant Line Road/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 8).</b> To ensure that the Grant Line Road/Douglas Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, a traffic signal must be installed at this intersection. Improvements to this intersection are contained within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Financing Plan</i>.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7e: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 9) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with and without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road Intersection (Intersection 9).</b> To improve LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Douglas Road intersection, all approaches must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</p> <p>However, even with these improvements, this intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS. For this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS, additional roadway connectivity is required. To achieve this connectivity, the Kiefer Boulevard Extension between Rancho Cordova and Sacramento must be implemented. Additional intersection improvements could be implemented consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, including partial grade separation of the intersection and/or aggressive at-grade treatments such as triple left-turn lanes, enhanced-capacity right-turn treatments, or conversion into a continuous-flow intersection.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection are contained within the <i>SunRidge Specific Plan Public Financing Plan</i>, but this Public Financing Plan would not be able to fund all of the improvements described above. These intersection improvements must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the required additional connectivity on Kiefer Boulevard between Rancho Cordova and Sacramento falls under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of this improvement. Furthermore, the feasibility of the aggressive at-grade or partial grade-separated alternatives has not been determined, as no specific designs have been developed and environmental constraints have not been identified.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7f: Unacceptable LOS at the Mather Field Road/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 12) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this signalized intersection would degrade from LOS E to LOS F, and the V/C ratio at this intersection would increase by 0.05 or more during the a.m. peak traffic hour, with the addition of project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. During the p.m. peak traffic hour, project traffic would cause intersection operations to degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Mather Field Road/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 12).</b> To ensure that the Mather Field Road/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, the eastbound approach must be reconfigured to include an additional right-turn lane. Improvements to this intersection are identified in the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and included in the City’s CIP, and must be coordinated with Caltrans.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the improvement identified above falls under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over its timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7g: Unacceptable LOS at Mather Field Road/International Drive (Intersection 13) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with and without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection by more than 0.05.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements at the Mather Field Road/International Drive Intersection (Intersection 13).</b> Southbound left-turn and westbound right-turn volumes at the Mather Field Road/International Drive intersection are substantial enough that additional lanes at this intersection would not reduce impacts at the intersection; therefore, the intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS E or LOS F. However, additional roadway connectivity in the area, through measures such as implementation of the Kiefer Boulevard Extension to Sacramento, extension of Routier Road to the south, completion of the International Drive–Old Placerville Road connection, and construction of the potential tunnel under Mather Field, has the potential to shift traffic volumes to reduce traffic impacts at the intersection. These additional roadway connectivity measures are identified in the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and included in the City’s CIP. Implementation of these improvements would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection by providing acceptable operations.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County and other regulatory agencies because of the proximity of some of these improvements to Mather Field.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the Kiefer Boulevard Extension and International Drive–Old Placerville Road connection fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and the Routier Road extension and tunnel construction under Mather Field would require coordination with other regulatory agencies because of their proximity to the airstrip. Therefore, neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of all the identified improvements.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-7h: Unacceptable LOS at the Zinfandel Drive/International Drive Intersection (Intersection 14) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Zinfandel Drive/International Drive Intersection (Intersection 14)</b> Improvements must be made to improve LOS at the Zinfandel Drive/International Drive intersection. Specifically, this intersection should be reconfigured to provide three left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane. Additionally, capacity enhancement is needed for the eastbound right-turn movement.</p> <p>These improvements would reduce the cumulative impact caused by the proposed project and alternatives under consideration by providing acceptable LOS. However, widening International Drive to four through lanes is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires roadway cross sections of six lanes or fewer.</p> <p>To be consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan, aggressive at-grade improvements are required, such as partial grade separation, capacity-enhancing right-turn treatments on all approaches, or implementation of a continuous-flow intersection. Additionally, improved roadway connectivity, such as the extension of Kiefer Boulevard, International Drive–Old Placerville Road connection, and/or construction of the tunnel under Mather Field would shift traffic volumes and reduce traffic at the intersection.</p> <p>The additional roadway connections described above and aggressive at-grade intersection treatments are identified in the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and included in the City’s CIP. Implementation of these improvements would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection by providing acceptable operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County and other regulatory agencies (such as FAA) because of the proximity of some of these improvements to Mather Field.</li> </ul> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the Kiefer Boulevard Extension and International Drive–Old Placerville Road connection are under the jurisdiction of the County, and the Routier Road extension and tunnel construction under Mather Field would require coordination with other regulatory agencies (such as FAA) because of their proximity to the airstrip. Furthermore, the aggressive at-grade treatments have not been designed, and they could have geometric and/or environmental constraints that may make the treatments infeasible. Therefore, neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of all the identified improvements.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-7i: Unacceptable LOS at the Zinfandel Drive/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 15) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Zinfandel Drive/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 15).</b> Improvements required to provide acceptable LOS at the Zinfandel Drive/White Rock Road intersection consist of three left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane on all approaches; and capacity enhancement treatments on the westbound right-turn movement.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection are identified in the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and included in the City’s CIP. Implementation of the identified improvements would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection by providing acceptable LOS. However, these improvements include widening the facility to more than six lanes, which is inconsistent with the City’s General Element/Plan. Alternatively, partial grade separation could be implemented consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and CIP; however, aggressive at-grade treatments such as partial grade separation have not been designed, and they could have geometric and/or environmental constraints that may make the treatments infeasible.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because one improvement is inconsistent with the City’s General Element/Plan, and the other (partial grade separation) has not been designed, the improvements may be infeasible as a result of consistency, geometric, and/or environmental constraints, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of all the identified improvements.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7j: Unacceptable LOS at the Zinfandel Drive/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 16) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS D during the a.m. peak traffic hour and an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour without the project under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05 and degrade a.m. peak-hour operations to an unacceptable LOS F.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Zinfandel Drive/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 16).</b> To ensure that the Zinfandel Drive/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of four through lanes and a shared through/right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three through lanes and a free right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a free right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Improvements to this intersection are identified in the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and included in the City’s CIP. Implementation of these improvements would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection by providing acceptable operation. Intersection improvements must be coordinated with Caltrans.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7k: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 18) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F and LOS E during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours, respectively, with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 18).</b> To ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, grade separation must be implemented at this intersection.</p> <p>Some funding for intersection improvements to this intersection is identified in the <i>Mather Field Specific Plan Public Financing Plan (Zinfandel Drive Extension)</i>, and grade separation of the intersection is in the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and included in the City’s CIP. The grade separation treatment has not been designed, however, and it could have geometric and/or environmental constraints that may make the treatment infeasible. No other feasible improvements are available at this intersection to ensure that it operates at an acceptable level.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the feasibility of grade separation at this location has not been determined, these identified improvements may not be feasible, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of the identified improvement.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7l: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 19) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this signalized intersection would be an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at the intersection by 0.05 or more.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 19).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/Folsom Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better. Specifically, all of the following improvements should be made:</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>These improvements must be coordinated with Sacramento RT. The identified improvements would provide acceptable operations at this intersection. However, they may be infeasible because of geometric constraints at this intersection caused by the grade-separated LRT tracks. No other feasible improvements are available, and there is no assurance that the required improvements would be implemented.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because of the potential for infeasibility of the identified improvements.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7m: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 21) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this signalized intersection would be an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic. The project would increase the V/C ratio by 0.05 or more.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 21).</b> To ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, the northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of three through lanes and one free (uncontrolled) right-turn lane; and the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes and a free right-turn lane with an adequate receiving lane on Sunrise Boulevard. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7n: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive Intersection (Intersection 22) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive Intersection (Intersection 22).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/Zinfandel Drive intersection operates at an acceptable LOS; specifically, the northbound and southbound approaches should be reconfigured to consist of an additional through lane. These at-grade improvements are consistent with the County Mobility Study; however, they would be inconsistent with the City's Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes or fewer.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>An alternative to this improvement that is consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and associated CIP is implementation of grade separation at this intersection. However, the grade-separation treatment has not been designed, and it could have geometric and/or environmental constraints that may make the treatment infeasible.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element Plan; and due to the potential for infeasibility of the identified alternative improvements.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7o: Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 23) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 23).</b> For the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better, grade separation of the intersection is required. This improvement is consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan; however, the grade-separation treatment has not been designed, and it could have geometric and/or environmental constraints that may make the treatment infeasible.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the alternative improvement may have as-yet-unknown potentially significant impacts, and because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of the improvement necessary to provide acceptable operations at the intersection.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7p: Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 24) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 24).</b> To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D, all of the following improvements are required at this interchange:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The structure across U.S. 50 must be widened to accommodate eight lanes (four in each direction) on the structure.</li> </ul>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>▶ The eastbound off-ramp approach must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, a shared left/right-turn lane, and one right turn lane. Improvements to this interchange must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7q: Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 25) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 25).</b> Substantial improvements must be made to ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better. Specifically, the following improvements should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of four through lanes and a free right-turn lane (this would require prohibiting northbound left turns to Tributary Point Drive).</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of five through lanes and a free right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of one free right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The westbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>However, these improvements would prohibit northbound access to development west of the intersection and may be deemed infeasible in that access must be maintained.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-7r: Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 26) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 26).</b> To ensure that the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes and three through lanes.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two through lanes and two right-turn lanes.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes and one free (uncontrolled) right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7s: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/Kiefer Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 27) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this signalized intersection would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic from the Proposed Project Alternative under cumulative (2030) conditions. Operations would degrade to an unacceptable LOS E during the p.m. peak traffic hour under the Proposed Project and High Density Alternatives.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/Kiefer Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 27).</b> To ensure that the Sunrise Boulevard/Kiefer Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, the northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7t: Unacceptable LOS at the Eagles Nest Road/Kiefer Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 28) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS E during the a.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic from the Impact Minimization Alternative. Without project traffic, the intersection would operate acceptably under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Eagles Nest Road/Kiefer Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 28).</b> To ensure that the Eagles Nest Road/Kiefer Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, all approaches must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7u: Unacceptable LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/International Drive Intersection (Intersection 29) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Sunrise Boulevard/International Drive Intersection (Intersection 29).</b> To improve LOS at the Sunrise Boulevard/International Drive intersection, the intersection must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes. However, even with these improvements, this intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS. To further improve operations and to fully reduce the impact, aggressive at-grade improvements (such as implementation of a continuous-flow intersection) or partial grade separation is required, consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and associated CIP. However, the aggressive at-grade treatments have not been designed, and they could have geometric and/or environmental constraints that may make the treatments infeasible.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the improvements may have as-yet-unknown potentially significant impacts.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7v: Unacceptable LOS at the Rancho Cordova Parkway/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 30) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. However, project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Rancho Cordova Parkway/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 30).</b> To improve operations at the Rancho Cordova Parkway/White Rock Road intersection, all the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to include a free right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound and westbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and a right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p>However, these improvements are inconsistent with the City’s General Element/Plan. Alternatively, aggressive at-grade improvements (such as implementation of a continuous-flow intersection) or partial grade separation, consistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and associated CIP, could be implemented.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the improvements may have as-yet-unknown potentially significant impacts.					
<p><b>3.14-7w: Unacceptable LOS at the Rancho Cordova Parkway/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 31) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS D during the a.m. peak traffic hours and LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hours without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio at this intersection by more than 0.05, and would degrade a.m. operations to an unacceptable LOS F.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Rancho Cordova Parkway/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Intersection 31).</b> To ensure that the Rancho Cordova Parkway/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two “free” right-turn lanes and two through lanes.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane and two through lanes.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one shared through/left-turn lane and two “free” right-turn lanes.</li> </ul> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with Caltrans.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7x: Unacceptable LOS at the Douglas Road/Jaeger Road Intersection (Intersection 33) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this signalized intersection would degrade from an acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS E during the p.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic from the Proposed Project and High Density Alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Douglas Road/Jaeger Road Intersection (Intersection 33).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that the Douglas Road/Jaeger Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. Specifically, all of the following improvements should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The northbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and a right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The southbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and a right-turn lane.</li> <li>▶ The eastbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane with right-turn capacity</li> </ul>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>enhancement (such as a pork-chop island or right-turn green arrow concurrent with the southbound left-turn phase).</p> <p>► The westbound approach should be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7y: Unacceptable LOS at the Douglas Road/Americanos Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 34) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this signalized intersection would degrade from an acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS E during the p.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Douglas Road/Americanos Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 34).</b> To ensure that the Douglas Road/Americanos Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better, a second eastbound right-turn lane must be added.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7z: Unacceptable LOS at the Chrysanthy Boulevard/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 35) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would degrade operations during the a.m. peak traffic hour to an unacceptable level.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Chrysanthy Boulevard/Sunrise Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 35).</b> To ensure that the Chrysanthy Boulevard/Sunrise Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, a second westbound right-turn lane must be added.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7aa: Unacceptable LOS at the White Rock Road/Americanos Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 39) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this signalized intersection would degrade from an unacceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the White Rock Road/Americanos Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 39).</b> To ensure that the White Rock Road/Americanos Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS during the a.m. peak traffic hour, the northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane; and the eastbound and westbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes.</p> <p>Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County and Aerojet General Corporation (Aerojet).</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the future north-south connectivity improvement fall under the jurisdiction of County and may be precluded by operations at Aerojet, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7bb: Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/Gold Country Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 40) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with and without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would cause the V/C ratio at this intersection to increase by 0.05 or more during the a.m. peak hour only.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to the Hazel Avenue/Gold Country Boulevard Intersection (Intersection 40).</b> To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/Gold Country Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of additional through lanes in the northbound and southbound directions. However, there are significant geographic constraints associated with additional widening of Hazel Avenue, primarily because of the existing bridge crossing of the American River just north of this intersection. Additionally, any roadway widening would require modification to the bluffs between the American River and Fair Oaks Boulevard. Improvements to this intersection must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7cc: Unacceptable LOS on International Drive between South White Rock Road and Zinfandel Drive (Roadway Segment 6) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations on this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS E with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to International Drive between South White Rock Road and Zinfandel Drive (Roadway Segment 6).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that International Drive operates at an acceptable LOS between South White Rock Road and Zinfandel Drive; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. However, the identified improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.</p> <p>An alternative to this improvement is additional connectivity, such as completion of the Kiefer Boulevard extension into Sacramento. This alternative improvement could relieve some traffic from this roadway segment, but would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements would fall under the jurisdiction of the</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation.					
<p><b>3.14-7dd: Unacceptable LOS on Mather Field Road between Folsom Boulevard and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 12) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations at this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Mather Field Road between Folsom Boulevard and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 12).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that Mather Field Road operates at an acceptable LOS between Folsom Boulevard and U.S. 50 westbound ramps; specifically, this roadway segment should have high-access controls.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7ee: Unacceptable LOS on Zinfandel Drive between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 15) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operation of this roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with or without the project, and the V/C ratio would increase by more than 0.05 with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Zinfandel Drive between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 15).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that Zinfandel Drive operates at an acceptable LOS between the U.S. 50 eastbound ramps and White Rock Road; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. However, this identified improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.</p> <p>An alternative to this improvement is additional connectivity, such as the completion of Kiefer Boulevard into Sacramento and the extension of Routier Road. This alternative improvement could relieve some traffic from this roadway segment, but would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of the County, neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of the improvements.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-7ff: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road (Roadway Segment 17) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road (Roadway Segment 17).</b> Improvements must be made to improve operation on Sunrise Boulevard between Gold Country Boulevard and Coloma Road; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Rio del Oro project on the roadway segment. However, because of other development in the region that would substantially increase traffic levels, the roadway segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS even with the capacity improvements identified to mitigate Rio del Oro impacts. The identified improvement is consistent with the County Mobility Study; however, it is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes. Moreover, without additional river crossings, there are no parallel capacity improvements to relieve Sunrise Boulevard on this segment. Additional river crossings would result in significant environmental effects (i.e., loss of riparian habitat and loss of structures).</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and therefore may not be implemented, and because the potential for additional river crossings is limited and would require coordination and approval by other regulatory agencies, neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the time or implementation.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7gg: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 18) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 18).</b> Improvements must be made to improve operation on Sunrise Boulevard between Coloma Road and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Rio del Oro project on this roadway segment. However, because of other development in the region that would substantially increase traffic levels, this roadway segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS even with the capacity improvements identified to mitigate Rio del Oro impacts. The identified improvement is consistent with the County Mobility Study; however, it is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes. Moreover, without additional river crossings, there are no parallel capacity improvements to relieve Sunrise Boulevard on this segment.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement (widening of Sunrise Boulevard) is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and therefore may not be implemented, and because the potential for additional river crossings is limited and</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
would require coordination and approval by other regulatory agencies.					
<p><b>3.14-7hh: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and Folsom Boulevard (Roadway Segment 19) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operation of this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F with project traffic under cumulative conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between the U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps and Folsom Boulevard (Roadway Segment 19).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that Sunrise Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS between the U.S. 50 eastbound ramps and Folsom Boulevard; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. With implementation of this identified improvement, this segment would operate at an acceptable LOS, and the improvement is consistent with the County Mobility Study; however, it is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement (widening of Sunrise Boulevard) is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and therefore may not be implemented.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7ii: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 20) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operation of this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS B to an unacceptable LOS E with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 20).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that Sunrise Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. With implementation of this identified improvement, this segment would operate at an acceptable LOS, but the improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.</p> <p>Because the identified improvement (widening of Sunrise Boulevard) is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and therefore may not be implemented, the impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7jj: Unacceptable LOS on Hazel Avenue between Winding Way and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 23) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05.</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Hazel Avenue between Winding Way and the U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Roadway Segment 23).</b> To improve operation on Hazel Avenue between Winding Way and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps, this roadway segment must be widened to eight lanes. Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Rio del Oro project on this roadway segment. However, because of other development in the region that would substantially increase traffic levels, this roadway segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS even with the capacity improvements identified to mitigate Rio del Oro impacts.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement would fall under the jurisdiction of the County, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the time or implementation</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7kk: Unacceptable LOS on U.S. 50 between Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive (Freeway Segment 27); between Sunrise Boulevard and Rancho Cordova Parkway (Freeway Segment 29); between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 30); and between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 31) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> These segments would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would exacerbate these unacceptable operations.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to U.S. 50 between Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive (Freeway Segment 27); between Sunrise Boulevard and Rancho Cordova Parkway (Freeway Segment 29); between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 30); and between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 31).</b> To ensure that these freeway segments operate at an acceptable LOS, all of the following improvements are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Ramp metering must be implemented on the Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive eastbound on-ramps.</li> <li>▶ Auxiliary lanes must be constructed from Mather Field Road, Sunrise Boulevard, and Rancho Cordova Parkway.</li> <li>▶ Traffic-signal timing at freeway interchanges must be coordinated with adjacent City intersections to minimize impacts of vehicle queue spillback onto U.S. 50.</li> <li>▶ Parallel facilities to U.S. 50 must be constructed, including improvements to SR 16, extension of International Drive into and through the project site, extension of Kiefer Boulevard, construction of Easton Valley Parkway, and connectivity of International Drive to Old Placerville Road.</li> <li>▶ HOV lanes must be extended from Sunrise Boulevard to downtown Sacramento (or, as an interim project, to Watt Avenue).</li> <li>▶ HOV enhancements to existing interchanges must be provided, such as bypass lanes at existing metered on-ramps.</li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>Improvements to these freeway segments must be coordinated with Caltrans.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement falls under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the time or implementation</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7II: Unacceptable LOS on Sunrise Boulevard between Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard (Roadway Segment 43) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations on this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F, and the V/C ratio would increase by 0.05 or more, with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Sunrise Boulevard between Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard (Roadway Segment 43).</b> Improvements must be made to ensure that Sunrise Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS D or better between Douglas Road and Chrysanthy Boulevard; specifically, this roadway segment should be widened to eight lanes. With implementation of this improvement, this segment would operate at an acceptable LOS; however, the improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes or fewer.</p> <p>An alternative to this improvement is additional connectivity, such as the extensions of Chrysanthy Boulevard to Kiefer Boulevard, Jaeger Road to Grant Line Road, and Kiefer Boulevard to Sacramento. This alternative improvement has the potential to relieve traffic from this roadway segment and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement (widening of Sunrise Boulevard) is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and therefore may not be implemented. Furthermore, the necessary alternative addition of roadway connectivity falls under the jurisdiction of the County; neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7mm: Unacceptable LOS on Rancho Cordova Parkway between Easton Valley Parkway and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 47) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations on this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Rancho Cordova Parkway between Easton Valley Parkway and White Rock Road (Roadway Segment 47).</b> To improve operation on Rancho Cordova Parkway between Easton Valley Parkway and White Rock Road, this roadway segment must be widened to eight lanes. The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Rio del Oro project on this roadway segment. However, because of other development in the region that would substantially increase traffic levels, this roadway segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS even with the capacity improvements identified to mitigate Rio del Oro impacts. Furthermore, this improvement is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan because</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>City policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes or fewer.</p> <p>An alternative to this improvement is additional connectivity, such as the extension of Chrysanthy Boulevard to Kiefer Boulevard, the extension of Jaeger Road to Grant Line Road, the extension of Kiefer Boulevard to Sacramento, and additional connectivity through the Aerojet site. This alternative improvement has the potential to relieve traffic from this roadway segment, but would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Improvements to this roadway segment must be coordinated with the County and Aerojet.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because the identified improvement (widening Rancho Cordova Parkway) is inconsistent with the City’s Circulation Element/Plan and therefore may not be implemented. Furthermore, the alternative roadway connectivity would not reduce the project impact to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, the alternative addition of roadway connectivity falls under the jurisdiction of the County and Aerojet; neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation.</p>					
<p><b>3.14-7nn: Unacceptable LOS on Rancho Cordova Parkway between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 48) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations on this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS A to an unacceptable LOS E with project traffic from the High Density and Impact Minimization Alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to Rancho Cordova Parkway between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 48).</b> To ensure that Rancho Cordova Parkway operates at an acceptable LOS D or better between White Rock Road and Douglas Road, high-access control must be implemented on this roadway segment.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI
<p><b>3.14-7oo: Unacceptable LOS on Americanos Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 50) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> Operations on this roadway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS E with project traffic from the High Density Alternative under cumulative (2030) conditions.</p> <p><b>HD: Participate in Improvements to Americanos Boulevard between White Rock Road and Douglas Road (Roadway Segment 50).</b> To ensure that Americanos Boulevard operates at an acceptable LOS D or better between White Rock Road and Douglas Road, this roadway segment must have high-access control.</p>	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	LTS(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.14-7pp: Unacceptable LOS at Various Merge, Diverge, and Weave Segments of U.S. 50 under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.</b> The following merge, diverge, and weave segments of U.S. 50 would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with and without project-related traffic from all three development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Eastbound U.S. 50                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mather Field Road direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Sunrise Boulevard direct off-ramp, diverge (p.m. peak traffic hour only)</li> <li>• Sunrise Boulevard loop/direct on-ramp, merge</li> <li>• Rancho Cordova Parkway direct on-ramp, merge</li> <li>• Rancho Cordova Parkway direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Hazel Avenue loop/direct on-ramp, weave (a.m. peak traffic hour only)</li> <li>• Aerojet direct off-ramp, weave (a.m. peak traffic hour only)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ Westbound U.S. 50                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Hazel Avenue loop on-ramp, merge</li> <li>• Rancho Cordova Parkway direct off-ramp, diverge</li> <li>• Rancho Cordova Parkway loop on-ramp, merge</li> <li>• Sunrise Boulevard direct off-ramp, diverge (p.m. peak traffic hour only)</li> <li>• Zinfandel Drive direct on-ramp, merge</li> <li>• Mather Field Road direct off-ramp, diverge (a.m. peak traffic hour only)</li> <li>• Mather Field Road loop on-ramp, merge (a.m. peak traffic hour only)</li> <li>• Mather Field Road direct on-ramp, merge</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The addition of project-related traffic under cumulative conditions would cause the following unacceptable LOS changes at U.S. 50 merge and diverge segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Eastbound U.S. 50</li> </ul> <p>Zinfandel Drive direct off-ramp, diverge—would degrade from LOS C to LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour under the Proposed Project and High Density Alternatives</p>	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU(m)	SU	NI

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>PP, HD, IM: Participate in Improvements to U.S. 50 Merge, Diverge, and Weave Segments.</b> To ensure that the U.S. 50 merge, diverge, or weave areas operate at an acceptable LOS, the following improvements to the U.S. 50 corridor are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Ramp metering must be added on the Mather Field Road and Zinfandel Drive eastbound on-ramps.</li> <li>▶ An auxiliary lane must be constructed from Mather Field Road and Sunrise Boulevard.</li> <li>▶ Traffic-signal timing at freeway interchanges must be coordinated with adjacent City intersections to minimize impacts of vehicle queue spillback onto U.S. 50.</li> <li>▶ Parallel facilities to U.S. 50 must be constructed, including improvements to SR 16, extension of International Drive into and through the project site, extension of Kiefer Boulevard, construction of Easton Valley Parkway, and connectivity of International Drive to Old Placerville Road.</li> <li>▶ HOV lanes must be extended from Sunrise Boulevard to downtown Sacramento (or, in an interim project, to Watt Avenue).</li> <li>▶ HOV enhancements to existing interchanges must be provided, such as bypass lanes at existing metered on-ramps.</li> </ul> <p>Improvements to these merge, diverge, and weave areas must be coordinated with Caltrans and the County.</p> <p>The impact conclusion reached in this DEIR/DEIS is significant and unavoidable because several of the identified improvements fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the County; and neither City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation.</p>					
<b>3.15 AIR QUALITY</b>					
<b>Program Level and Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.15-1: Generation of Temporary, Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>.</b> Construction activities associated with the project would generate temporary, short-term emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. Because of the large size of the project, construction-generated emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, an ozone precursor, would exceed SMAQMD-recommended thresholds and would substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Measures to Control Construction-Generated Air Pollutant Emissions.</b> To reduce short-term construction emissions, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall implement the measures described below. In addition to the measures identified below, construction operations shall comply with all applicable SMAQMD rules and regulations.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Phase 1 of all action alternatives for Rio del Oro would result in construction-generated emissions that exceed the SMAQMD threshold of significance, even after implementation of the SMAQMD “standard construction mitigation.” Therefore, the project applicant(s) shall pay SMAQMD an off-site mitigation fee for implementation of any of these alternatives for the purpose of reducing impacts to a less-than-significant level. The specific fee amounts shall be calculated when the construction emissions can be more accurately determined. This calculation would occur when an alternative has been selected, the project has been approved, and the Phase 1 improvement plans have been prepared. Calculation of fees associated with future, subsequent project phases shall be conducted before the approval of grading plans. It is estimated, based on information available at this time, that the off-site construction mitigation fees would range from \$4,404,845 to \$5,461,587 for development Phase 1, depending on which alternative is selected.</li> <li>▶ The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall pay into SMAQMD’s off-site construction mitigation fund to further mitigate construction-generated emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> that exceed SMAQMD’s daily emission threshold of 85 lb/day. The calculation of daily NO<sub>x</sub> emissions is based on the current cost of \$14,300 to reduce 1 ton of NO<sub>x</sub>. The determination of the final mitigation fee shall be conducted in coordination with SMAQMD before any demolition or ground disturbance occurs for any project phase.</li> <li>▶ Calculation of and payment of the fee for development Phase 1 and all subsequent project phases shall also be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project.</li> <li>▶ The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall reduce NO<sub>x</sub> and visible emissions from heavy-duty diesel equipment by implementing the following measures:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan shall be developed for approval by the City, in consultation with SMAQMD, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (&gt;50 hp), off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project (including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) will achieve a projectwide fleet-average 20% NO<sub>x</sub> reduction and 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average at the time of construction. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, particulate-matter traps, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or such other options as become available.</li> <li>• A comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment equal to or greater than 50 hp that shall be used for an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of project construction shall be submitted to the City and SMAQMD. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction operations occur. At least 48 hours before heavy-duty off-road equipment is used, the project applicant(s) shall provide SMAQMD with the anticipated construction timeline, including the start date, and the name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman.</li> <li>• Emissions from off-road, diesel-powered equipment used on the project site shall not exceed 40% opacity for more than 3 minutes in any 1 hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40% opacity (or Ringlemann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately, and SMAQMD shall be notified of noncompliant equipment within 48 hours of identification. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly. A monthly summary of visual survey</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>results shall be submitted to SMAQMD throughout the duration of the construction project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction operations occur. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed, as well as the dates of each survey. SMAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emulsified diesel or diesel catalysts shall be used on applicable heavy-duty construction equipment.</li> <li>• All of the above measures shall be included in all construction plans and specifications.</li> <li>• Payment into SMAQMD’s construction mitigation fund to offset construction-generated emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> that exceed SMAQMD’s daily emission threshold of 85 lb/day shall be made. The calculation of daily NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, for determination of offset fee mitigation, shall be conducted in coordination with SMAQMD and shall be based on the construction plan and equipment inventory to be prepared by the project representative.</li> </ul> <p>▶ As recommended by SMAQMD, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall reduce fugitive-dust emissions by implementing the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust emissions on all disturbed areas, including storage piles that are not being actively used for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized using water, a chemical stabilizer or suppressant, or vegetative ground cover (keeping soil moist at all times).</li> <li>• Dust emissions on all on- and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized using water or a chemical stabilizer or suppressant.</li> <li>• When materials are transported off-site, such materials shall be covered and effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least 2 feet of freeboard space shall be maintained from the top of the container.</li> <li>• The accumulation of project-generated mud or dirt from adjacent public streets shall be limited or expeditiously removed at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. After materials are added to or removed from the surfaces of outdoor storage piles that have the potential for fugitive-dust emissions, such storage piles shall be effectively stabilized using sufficient water or a chemical stabilizer or suppressant.</li> <li>• On-site vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>• Wheel washers shall be installed for all trucks and equipment exiting unpaved areas, or wheels shall be washed to remove accumulated dirt before such vehicles leave the site.</li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sandbags or other erosion control measures shall be installed to prevent runoff of silt to public roadways from adjacent project areas with a slope greater than 1%.</li> <li>Excavation and grading activities, except soil stabilization activities, shall be suspended when winds exceed 20 mph. The extent of areas simultaneously subject to excavation and grading shall be limited to the minimum area feasible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of all grading plans and throughout project construction for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works and Planning Departments and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.15-2: Generation of Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>.</b> Operational area- and mobile-source emissions from implementation of the project would exceed the SMAQMD-recommended threshold of 65 lb/day for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>, and would result in or substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS. In addition, because of the large increase in emissions associated with project buildout and the fact that the project is not within an already approved plan (which means that increased emissions would not already be accounted for in applicable air quality plans), project implementation could conflict with air quality planning efforts.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Measures to Control Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall submit a copy of the Operational Air Quality Plan developed in consultation with and approved by SMAQMD to the City. The Operational Air Quality Plan shall include measures to reduce operational air quality impacts associated with the project by a minimum of 15%, and these measures shall be included in the Rio del Oro Specific Plan. The project applicant(s) shall implement all measures included in the Operational Air Quality Plan. (The Operational Air Quality Plan is included in Appendix L of this DEIR/DEIS.)</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before approval of grading plans and through project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Public Works, Building and Safety, and Planning Departments and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.15-3: Generation of Local Mobile-Source CO Emissions.</b> Project-generated local mobile-source CO emissions would not result in or substantially contribute to concentrations that exceed the 1-hour ambient air quality standard of 20 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.15-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Short- and Long-Term Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants.</b> Project implementation would result in exposure of receptors to short- and long-term emissions of TACs from on-site mobile and stationary sources.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Develop a Plan to Reduce Emissions and Implement Measures to Control Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Emissions.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall develop a plan to reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs from project construction and operation. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval before the approval of any grading plans.</p> <p>With respect to project construction, the plan may include such measures as scheduling activities when the residences are the least likely to be occupied, requiring equipment to be shut off when not in use, and prohibiting heavy trucks from idling. Applicable measures shall be included in all project plans and specifications for all project phases.</p> <p>With respect to project operation for all project phases, the plan may include such measures as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Before the issuance of any certificates of occupancy or final inspections for on-site sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools) in close proximity to mining operations (i.e., within 1,000 feet), the City shall ensure that associated mining activities have concluded.</li> <li>▶ Proposed commercial/convenience land uses (e.g., loading docks) that have the potential to emit TACs shall be located as far away as possible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors (i.e., 1,000 feet).</li> <li>▶ When determining the exact type of facility that would occupy the proposed commercial/convenience space, the project shall take into consideration the facility's TAC-producing potential.</li> </ul> <p>The following additional guidelines are recommended in ARB's <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective</i> (California Air Resources Board 2005a) and are considered to be advisory and not regulatory:</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>▶ Sensitive receptors, such as residential units and daycare centers, shall not be located in the same building as dry-cleaning operations that use perchloroethylene. Dry-cleaning operations that use perchloroethylene shall not be located within 300 feet of any sensitive receptor. A setback of 500 feet shall be provided for operations with two or more machines. Large gasoline stations (defined as facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) and sensitive land uses shall not be sited within 300 feet of each other. Small gasoline-dispensing facilities (less than 3.6 million gallons of throughput per year) and sensitive land uses shall not be sited within 50 feet of each other.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of all grading plans and throughout project construction, where applicable for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.15-5: Possible Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odorous Emissions.</b> Construction and long-term operation of the project could generate odorous emissions, thereby exposing sensitive receptors to such emissions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Measures to Control Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odorous Emissions.</b> The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Commercial/convenience land uses that have the potential to emit objectionable odors shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors.</li> <li>▶ Delivery areas shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors.</li> <li>▶ The odor-producing potential of land uses shall be considered when the exact type of facility that would occupy commercial/convenience areas is determined.</li> <li>▶ Before approval of building permits, odor control devices shall be identified to mitigate the exposure of receptors to objectionable odors if a potentially odor-producing source is to occupy space in the commercial/convenience area. The identified odor control devices shall be installed before the issuance of certificates of occupancy for the potentially odor-producing use. The odor-producing potential of a source and control devices shall be determined in coordination with SMAQMD and based on the number of complaints associated with existing sources of the same nature.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> Before the approval of building permits and certificates of occupancy for commercial uses for all project phases.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Building and Safety and Planning Departments.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.15-6: Possible Exposure to Hazardous Indoor Emissions of Air Pollutants.</b> Project implementation could result in the exposure of construction workers or future residents to indoor emissions of air pollutants that would pose a threat to human health.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.15-7: Increase in Long-Term Atmospheric Greenhouse Gas Emissions.</b> Project implementation could contribute to an increase in atmospheric GHG concentrations. GHGs contribute to a rise in Earth’s global average temperature, a phenomenon known as global warming. The project could generate substantial new GHG emissions at a rate that exceeds levels that would be needed to help achieve the objectives of AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.15-2. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.15-8: Generation of Temporary, Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>.</b> Construction activity associated with development Phase 1 would generate temporary, short-term emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. Because of the large size of the Phase 1 development area, construction-generated emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, an ozone precursor, would exceed the SMAQMD-recommended thresholds and substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.15-1. <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.15-9: Generation of Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>.</b> Operational area- and mobile-source emissions from implementation of the project would exceed the SMAQMD-recommended threshold of 65 lb/day for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>, and would result in or substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS. In addition, because of the large increase in emissions associated with Phase 1 development and the fact that the project is not within an already approved plan (meaning that increased emissions would not already be accounted for in applicable air quality plans), project implementation could conflict with air quality planning efforts.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.15-2.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.15-10: Generation of Local Mobile-Source CO Emissions.</b> Project-generated local mobile-source CO emissions would not result in or substantially contribute to concentrations that exceed the 1-hour ambient air quality standard of 20 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.15-11: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Short- and Long-Term Emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would result in exposure of receptors to short- and long-term emissions of TACs from on-site mobile and stationary sources.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.15-4.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.15-12: Possible Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Odorous Emissions.</b> Construction and long-term operation of development Phase 1 could generate odorous emissions, thereby exposing sensitive receptors to such emissions.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.15-5.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.15-13: Possible Exposure to Hazardous Indoor Emissions of Air Pollutants.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could result in the exposure of construction workers or future residents to indoor emissions of air pollutants that would pose a threat to human health.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.15-14: Increase in Long-Term Atmospheric Greenhouse Gas Emissions.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could contribute to an increase in atmospheric GHG concentrations, resulting in an associated rise in Earth’s global average temperature, a phenomenon known as global warming. Phase 1 of the project could generate substantial new GHG emissions at a rate that exceeds levels that would be needed to help achieve the objectives of AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.15-2.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>3.16 NOISE</b>					
<b>Program Level</b>					
<b>3.16-1: Temporary Exposure to Construction-Generated Noise.</b> Project construction activities could temporarily exceed applicable standards at nearby noise-sensitive receptors.	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Measures to Prevent Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Temporary Construction-Generated Noise.</b> To reduce impacts associated with noise generated during construction activities, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall conform to the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Noise-generating construction operations shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday.</li> <li>▶ All construction equipment and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses.</li> <li>▶ All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.</li> <li>▶ All motorized construction equipment shall be shut down when not in use to prevent idling.</li> <li>▶ The following measures shall be required for exterior activities that involve the use of heavy-duty construction equipment (see Table 3.16-8) located within 800 feet of occupied noise-sensitive daytime land uses (e.g., school classrooms, childcare and convalescent care facilities, inpatient medical facilities, places of worship): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual operations and techniques shall be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete off-site instead of on-site).</li> <li>• Written notification of construction activities shall be provided to all noise-sensitive receptors located within 800 feet of construction activities. Notification shall include anticipated dates and hours during which construction activities are anticipated to occur and contact information, including a daytime telephone number, for the project representative to be contacted in the event that noise levels are deemed excessive. Recommendations to assist noise-sensitive land uses in reducing interior noise levels (e.g., closing windows and doors) shall also be included in the notification.</li> <li>• To the extent feasible, acoustic barriers (e.g., lead curtains, sound barriers) shall be constructed to reduce construction-generated noise levels at affected noise-sensitive land uses. The barriers shall be designed to obstruct the line of sight between the noise-sensitive land use and on-site construction equipment. When installed properly, acoustic barriers can reduce construction noise levels by approximately 8–10 dBA (EPA 1971).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>Timing:</b> During all phases of project construction.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.16-2: Potential Exposure to Stationary-Source Noise Generated by On-Site Land Uses.</b> Project implementation could result in potential exposure of sensitive receptors to noise levels from on-site stationary sources in excess of applicable standards.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Measures to Reduce Potential Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Stationary Source-Generated Noise.</b> To reduce potential long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to noise generated by City-controlled, project-related stationary noise sources from private activities, the City shall evaluate individual facilities, subdivisions, and other project elements for compliance with the City’s noise ordinance and policies contained in the City General Plan. All project elements shall comply with City noise standards. The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall implement the following measures to assure maximum reduction of project interior and exterior noise levels from operational activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The proposed land uses shall be designed so that on-site mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC units, compressors, generators) and area-source operations (e.g., loading docks, parking lots, and recreational-use areas) are located as far as possible from or shielded from nearby noise-sensitive land uses.</li> <li>▶ Residential air conditioning units shall be located a minimum of 10 feet from adjacent residential dwellings, including outdoor entertainment and relaxation areas, or shall be shielded to reduce operational noise levels at adjacent dwellings or designed to meet City noise standards. Shielding may include the use of fences or partial equipment enclosures. To be effective, fences or barriers need to be continuous or solid, with very few gaps, and must block the line of sight to windows of neighboring dwellings. Achieved noise reductions from fences or barriers can vary, but typically range from approximately 5 to 10 dBA, depending on construction characteristics, height, and location.</li> <li>▶ To the extent feasible, residential land uses located within 2,500 feet and within the direct line of sight of major noise-generating commercial and industrial land uses (e.g., loading docks, manufacturing facilities, equipment/vehicle storage and repair facilities, and material processing areas such as concrete batch plants) shall be shielded from the line of sight of these facilities by construction of a sound barrier. To be effective, fences or sound barriers need to be continuous or solid, with very few gaps, and must block the line of sight to windows of neighboring dwellings. Achieved noise reductions from fences or barriers can vary, but typically range from approximately 5 to 10 dBA, depending on construction characteristics, height, and location. The developer shall obtain the services of a professional acoustician to determine the design and location of noise barriers to be constructed.</li> <li>▶ Dual-pane, noise-rated windows; mechanical air systems; exterior wall insulation; and other noise-reducing building materials shall be used.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the City shall seek to reduce potential long-term exposure of sensitive receptors to noise generated by project-related stationary noise sources from public activities on school grounds, in neighborhood and community parks, and in open-space areas. Specifically, the City shall encourage the controlling agencies (i.e.,</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation



<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>schools and park and recreation districts) to implement measures to reduce project interior and exterior noise levels to within acceptable levels, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ On-site landscape maintenance equipment shall be equipped with properly operating exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.</li> <li>▶ For maintenance areas located within 500 feet of noise-sensitive land uses, the operation of on-site landscape maintenance equipment shall be limited to the least noise-sensitive periods of the day, between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m.</li> <li>▶ Outdoor use of amplified sound systems within 500 feet of noise-sensitive land uses shall be permitted only between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. Sunday through Thursday, and between 7 a.m. and 11 p.m. on Friday and Saturday.</li> <li>▶ During subsequent environmental review of future project phases, the project applicant(s) shall demonstrate that the amphitheater and adjacent residences have been designed to reduce noise exposure to noise-sensitive uses to the maximum extent feasible. An acoustical engineer with experience in the prediction and mitigation of outdoor theater sound levels shall be consulted prior to design and construction of the proposed amphitheater and residences proposed within 1,500 feet of the amphitheater. The acoustical engineer shall identify all feasible mitigation measures available for reducing noise-related impacts to nearby noise-sensitive receptors. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, orientation and location of amphitheater, construction of noise barriers, limitations on speaker orientation, limitations on noise-generation levels, and hours of activity. The project applicant(s) shall incorporate the mitigation measures into the design and operation of the amphitheater and nearby residential uses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing:</b> During design review and before the approval of all improvement plans, where applicable for all project phases. For measures that the City should encourage other agencies to undertake, before the approval of final maps for all project phases for noise-generating school and park and recreation sites</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Building and Safety, and Planning Departments.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.16-3: Potential Exposure to Off-Site Stationary-Source Noise.</b> Project implementation could result in potential exposure of proposed sensitive receptors to noise levels from off-site stationary sources in excess of applicable standards.</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>Direct &amp; SU(m), No Indirect</p>	<p>No Direct, No Indirect</p>
<p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-2.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> During design review and before the approval of all improvement plans, where applicable for all project phases. For measures that the City should encourage other agencies to undertake, before the approval of final maps for noise-generating school and park and recreation use sites.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Building and Safety, and Planning Departments.</p>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.16-4: Project-Generated Increases in Traffic Noise Levels on Area Roadways.</b> Project implementation would introduce new traffic to area roadways, resulting in an associated increase in traffic noise levels.	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.					
<b>3.16-5: Compatibility of Proposed Land Uses with Projected Noise Levels.</b> Noise levels could exceed the City’s applicable land-use compatibility noise standards at proposed noise-sensitive land uses located close to airport, roadway, and mining noise sources.	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m),	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>PP, HD, IM, NF: Implement Measures to Improve Land Use Compatibility with Noise Sources.</b> To meet City noise standards set forth in the City’s General Plan and Noise Ordinance and improve compatibility between project land uses and noise sources, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall implement the following for all project phases:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-2, described above.</li> <li>▶ Obtain the services of a consultant (such as a licensed engineer or licensed architect) to develop noise attenuation measures for the proposed construction of on-site noise-sensitive land uses (i.e., residential dwellings and school classrooms) that will produce a minimum composite Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating for buildings of 30 or greater, individually computed for the walls and the floor/ceiling construction of buildings, for the proposed construction of on-site noise-sensitive land uses (i.e., residential dwellings and school classrooms).</li> <li>▶ When tentative subdivision maps and commercial uses are proposed, the applicant(s) shall conduct a site-specific acoustical analysis to determine predicted roadway noise impacts attributable to the project, taking into account site-specific conditions (e.g., site design, location of structures, building characteristics). The acoustical analysis shall evaluate stationary- and mobile-source noise attributable to the proposed use or uses and impacts on nearby noise-sensitive land uses, in accordance with adopted City noise standards. Feasible measures shall be identified to reduce project-related noise impacts. Measures may include, but are not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• construction of exterior sound walls;</li> <li>• use of increased noise-attenuation measures in building construction (e.g., dual-pane, sound-rated windows; exterior wall insulation); and</li> <li>• limiting noise-generating operational activities associated with proposed commercial land uses, including truck deliveries.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>In addition, to reduce impacts associated with noise generated during ongoing mining activities, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall implement the following measures where mining activities would be located within 1,100 feet of occupied noise-sensitive daytime land uses (e.g., school classrooms, childcare and convalescent care facilities, inpatient medical facilities):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Written notification of mining activities shall be provided to noise-sensitive receptors located within 1,100 feet of mining activities. Notification shall include anticipated hours during which mining activities are anticipated to occur and contact information, including a daytime telephone number, for the project representative to be contacted if noise levels are deemed excessive. The notification shall also include recommendations to assist noise-sensitive land uses in reducing interior noise levels (e.g., closing windows and doors).</li> <li>▶ Occupied noise-sensitive receptors shall not be located within 1,100 feet of mining equipment/activities unless a temporary barrier is constructed in accordance with the following specifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The barrier shall be placed as close to the noise source or as close to the receptor as possible and shall break the line of sight between the source and receptor.</li> <li>• The barrier shall be constructed of three-quarter-inch Medium Density Overlay (MDO) plywood sheeting, or other acceptable material that has a surface weight of 2 pounds per square foot (lb/sf) or greater, and a demonstrated STC rating of 25 or greater as defined by American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Test Method E90.</li> <li>• If a temporary acoustical curtain is used, the material shall be weather and abuse resistant and shall exhibit superior hanging and tear strength during construction, with a surface weight of at least 1 lb/sf. The material shall have a minimum breaking strength of 120 pounds per inch (lb/in) per Federal Test Method Standard (FTMS) 191 A-M5102 and a minimum tear strength of 30 lb/in per ASTM D117. Based on the same test procedures, the absorptive material facing shall have a minimum breaking strength of 100 lb/in and a minimum tear strength of 7 lb/in. The material shall have an STC rating of 25 or greater, based on certified sound transmission loss data taken according to ASTM Test Method E90. It shall also have a Noise Reduction Coefficient rating of 0.70 or greater, based on certified sound absorption coefficient data according to ASTM Test Method C423.</li> <li>• When barrier units are joined together, the mating surfaces of the barrier sides shall be flush with each other. Gaps between barrier units, and between the bottom edge of the barrier panels and the ground, shall be closed with material that will completely close the gaps, and be dense enough to attenuate noise.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, to reduce impacts associated with aircraft noise, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Ensure that aviation easements are prepared before completion of final maps, and submitted with the final maps to the Department of Airports. Such an aviation easements shall acknowledge the property's location within the MAPA and shall grant the right of flight and unobstructed passage of all aircraft into and out of Mather Airport.</li> <li>▶ Provide notification in a public report, to be prepared by the California Department of Real Estate, disclosing to prospective buyers that parcels to be purchased are located within the MAPA and that an aviation easement exists for aircraft into and out of Mather Airport.</li> </ul>					

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p>► Revise relevant portions of project land use plans to be compatible with the existing noise contours if the proposed Mather Airport noise contours are not adopted.  <b>Timing:</b> Before the recordation of final maps and during all project construction activities for all project phases where applicable.  <b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.  <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>					
<p><b>3.16-6: Potential Exposure to Single-Event Aircraft Noise Levels Exceeding Applicable Standards.</b> Project implementation could result in exposure of proposed sensitive receptors to single-event aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-5.  <b>Timing:</b> Before the recordation of final maps and during all project construction activities for all project phases where applicable.  <b>Enforcement:</b> City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.  <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<b>Project Level (Phase 1)</b>					
<p><b>3.16-7: Temporary Exposure to Construction-Generated Noise.</b> Construction activities for development Phase 1 could temporarily exceed applicable standards at nearby noise-sensitive receptors.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-1.  <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	Direct & LTS(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.16-8: Potential Exposure to Stationary-Source Noise Generated by On-Site Land Uses.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could result in potential exposure of sensitive receptors to noise levels from on-site stationary sources in excess of applicable standards.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-2.  <b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of the Program and Project Level (Phase 1) Impacts and Mitigation Measures Proposed Project and Alternatives under Consideration</b>					
Impact Mitigation	Alternatives				
	PP	HD	IM	NF	NP
<p><b>3.16-9: Potential Exposure to Off-Site Stationary-Source Noise.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could result in potential exposure of proposed sensitive receptors to noise levels from off-site stationary sources in excess of applicable standards.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-3.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.16-10: Project-Generated Increases in Traffic Noise Levels on Area Roadways.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 would introduce new traffic to area roadways, resulting in an associated increase in traffic noise levels.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF, NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	Direct & LTS, No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.16-11: Compatibility of Proposed Land Uses with Projected Noise Levels.</b> Under development Phase 1, noise levels could exceed the City's applicable land-use compatibility noise standards at proposed noise-sensitive land uses located close to airport, roadway, and mining noise sources.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-5.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	Direct & Indirect SU(m)	No Direct, No Indirect
<p><b>3.16-12: Potential Exposure to Single-Event Aircraft Noise Levels Exceeding Applicable Standards.</b> Implementation of development Phase 1 could result in exposure of proposed sensitive receptors to single-event aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards.</p> <p><b>PP, HD, IM, NF:</b> Implement Mitigation Measure 3.16-6.</p> <p><b>NP:</b> No mitigation measures are required.</p>	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	Direct & SU(m), No Indirect	No Direct, No Indirect

Note: PP = Proposed Project Alternative; HD = High Density Alternative; IM = Impact Minimization Alternative; NF = No Federal Action Alternative; NP = No Project Alternative. For impacts labeled B, LTS, NI, No Direct, and/or No Indirect, no mitigation measures are required. B = Beneficial, LTS = Less than significant, LTS(m) = Less than significant with mitigation, NI = No Impact, PS = Potentially Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable, SU(m) = Significant and Unavoidable with mitigation