

ANATOLIA IV

Mitigated Negative Declaration



City of Rancho Cordova
3121 Gold Canal Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

November 2005

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
ANATOLIA IV
CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, CALIFORNIA

Prepared by:

THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA
3121 Gold Canal Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone 916.942.0223
Fax 916.853.1680

NOVEMBER 2005

1.0	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Introduction and Regulatory Guidance	1-1
1.2	Lead Agency.....	1-1
1.3	Purpose and Document Organization	1-1
1.4	Assumptions	1-2
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
2.1	Project Location.....	2-1
2.2	Project Background.....	2-1
2.3	Project Characteristics	2-4
2.4	Required Project Approvals	2-4
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES	
3.1	Introduction	3-1
I.	Aesthetics	3-5
II.	Agricultural Resources	3-7
III.	Air Quality	3-9
IV.	Biological Resources.....	3-14
V.	Cultural Resources	3-21
VI.	Geology and Soils	3-23
VII.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	3-25
VIII.	Hydrology and Water Quality	3-30
IX.	Land Use and Planning	3-36
X.	Mineral Resources	3-37
XI.	Noise.....	3-38
XII.	Population and Housing.....	3-41
XIII.	Public Services	3-42
XIV.	Recreation.....	3-45
XV.	Transportation and Traffic	3-46
XVI.	Utility and Service Systems.....	3-49
XVII.	Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	3-53
4.0	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	
4.1	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-1
5.0	DETERMINATION	
5.0	Determination	5-1
6.0	REPORT PREPARATION AND CONSULTATIONS	
6.1	Report Preparation	6-1
6.2	Persons and Agencies Consulted	6-1
7.0	REFERENCES	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This document is an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for the proposed Anatolia IV project. This MND has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Sections 21000 *et seq.*, and the CEQA Guidelines.

An initial study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064, an environmental impact report (EIR) must be prepared if the initial study indicates that the proposed project under review may have a potentially significant impact on the environment. A negative declaration may be prepared instead, if the lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons why a proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and, therefore, why it does not require the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15371). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, a negative declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either:

- a) *The initial study shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, or*
- b) *The initial study identified potentially significant effects, but:*
 - (1) *Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed negative declaration is released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and*
 - (2) *There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.*

If revisions are adopted into the proposed project in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15070(b), a mitigated negative declaration is prepared.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary responsibility over a proposed project. Where two or more public agencies will be involved with a project, CEQA Guidelines Section 15051 provides criteria for identifying the lead agency. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15051(b) (1), "the lead agency will normally be the agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose." Based on these criteria, the City of Rancho Cordova will serve as lead agency for the proposed Anatolia IV project.

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

The purpose of this Initial Study and draft Mitigated Negative Declaration is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Anatolia IV project including all on-site infrastructure improvements.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is divided into the following sections:

- **1.0 Introduction** - Provides an introduction and describes the purpose and organization of this document;
- **2.0 Project Description** - Provides a detailed description of the proposed project;
- **3.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures** - Describes the environmental setting for each of the environmental subject areas, evaluates a range of impacts classified as “no impact,” “less than significant,” or “potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated” in response to the environmental checklist, and provides mitigation measures, where appropriate, to mitigate potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level;
- **4.0 Cumulative Impacts** - Includes a discussion of cumulative impacts of this project.
- **5.0 Determination** - Provides the environmental determination for the project;
- **6.0 Report Preparation and Consultations** - Identifies staff and consultants responsible for preparation of this document, persons and agencies consulted, and references.
- **7.0 References** – List of references use by the MND.

1.4 ASSUMPTIONS

Rancho Cordova became an incorporated city on July 1, 2003. The City is currently in the process of preparing a Draft General Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) consistent with state planning and zoning law and the California Environmental Quality Act.

While the General Plan/DEIR process is underway, the City has adopted a Vision Book, Draft Land Use Map Book, and Circulation Plan. The Vision Book establishes the conceptual vision of the City and reflects the compilation of ideas from the community on a wide variety of topics related to the future of Rancho Cordova. It includes ideas that relate to specific sites and issues, as well as ideas that are more conceptual in nature. The Circulation Plan describes the basic roadway, bikeway, transit, and pedestrian system that will form the backbone of the City as it develops. The General Plan Land Use Map combine geographical areas of the City with generalized and specific land use designations to guide the City’s future development patterns. The intent of the General Plan Land Use Map is to establish a variety of new land use designations that reflect more mixed, and in some cases, a higher density of development envisioned for the City. These mixed-use categories provide for residential, commercial, and office uses all on a single site. Per Government Code §65360(b), new development proposals and actions by the City will be examined for their consistency with these interim policies and standards. The Vision Book, Draft Land Use Book and Map, and Circulation Plan also have been included for further study and evaluation in the City’s Draft General Plan/DEIR.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Anatolia IV project site is located within the approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and Sunridge Specific Plan (SDCP/SRSP) areas on the southwest corner of Chrysanthy Road and Jaeger Road. **Figures 1** and **2** show the project location and vicinity in relation to the Sunridge Specific Plan and Sunrise Douglas Community Plan.

2.2 BACKGROUND

The SDCP/SRSP Final EIR (FEIR) was certified by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors on June 19, 2002. The FEIR was designated a “Master” EIR, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21157 (FEIR, Vol. 1, p. 3.10). A Master EIR is intended to provide a detailed environmental review of plans and programs upon which the approval of subsequent related development proposals can be based. A Master EIR must, to the greatest extent feasible, evaluate the cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts and irreversible significant effects on the environment of specific, subsequent projects. The review of subsequent projects that have been described in the Master EIR can be limited to the extent that the Master EIR has already reviewed project impacts and set forth mitigation measures. (See Public Resources Code section 21157.)

A Master EIR enables a lead agency to perform limited environmental review of subsequent projects proposed within five years of certification of the Master EIR, in accordance with the following requirements:

- The lead agency for the subsequent project is the lead agency or any responsible agency identified in the Master EIR.
- The lead agency prepares an Initial Study that analyzes (1) whether the subsequent project may cause any significant effect on the environment that was not examined in the Master EIR, and (2) whether the subsequent project was described in the Master EIR as being within the scope of the project.
- If the lead agency determines that a subsequent project will have no significant effect on the environment which was not previously identified in the Master EIR and that no new or additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be required, no new environmental document may be required. However, the lead agency must make a written finding that the subsequent project is within the scope of the project covered by the Master EIR, and must incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives set forth in the Master EIR that are appropriate to the project.
- If the lead agency determines that a subsequent project may have an additional significant effect on the environment that was not identified in the Master EIR, the lead agency must prepare either a mitigated negative declaration, an EIR, or a focused EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21157.1.)

The Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan EIR was “tiered” from the Sacramento County General Plan Update EIR and in turn is considered to be the Master EIR upon which the environmental review for future development projects within the planning area, such as the Anatolia IV project may rely (FEIR, Vol. 1, pp. 3.10–3.11). Subsequent projects expected to be within the scope of the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan Master EIR would include future planning/development approvals for properties within the Specific Plan area that are consistent with the Sunridge Specific Plan land use designations and

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

the permissible development densities and intensities established by the Specific Plan, such as the Anatolia IV project that is the subject of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (*ibid.*).

Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 limits CEQA review of certain projects to environmental effects that are “peculiar” to the parcel or to the project and which were not addressed as significant effects in a prior EIR, or which new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior EIR. This project is a qualified project pursuant to section 21083.3, which provides in pertinent part:

- (a) If a parcel has been zoned to accommodate a particular density of development or has been designated in a community plan to accommodate a particular density of development and an environmental impact report was certified for that zoning or planning action, the application of this division to the approval of any subdivision map or other project that is consistent with the zoning or community plan shall be limited to effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior environmental impact report, or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior environmental impact report.
- (b) If a development project is consistent with the general plan of a local agency and an environmental impact report was certified with respect to that general plan, the application of this division to the approval of that development project shall be limited to effects on the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior environmental impact report, or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior environmental impact report.

The Sunrise Douglas Community Plan provides “policy direction for development of lands within the entire 6,042 acre Community Plan boundary, but does not assign specific land uses.” (FEIR, Vol. 1, p. 4.12.) The Sunridge Specific Plan “does define specific land uses and a development program for 2,632 acres within the Community Plan boundary.” (*ibid.*) The Specific Plan land use designations for the Anatolia IV parcels have RD-5 and RD-10 zoning designations (See FEIR, Vol.1, p. 4.15a, map of specific plan designations). The proposed project substantially conforms to the existing allocation of land uses and densities specified in the SDCP and SRSP with an RD-10 and park designation. Further analysis was required, however, prior to making a determination of the appropriate environmental document for the processing of the Anatolia IV project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provides guidance on the criteria to be used in making a determination as to whether Section 21083.3 will apply. Specifically, Guideline Section 15183, subdivision (b), provides as follows:

- (b) In approving a project meeting the requirements of this section, a public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those, which the agency determines, in an initial study or other analysis:
 - (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and
 - (2) Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent,

- (3) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or
- (4) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

This Initial Study is devoted to discussing the basis upon which this partial exemption provided by Section 21083.3 is used for the Anatolia IV project. Most importantly, it summarizes the findings of Sacramento County relating to the prior SDCP/SRSP Master EIR and how the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15183 have been met.

Guideline Section 15183, subdivision (f), provides guidance as to certain categories of effects that, as a matter of law, are not considered "peculiar" to a project. This provision states in part as follows:

- (f) An effect of a project on the environment shall not be considered peculiar to the project or the parcel for the purposes of this section if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the city or county with a finding that the development policies or standards will substantially mitigate the environmental effect when applied to future projects, unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect.

The section entitled "Summary of Impacts and Their Disposition," beginning on page 17.1 of Volume 1 of the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR, provided a summary of the findings leading to the conclusions of significance for each of the categories listed below. The bulk of these listed categories are not relevant to the Anatolia IV project due in large part to the fact that the project is substantially consistent with the Specific Plan and proposes no substantial changes to the Plan.

Impacts deemed significant and unavoidable based on both project specific and cumulative impact.

- Wetland impacts
- Special status species impacts
- Certain traffic impacts
- Certain air quality impacts

Impacts deemed potentially significant and mitigable.

- Construction-related impacts
- Land use compatibility
- Rendering plant compatibility
- General Plan consistency
- Transit service
- Sewer service development
- Groundwater Impacts
- Drainage
- Certain traffic impacts
- Certain air quality impacts
- Certain biological impacts
- Traffic noise

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In accordance with Guidelines Section 15183, a discussion of each of those impacts found to be significant in the prior EIR and the relative impact of the subject project in each of those categories is provided in this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Anatolia IV project.

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration hereby incorporates the Master EIR for the SDCP/SRSP planning areas by reference. The SDCP/SRSP project received final approval on July 17, 2002. The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors certified the Sunrise Douglas/SunRidge EIR as adequate and complete on June 19, 2002 and a State of Overriding Consideration was adopted for the significant and unavoidable impacts listed above.

2.3 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The Anatolia IV project comprises 25.1 acres and proposes the construction of 203 dwelling units (du). The proposed project also includes a park area, pedestrian paseos, landscape paseos, landscape corridors, and major roads (See **Figure 3** for Tentative Subdivision Map and **Table 1** for Proposed Land Uses). Infrastructure improvements such as water, sewer, and dry utilities are proposed along Chrysanthy Road and Jaeger Road within the proposed project boundary. Furthermore, the proposed project includes all on-site infrastructure needed to develop the site.

Table 1
Proposed Land Uses

Land Uses	Net Acreage	Units
RD-10	18.8	203
Park	2.6	--
Pedestrian Paseos	0.2	--
Landscape Paseos	0.8	--
Landscape Corridor	0.5	--
Major Roads	2.2	--
Total	25.1	203

2.4 REQUIRED PROJECT APPROVALS

In addition to the approval of the proposed project by the City Council of the City of Rancho Cordova, the following agency approvals may be required (depending on the final project design):

- Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA) Zone 40
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQB)
- Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District (SMUD)
- Sacramento Resource Conservation District (SRCD)
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- County Sanitation District (CSD-1)





Figure 2
SITE AND VICINITY MAP

LARGE LOT/SMALL LOT TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP

ANATOLIA IV
CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, CALIFORNIA

(REVISED SEPTEMBER 23, 2002)
(REVISED SEPTEMBER 22, 2004)
(REVISED APRIL 18, 2005)



PROJECT NOTES



1. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
2. LANDSCAPE CORRIDOR LOTS.
3. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
4. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
5. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
6. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
7. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
8. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
9. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
10. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
11. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
12. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
13. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
14. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
15. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
16. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
17. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
18. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
19. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
20. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
21. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
22. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
23. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
24. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
25. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
26. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
27. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
28. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
29. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
30. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
31. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
32. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
33. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
34. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
35. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
36. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
37. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
38. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
39. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
40. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
41. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
42. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
43. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
44. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
45. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
46. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
47. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
48. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
49. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
50. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
51. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
52. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
53. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
54. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
55. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
56. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
57. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
58. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
59. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
60. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
61. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
62. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
63. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
64. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
65. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
66. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
67. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
68. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
69. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
70. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
71. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
72. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
73. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
74. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
75. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
76. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
77. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
78. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
79. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
80. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
81. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
82. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
83. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
84. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
85. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
86. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
87. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
88. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
89. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
90. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
91. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
92. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
93. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
94. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
95. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
96. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
97. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
98. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
99. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.
100. ALL LOTS SHALL BE 100' WIDE.

LAND USE SUMMARY

GENERAL LAND USE PLAN	ACRES	PERCENTAGE	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL	18.88	87.4	87.4
LANDSCAPE CORRIDOR	2.62	12.6	12.6
TOTAL	21.50	100.0	100.0

LANDSCAPE CORRIDOR - PRESTATION PARSED LOT TOTAL AREA/ PARSED IN GROSS AREA OF ABOVE PARCELS

LOT NO.	LANDSCAPE CORRIDOR AREA (AC)	PARSED AREA (AC)
1	0.08	0.08
2	0.08	0.08
3	0.08	0.08
4	0.08	0.08
5	0.08	0.08
6	0.08	0.08
7	0.08	0.08
8	0.08	0.08
9	0.08	0.08
10	0.08	0.08
11	0.08	0.08
12	0.08	0.08
13	0.08	0.08
14	0.08	0.08
15	0.08	0.08
16	0.08	0.08
17	0.08	0.08
18	0.08	0.08
19	0.08	0.08
20	0.08	0.08
21	0.08	0.08
22	0.08	0.08
23	0.08	0.08
24	0.08	0.08
25	0.08	0.08
26	0.08	0.08
27	0.08	0.08
28	0.08	0.08
29	0.08	0.08
30	0.08	0.08
31	0.08	0.08
32	0.08	0.08
33	0.08	0.08
34	0.08	0.08
35	0.08	0.08
36	0.08	0.08
37	0.08	0.08
38	0.08	0.08
39	0.08	0.08
40	0.08	0.08
41	0.08	0.08
42	0.08	0.08
43	0.08	0.08
44	0.08	0.08
45	0.08	0.08
46	0.08	0.08
47	0.08	0.08
48	0.08	0.08
49	0.08	0.08
50	0.08	0.08
51	0.08	0.08
52	0.08	0.08
53	0.08	0.08
54	0.08	0.08
55	0.08	0.08
56	0.08	0.08
57	0.08	0.08
58	0.08	0.08
59	0.08	0.08
60	0.08	0.08
61	0.08	0.08
62	0.08	0.08
63	0.08	0.08
64	0.08	0.08
65	0.08	0.08
66	0.08	0.08
67	0.08	0.08
68	0.08	0.08
69	0.08	0.08
70	0.08	0.08
71	0.08	0.08
72	0.08	0.08
73	0.08	0.08
74	0.08	0.08
75	0.08	0.08
76	0.08	0.08
77	0.08	0.08
78	0.08	0.08
79	0.08	0.08
80	0.08	0.08
81	0.08	0.08
82	0.08	0.08
83	0.08	0.08
84	0.08	0.08
85	0.08	0.08
86	0.08	0.08
87	0.08	0.08
88	0.08	0.08
89	0.08	0.08
90	0.08	0.08
91	0.08	0.08
92	0.08	0.08
93	0.08	0.08
94	0.08	0.08
95	0.08	0.08
96	0.08	0.08
97	0.08	0.08
98	0.08	0.08
99	0.08	0.08
100	0.08	0.08



WOOD ROGERS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
1000 N. GARDEN STREET, SUITE 100
COSTA MESA, CA 92626
(714) 440-1100
WWW.WOODROGERS.COM

Figure 3
TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP



3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, including the CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance. There are 14 specific environmental issues evaluated in this chapter. Other CEQA considerations are evaluated in Chapter 4.0. The environmental issues evaluated in this chapter include:

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

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** Anatolia IV
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova
3121 Gold Canal Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Hilary Anderson (916) 361-8384
4. **Project Location:** The Anatolia IV project site is located within the approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and Sunridge Specific Plan (SDCP/SRSP) areas on the southwest corner of Chrysanthy Road and Jaeger Road.
5. **Project Sponsors' Names and Addresses:** Lennar Communities
1075 Creekside Ridge Drive, Suite 110
Roseville, CA 95678
6. **General Plan Designation(s):** Urban Development Area.
7. **Zoning:** RD-10 and park.
8. **Specific Plan:** The project location is within the 2,605.8 SunRidge Specific Plan Area, which was approved the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors on September 18, 2002 (Resolution No. 2002-0901).
9. **APN Number:** 067-0030-019
10. **Description of the Project:** The Anatolia IV project comprises 25.1 acres and proposes the construction of 203 dwelling units (du). The proposed project also includes a park area, pedestrian paseos, landscape paseos, landscape corridors, and major roads. Infrastructure improvements such as water, sewer, and dry utilities are proposed along Chrysanthy Road and Jaeger Road within the proposed project boundary. Furthermore, the proposed project includes all on-site infrastructure improvements necessary to develop the site.
11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The Anatolia IV project is located within the approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and SunRidge Specific Plan (SDCP/SRSP) area on the southwest corner of Chrysanthy Road and Jaeger Road. The project site is generally bounded by the future Montelena project to the north and west, the proposed Preserve at Sunridge subdivision to the east, and the approved Anatolia II subdivision to the south.
12. **Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
 1. Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA)
 2. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
 3. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
 4. Sacramento Metropolitan Utility District (SMUD)
 5. Sacramento Resource Conservation District (SRCD)
 6. U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
 7. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
 8. California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

9. County Sanitation District (CSD-1)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation is Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Anatolia IV project, as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. (The discussion demonstrates that there are no potentially significant impacts identified that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, an EIR is not warranted.)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

6. "Reviewed Under Previous Document" applies where the impact has been evaluated and discussed in a previous document. This category could be checked if an impact is either "Potentially Significant" or "Less than Significant". Discussion will include reference to the previous documents.
7. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.
8. Preparers are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individual contacts should be cited in the discussion.
9. Impacts that were originally classified as potentially significant on previous documents may now be indicated as less than significant. These particular impacts will be marked as "Less than Significant Impact" if the Specific Plan does not create any new impacts for the project area than those previously evaluated.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project's potential visual resource impacts were globally addressed in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan EIR (SDCP/SRSP EIR) (State Clearinghouse SCH#97022055, page 4.32). There are no scenic vista views available from the Anatolia IV project site. Mid-range views consist of rural homesteads, limited agriculture operations, open space, and developing projects within Specific Plan Area. Long-range views generally consist of rural/agricultural land uses, power transmission lines, industrial and aggregate operations and military/airport operations. Implementation of the project would not adversely affect views on nearby or distant scenic vistas; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP EIR addressed the Community Plan's potential to substantially damage scenic resources on and in the vicinity of the project site (SDCP/SRSP FEIR page 4.32). The nearest highways are US 50 and the Jackson Highway (State Route 16), which are not designated as a state scenic highway in the vicinity of the project site. United States 50 (US 50) is approximately 4 miles north of the project site and State Route 16 is approximately 4 miles south of the project site. Due to this distance, implementation of the proposed project would not damage scenic resources views from these highways. Therefore, this impact considered *less than significant*.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The entire Community Plan area is specifically identified in the County General Plan as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Service Boundary. Issues resulting from (i) new growth in this area, (ii) conversion of land to urban uses, (iii) compatibility with the surrounding area, (iv) loss of open space, and (v) increase in nighttime lighting and daytime glare were globally addressed in the General Plan EIR (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, p. 4.32).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The General Plan EIR noted that development of the project area would include various intensities of development, which could substantially alter existing views and conflict with the scale of existing structures and the rural character of these areas. The introduction of urban uses and densities into these areas would substantially alter the present nature of their viewsheds, and therefore result in a significant and unavoidable impact (Sacramento County General Plan EIR, pp. 4.10-11).

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

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

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The soils on the proposed project site are depicted on Sacramento County General Soils Map as being comprised of the Redding-Corning-Red Bluff complexes (NRCS Soil Survey, 1993). These soils are moderately well drained that are moderately deep over a cemented hardpan. In addition, the project site is depicted on the CA Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) as Grazing Land (G) and Farmland of Local Importance (L). Grazing Land is suitable for the grazing of livestock and Farmland of Local Importance are crop and irrigated pasture lands, which do not qualify as Prime or Unique farmland. The proposed project would not convert Prime, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland to non-agricultural uses; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The entire SDCP area, which includes the project site, was specifically identified in the Sacramento County General Plan as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Services Boundary. Issues resulting from (i) new growth in this area, (ii) conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, (iii) compatibility with the surrounding area; and (iv) loss of open space were globally addressed in the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/SunRidge Specific Plan Final EIR (SDCP/SRSP FEIR) (State Clearinghouse SCH#97022055, page 4.32). The FEIR identified three areas of potential inconsistency with the Sacramento County General Plan and the SunRidge Specific Plan; the possible need for development clustering, the possible need to increase certain land uses and to reduce others with the overall mix of land uses; and the possible need for a more transit-oriented design within the project. However, the CEQA

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Findings of Fact for the SDCP/SRSP project (Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, June 19, 2002, page 31) disagreed with the EIR conclusion and determined that there is “no significant effect” relating to any General Plan inconsistency.

As relating specifically to the Anatolia IV project site, no parcels are under Williamson Act contracts (SDCP/SRSP, page 4.30a). Therefore, the project's conflicts and impacts with existing zoning, nearby agricultural uses, and existing Williamson Act contracts are considered *less than significant*.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) has prepared its Air Quality Attainment Plan, which describes the local measures, which are planned for implementation to achieve the federal and state air quality standards. The SunRidge Specific Plan, which includes the project site, was developed in collaboration with the SMAQMD's Air Quality Attainment Plan. The Anatolia IV project would include, but not be limited to, a mixture of complementary uses within ½ mile from the project's boundaries, Class I or Class II bike lanes, multiple and/or direct pedestrian access, state-of-the-art telecommunications capabilities, and located within ¼ mile of a bus stop. In addition to these standards and design features the project would include other features, (see discussion below) to the fulfill SMAQMD's objectives of Policy AQ-15. All air quality impacts were quantified and mitigated to the furthest extent possible in the SunRidge Specific Plan EIR. As such, the project would not conflict or obstruct SMAQMD's Air Quality Attainment Plan; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 3.1 would reduce this impact to *less than significant*.

b) *Potentially Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Sacramento County is a known area of non-attainment for State and federal standards for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀). The SDCP/SRSP EIR determined that construction-related and operational emissions arising from the implementation of the SunRidge Specific Plan would result in emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ that are above the SMAQMD significance thresholds for those pollutants (FEIR, pp. 11.15–11.16, 11.18–11.19). The Master EIR determined that the buildout of the Specific Plan with projects such as Anatolia IV would contribute to a cumulative increase of construction-related emissions and exacerbates SMAQMD’s non-attainment status for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, and PM₁₀ (*Ibid.*). The project is subject to the Sacramento County General Plan Policy AQ-15 or equivalent mechanism, which is designed to reduce by at least 15 percent air pollution emissions resulting from new developments. Additionally, the SMAQMD has an established construction-related emissions reduction program (Category 1: Reducing No_x emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment, and Category 2: Controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment) to reduce construction-related air quality impacts. The Master EIR determined that the air quality impacts arising from buildout of the Specific Plan and construction-related activities were significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures (FEIR, pp. 11.15–11.16, 11.18–11.20). Implementation of Mitigation Measure AI-1, proposed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR, SMAQMD’s approved construction emissions programs (Findings, p. 101), and a measure substituted by the Board for proposed measure AI-5 (Findings, p. 106) were found by the Board to mitigate, but not entirely avoid, these impacts from air pollutant emissions.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Anatolia IV project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant air quality impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15178, subd. (c)(1).) To ensure, however, that the mitigation measures adopted for the Specific Plan are carried out at this project level, the City proposes the following Mitigation Measures, which are revisions to those previously adopted measures, made applicable to this proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova and SMAQMD.

In addition, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented by the Anatolia IV project to reduce emissions from off- road diesel powered construction vehicles.

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

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

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

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to and during construction activities.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts to special-status species were globally (non site-specific) evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 14.27–14.32). The Anatolia IV project site may contain suitable habitat for special status species (FEIR, p. 14.27). The potential impact of development within the SDCP/SRSP area on special status species was disclosed in the Master EIR as significant and unavoidable, for the reason that site-specific information for the area was not yet available, and therefore, the analysis in the FEIR assumed that such habitat would not be avoided (FEIR, p. 14.31). Therefore, the FEIR proposed, and the Board adopted, mitigation measures that require future project proponents for development entitlements to conduct determinate surveys for special status species, prepare detailed mitigation plans designed to reduce the impact to such species to a less than significant level, and coordinate with the appropriate agencies to obtain the necessary permits. (Findings, pp. 120-121 (mitigation measures BR-6, BR-7).) To completely fulfill the requirements, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures BR-6 and BR-7, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of these measures at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant impact to special status species to a less than significant level, as required by SDCP/SRSP Mitigation Measure BR-6 (FEIR, p. 14.31; Findings, p. 120).

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

Mitigation Measures

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

- MM 4.1a** The project applicant shall conduct (or update) determinate surveys for potentially occurring special status species or their habitat using protocol acceptable to the regulatory agencies with authority over these species.
- If any of the special status species or their habitat are indicated, a detailed plan which describes the specific methods to be implemented to avoid and/or mitigate any project impacts upon special status species to a less than significant level will be required. This detailed Special Status Species Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall be prepared in consultation with the USFWS and CDFG, and shall emphasize a multi-species approach to the maximum extent possible.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- Where project impacts include taking of a federally listed species, a Section 10 Incidental Take Permit or a Biological Opinion resulting from Section 7 Consultation with another federal agency shall be obtained from the USFWS and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act.
- Where project impacts include taking of a state listed animal species, a "2081" permit shall be obtained from the CDFG and permit conditions implemented, pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 4.1b

The project applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by implementing one of the following alternatives:

- For projects within a one-mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 1.0 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. For projects within a one to five mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 0.75 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. For projects within a five to ten mile radius of an active nest site, the project proponent shall preserve 0.5 acre of similar habitat for each acre lost within a ten-mile radius of the project site. This land shall be protected through fee title or conservation easement (acceptable to the CDFG); or,
- The project applicant shall, in consultation with the CDFG, prepare and implement a Swainson's hawk mitigation plan that will include preservation of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.

Should the City Council of the City of Rancho Cordova adopt a Swainson's hawk mitigation policy/program prior to implementation of one of the measures above, the project applicant shall be subject to that program instead.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each project and throughout construction activities of all projects.

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

MM 4.1c

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

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

b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above.

c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Impacts to wetlands were globally (non site-specific) evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR (See FEIR, pp. 14.22–14.24). The Anatolia IV project site contains federally protected wetlands (i.e., vernal pools, ponds, and or wet swales), which could be disturbed by grading and other site preparation activities. The potential impact of development within the SDCP/SRSP area on wetlands was disclosed in the Master EIR as significant and unavoidable, for the reason that site-specific information for the area was not yet available, and therefore, the analysis in the FEIR assumed that wetland-dependent species such as fairy/tadpole shrimp were present (FEIR, p. 14.22). It was also assumed in the FEIR's analysis that such impacts would be mitigated with off-site compensation, rather than on-site preservation (FEIR, p. 14.23). The FEIR noted that the County's General Plan policy mandating "no net loss" for wetlands acreage is applicable to all development within the SDCP/SRSP area, and that impacts to wetlands are also subject to federal regulation and permitting (FEIR, p.14.23–14.24). The FEIR proposed a mitigation measure requiring future project proponents for development entitlements to place the highest priority on avoiding and preserving on-site wetlands. (FEIR, pp. 14.24–14.25 (mitigation measure BR-1).) The Board rejected this measure as infeasible, however, on the grounds that, due to the area's designation in the General Plan as an Urban Growth Area, the preservation of vast swaths of land upon which diffuse, low quality wetlands may occur was inconsistent with the intent of the General Plan and an inefficient use of this land (Findings, pp. 116-117). The Board determined, instead, to adopt a measure requiring future project proponents to prepare wetland delineations of their parcels and to submit wetland avoidance/mitigation, monitoring and maintenance plans sufficient to comply with the County's "no net loss" wetlands policy and the applicable state and federal agencies' permitting requirements. (Findings, pp. 117-118 (mitigation measures B-R2, BR-3, BR-4).) The Board's measures also allowed for flexibility in achieving compliance with the no net loss policy, in order to accommodate future improvements in wetlands mitigation strategies. (Findings, pp. 118-119 (mitigation measures BR-3 and SRSP zoning condition No. 62).)

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

species to a less than significant level, as required by the County's and federal government's no net loss policies (FEIR, pp. 14.23–14.24; Findings, pp. 116–119).

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures (based on BR-1, BR-2, and BR-4 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) are revised to apply to the Anatolia IV project.

MM 4.2a The project shall comply with Sacramento County's no net loss policies for wetland habitat acreage and values (CO-62, CO-70, CO-83, and CO-96), which establish minimum performance for a wetland avoidance/mitigation strategy. If a Clean Water Act permit is not required, the applicant shall submit the Avoidance/Mitigation Plan to the City of Rancho Cordova for review and approval. This measure must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to site disturbance.

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

MM 4.2b If a Clean Water Act permit is required, then the applicant shall submit a Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan, which describes the specific methods to be implemented to avoid and/or mitigate any project impacts upon wetlands such that no net loss in wetland habitat or acreage and values is achieved. This detailed Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the USFWS, and the CDFG regulations, and to the satisfaction of the City of Rancho Cordova, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the USFWS, and CDFG. The Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall ensure the following:

- The location of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers verified wetlands and vernal pools on-site and for all offsite properties where grading activities and uses are proposed;
- The location of proposed wetland preservation, acquisition, and creation site(s);
- A detailed map of proposed wetland creation site(s) showing the acreage, distribution, and type of wetlands to be created to ensure no net loss in wetland habitat acreage, values and functions. Compensation wetlands shall be designed to:
 - Meet or exceed the hydrophytic conditions and operating functions of the existing wetlands proposed for impact.
 - Mitigate the loss of special status species habitat, including fairy/tadpole shrimp, as required by the USFWS and the CDFG;
- A monitoring plan designed to assess whether the compensation wetlands are functioning as intended. Specific performance standards for hydrologic, floral, and faunal parameters shall be proposed to determine success of the created wetlands. The monitoring plan shall

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

specify the corrective measures/modifications to be implemented in the event that monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met. Monitoring shall occur for at least five years and until success criteria are met, and as required by the US Army Corps of Engineers, the USFWS, and the City of Rancho Cordova.

- A maintenance plan for the wetland preservation/mitigation areas describing the measures to be implemented to assure that they are maintained as wetland habitat in perpetuity. The maintenance plan address buffering from adjacent uses, fencing, access, erosion control, and weed eradication.
- The applicant shall grant full access to the project site for City of Rancho Cordova environmental staff to monitor construction activities and mitigation compliance. Access shall be granted during all construction activities. In addition, City monitor may issue stop work orders if mitigation non-compliance is identified.

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

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

MM 4.2c

Prior to construction activities, project applicant shall obtain all necessary U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and all necessary California Endangered Species Act Permits.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to site disturbance.

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

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

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

The Anatolia IV project is within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant impacts to on-site trees that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).). Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Mitigation Measure

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

MM 4.3 The project applicant for the Anatolia IV project shall submit a survey identifying the specific type, size, and location of all existing on-site trees. Existing on-site trees shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Consistent with General Plan policies, the removal of any native oak tree measuring six inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) and the removal of any non-oak native tree (excluding cottonwoods and willows) measuring 19 inches or greater dbh necessary to accommodate future development shall be mitigated by planting replacement trees (in-kind species on an inch-for-inch basis) within the project area. In addition, other non-native landmark size (19" or greater) may require mitigation as determined on a project- by- project basis.

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

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Currently, there is not an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for Sacramento County or the SDCP/SRSP; therefore, the project would not conflict with such plans and the impact would be *less than significant*. However, the Sacramento Planning Department has indicated that the South Sacramento County HCP is in the planning stages and they may have an administrative draft in seven months. However, they don't anticipate adoption of the plan for more than two years. Since it is not finalized and adopted, it cannot be ascertained if the project will be in conflict with the Plan, therefore *less than significant* impacts would occur for the proposed project.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

Mitigation Measures

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits and during all phases of construction.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above.
- c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* There are no known cemeteries on the project site, however, due to the large Native American population in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked sites, such as gravesites of areas of spiritual significance, which may not contain any surface evidence of occupancy. The project is not expected to result in any new cultural resource impacts. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.1 would reduce any potential human remain impacts to *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

EXISTING SETTING

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* This issue was reviewed in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and the SunRidge Specific Plan Areas (See Section 16. Hazardous Materials). The land uses proposed as part of the Anatolia IV project consist of residential and park uses, which are not associated with the use of large amounts of hazardous materials. In addition, the proposed land uses do not, generally, involve the routine transport of hazardous materials; therefore, implementation of the proposed project is expected to result in *less than significant* hazardous material transportation and disposal related impacts.

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

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

Mitigation Measures

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Mitigation Measures

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site is not located within the Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP) area of the Sacramento Mather Airport, but is within two miles of the facility. Implementation of the project would not adversely affect operations of this facility and is not anticipated to result in safety-related hazards or adverse impacts to people residing or working on the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 4.29).
- f) *No Impact.* The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, *no impacts* are anticipated.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the Sacramento County Multi-hazard Disaster Plan, the Sacramento County Area Plan, or any other adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project site is not adjacent to wildlands and is in an area designated for urbanized land uses. Additionally, implementation of the project will not place residences or structures where they are

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

intermixed with wildlands. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* and does not require mitigation.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
j) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas. Implementation of this measure at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant water quality impacts to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, pp. 9.13).

Mitigation Measures

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

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

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

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

c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As noted for the larger SDCP/SRSP project, conversion of approximately 25 acres of agricultural lands to suburban development will substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site (FEIR, p. 9.11). Buildout under the SDCP/SRSP such as the proposed Anatolia IV project would increase drainage rates that could result in flooding and erosion (*Ibid.*). The Master EIR and the Board determined that drainage and detention facilities that ensure post-development peak flows are reduced to at least pre-development levels will mitigate potential drainage and flooding impacts to a less than significant level (FEIR, p. 9.11; Findings, pp. 76-77). The Board imposed mitigation measures requiring the facilities

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

outlined in the SDCP/SRSP Master Drainage Plan be constructed as development within the planning area occurs (Findings, pp. 77-80 (mitigation measures HY-2, HY-4, HY-5). No additional on- or off-site siltation or erosion impacts are anticipated beyond those previously identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR.

The Anatolia IV project is a subsequent project within the scope of activities and land uses studied in the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR. This project would not create any new or additional significant drainage impacts that were not already identified in the Master EIR; nor would it cause any impacts peculiar to the project or parcels. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15178, subd. (c)(1).). Furthermore, because this project is substantially consistent with the land use designations set forth in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and because the drainage impacts at issue have been previously disclosed and are not peculiar to the project or parcels, such impacts are not subject to CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.) To ensure that the measures adopted by the Board are carried out at the project-specific level, the City is requiring the following mitigation measures, which are based on the requirements of measures HY-2, HY-4, and HY-5, adopted by the Board for application to subsequent developments within the SDCP/SRSP planning areas (Findings, pp. 76-80). Implementation of these measures at a project-specific level will reduce the potentially significant drainage impacts to a less than significant level, as noted by the Master EIR (FEIR, p. 9.14).

Mitigation Measures

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

MM 8.2a

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

- Detailed plans for the design and construction of all proposed drainage, flood control and water quality improvements, consistent with the Final MDS and Amendment, shall be submitted to the County WRD for review and approval.
- Plans for the design and construction of any joint-use park/detention facilities shall also be subject to the approval of the Cordova Parks and Recreation District.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

MM 8.2b

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 8.2c

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 8.2a through 8.2c would reduce the project's potential water quality standards and waste discharge requirement impacts to *less than significant*.

- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Chapter 9 Drainage and Hydrology and discussions c) above.
- e-g) *Less Than Significant impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussions a) through d) above.
- h) *Less Than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.
- i) *Less Than Significant Impact/ Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, provided that improvements are constructed as required by the Water Resources Division. Because this project would involve a land disturbance of more than five acres, the Regional Water Quality Control Board would require a Construction Activity Storm Water General Permit. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- j) *Less Than Significant Impact/ Reviewed Under Previous Document.* According to the flood hazard and insurance rate maps, the entire project sites are located outside the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- k) *Less Than Significant Impact/ Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.
- l) *Less Than Significant Impact Reviewed/ Under Previous Document.* See discussion a) above.
- m) *No Impact.* The project site is not located near the Pacific Ocean, nor is it near a large water body that would be capable of creating a seiches or tsunami.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP area is currently being developed and is surrounded by limited development; as such, the project would not divide an established community. The Master Plan EIR identified nine residential clusters or community “villages” for the SDCP area, which included land use allocations for the SDCP/SRSP areas. These allocations included, but were not limited to, residential densities, public service acreage, and commercial square footage. Land use related impacts for the Community Plan and SunRidge Specific Plan areas were evaluated in the previous Master EIR (SDCP/SRSP Final EIR, page 4.28). Implementation of the Anatolia IV project would not result in any additional land use impacts than those identified in previous documents; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR, Section 4: Land Use and a) above. The Board found that the land use designations contained within the SDCP/SRSP project were not inconsistent with the County’s General Plan, and that, as a result, this project did not cause any significant impacts with respect to General Plan consistency (SDCP/SRSP Findings, p. 31). The Anatolia IV project proposes land uses that are substantially consistent with the Community Plan and Specific Plan designations for these areas (See FEIR, pp. 4.15a–4.17b. Development of the Anatolia IV project would not result in any new or significant additional land use impacts beyond those identified in the Master EIR. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Currently, there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in Sacramento County; therefore, *less than significant* impacts are expected.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP Master EIR evaluated noise impacts associated with development of the Community Plan and Specific Plan areas (FEIR, pp. 12.15–12.16). The Master EIR determined that the impacts of traffic noise, proposed commercial, business/professional and school uses were significant, but in most cases, mitigable to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures requiring acoustical analysis and the development of noise

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

attenuation measures as future projects within the SDCP/SRSP areas are proposed (*Ibid.*; Findings, pp. 111-114). As predicted in the Master EIR, the Anatolia IV project may place residential and other land uses in close proximity to roadways, which may result in traffic noise in excess of established Sacramento County General Plan and Noise Ordinance Standards (FEIR, pp. 12.15–12.16). This project, however, is subject to the mitigation measures adopted by the County for these impacts. Therefore, this impact will be mitigated to a *less than significant* level.

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

- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Implementation of the Anatolia IV project would not generate excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise sources. Construction activities would temporarily increase groundbourne related impacts; however, standard Sacramento County Noise Ordinance requirements would reduce this impact to *less than significant*.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above. In addition, implementation of the project would substantially increase traffic volumes and result in changes in traffic noise levels adjacent to roadways in the vicinity of the projects. The project would also result in additional stationary noise sources from the proposed park uses. To reduce potential noise impacts from these sources, the project will incorporate the use of setbacks, barriers and various site designs to help shield noise sensitive areas (i.e., residential areas and parks). The project would not result in any permanent noise increases than those identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR.

Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure (based on NS-5 of the SDCP/SRSP EIR) is revised to apply to the Anatolia IV project.

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to improvement plan approval.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Mitigation Measure

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

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

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

b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will provide approximately 203 residential units on land that currently has one rural residence. Therefore, there would be no significant displacement of existing housing and no need for the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c) *No Impact.* See b) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on fire protection were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated that reduce the level of potential impact to *less than significant*. The Sacramento Metro Fire District indicated that one or two more fire stations would be needed to accommodate the proposed growth within the SRSP area. During the project's development, the primary calls for fire service will most likely be for emergency medical responses. The proposed project is subject to modern fire codes, which would decrease the likeliness of structure related fire responses.

Mitigation Measure

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

- MM 13.1** The project applicant shall pay the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District's building permit fee.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

Implementation of the Mitigation Measure MM 13.1 would fully mitigate the proposed project's potential impacts on fire protection services to *less than significant*.

- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The Sacramento County Sheriff's Department will provide law enforcement services to the Anatolia IV project site. The SDCP/SRSP project's effects on law enforcement were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated which reduce the level of potential impact to *less than significant*. The Sheriff's Department reviewed the SDCP/SRSP projects and identified various design features, which can be included in future

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

development proposals to minimize the demand for law enforcement services (SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 6.16).

Mitigation Measure

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

- c) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Construction of the proposed residential units would generate students for schools. However, the SDCP/SRSP FEIR states, "The public Facilities Financing Plan for the Specific Plan area indicates that funding of needed school facilities will occur through the payment of Elk Grove and Folsom Cordova school impact fees, through participation in the Elk Grove School District's Mello Roos CFD, and through the State School Building Program. By contributing towards the costs of school facilities as outlined in the proposed Financing Plan, and by designating an adequate number of sites for new school construction, Sunrise Douglas Plan area development will have a less than significant impact on school facilities". Specifically, the proposed project would also have a *less than significant* impact on school facilities.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Construction of the residential units would generate the need for additional parkland. The project proposes the construction of approximately 2.6 acres of park uses to serve the residential units. Park uses proposed by the Anatolia IV project are far greater in size than proposed in the SDCP/SRSP FEIR (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, page 4.15a). This is considered a *less than significant* impact to park resources.
- e) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Section 6: Public Services and a) through d) above. Three new electrical substations will be needed to serve the SRSP area. It is important to note that SMUD has indicated the need for a substation on or near the proposed project site. However, the specific location of the substation has yet to be determined. Natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure will also be extended to serve the proposed land uses within the SRSP area. The SDCP/SRSP projects' effects on electrical, natural gas, and cable service were studied in the Master EIR and mitigation measures were incorporated that reduce the level of potential impact to *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to recordation of final map.

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

MM 13.3d The Anatolia IV project applicant shall address and resolve issues related to the provision of telephone and cable television services within the project area through close coordination with the applicable service provider during project planning and development.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See XIII. Public Services d) above. The Anatolia IV project would include approximately 2.6 acres of park uses, which is far greater than was evaluated in the SDCP/SRST EIR. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See a) above. The potential environmental impacts of park construction and provision were addressed in the appropriate technical sections of the SDCP/SRSP EIR. The construction of proposed park uses would not result in additional environmental impacts than those identified in the EIR; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

The Traffic and Circulation section of the SDCP/SRSP Master EIR assessed the potential traffic-related impacts resulting from buildout under the SRSP (FEIR, section 10). The analysis examined the project-specific and cumulative effects on the Specific Plan area’s roadways, intersections, freeway operations, and proposed transit and bikeway facilities (FEIR, pp. 10.17–10.36). Implementation of the SRSP would increase A.M. and P.M. peak hour and daily vehicle trips over existing conditions (FEIR, p. 10.17). The SDCP/SRSP EIR identified thirty-one (31) traffic and circulation mitigation measures, most of which the Board subsequently adopted (Findings, pp. 80-98).

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated /Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Traffic and Circulation issues were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 10: Traffic and Circulation). The SDCP/SRSP EIR indicated that a significant number of trips would be generated by implementation of the SRSP under existing plus project conditions. Buildout under the SRSP is projected to generate approximately 152,400 daily vehicle trips – 10,155 during the A.M. peak hour and 15,830 during the P.M. peak hour.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Mitigation Measures

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

MM 15.1 The Anatolia IV project shall participate in fair share funding for freeway, transit, and rail improvements identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR in Mitigation Measures TC-1 through TC-7 and TC-9 through TC-31. Payment of the specific plan roadway fee and or the citywide transportation impact fee satisfies the fair share-funding obligation for transportation facilities. However, payment of the fees does not release any other existing specific plan condition with respect to recording of final maps based on thresholds relating to construction of the listed priority projects.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures

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

MM 15.2 The Anatolia IV project applicant shall participate in their fair share of traffic calming measures required along Sunrise Boulevard (i.e., signal timing, striping, and left turn restriction). Payment of the specific plan roadway fee and or the citywide transportation impact fee satisfies the fair share funding obligation for transportation facilities. However, payment of the fees does not release any other existing specific plan condition with respect to recording of final maps based on thresholds relating to construction of the listed priority project.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of building permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

- c) *No Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed project does not involve any aviation-related uses but is located within two-miles of the Sacramento Mather Airport. The project site is not located within the airport safety zones or within the approach and departure paths for aircraft using the airport and *no impacts* are anticipated.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The proposed roadway system for the Anatolia IV project would be designed consistent with Sacramento County Department of Transportation Engineering standards and the approved SRSP; therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP identified roadway improvements, which will ensure adequate emergency access to the Anatolia IV project site; therefore, *less than significant* impacts are anticipated.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRSP EIR indicated that all development projects within the SRSP area are subject to parking requirements established in the Sacramento County Zoning Code for the proposed land uses. In addition, the SDCP/SRSP EIR (page 10.36) indicated that parking related impacts are considered *less than significant* and no mitigation measures are necessary.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The SDCP/SRDP EIR evaluated alternative transportation modes for the SunRidge Specific Plan area. The project will incorporate pedestrian pathways and bikeways and the routing of the collector streets will provide bikeway and pedestrian connections to regional bikeway systems and regional transit. SRSP preliminary conceptual transit routes are proposed along Douglas Road and Pyramid Road. In addition, the bikeways will meet the standards set forth in the 2010 Sacramento City/County Bikeway Master Plan (SRSP page 4-7). The project would not conflict with the provision of alternative modes of transportation; therefore, *less than significant* impacts are anticipated.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

EXISTING SETTING

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Wastewater treatment issues were addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 8: Sewer Service). No wastewater treatment impacts were identified in the EIR that conflicted with applicable Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) requirements or standards. Interim sewer outfall will be needed to serve the projects due to the timing of construction of the proposed CSD-1 Mather and Laguna Interceptors. Temporary facilities include a pump station (located approximately 4,000 feet south of Douglas Road and 1,200 feet east of Sunrise Boulevard) with an ultimate capacity of approximately 5.75 (mgd), serving approximately 8,000 dwelling units. The wastewater from the Anatolia IV projects would be pumped via an 18-inch 36,000-foot force main to the Bradshaw Interceptor at Bradshaw Road and Jackson Highway. The 18-inch force main has a capacity of approximately 9.0 mgd at a velocity of 8 fps; therefore, the proposed facilities (interim and long-term) would fully accommodate the sewer flows anticipated from the proposed developments, which includes buildout of the SRSP area (SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 8.6); therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential environmental impacts associated with providing new wastewater and water facilities were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (See Section 7: Water Supply and Section 8: Sewer Service). Although, there is presently no public sewer or water infrastructure available for the proposed project, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and County Sanitation District-1 (CSD-1) planned facilities and interceptor construction will provide sufficient capacity to accommodate SRSP buildout sewer flows (see a) above and the SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 8.6). The water supply plan for the SRSP area and the Anatolia IV project includes the construction of water supply facilities in phases according to increases in water demand. The water supply plan includes construction of the Excelsior Groundwater Treatment Plant, formerly known as the North Vineyard Well Field (NVWF), located near the intersection Florin and Excelsior Roads to extract groundwater from the basin underlying Zone 40. The "initial phase" would include construction of water supply facilities with sufficient capacity to deliver up to approximately 2,265 acre-feet per year, with a maximum day flow rate of approximately 4.0 mgd. Groundwater extraction and treatment, pumping and pipeline conveyance, and water storage facilities would be constructed during the "initial phase." Subsequent phases include expansion of "initial phase" facilities to deliver an additional 3,262 acre-feet year and a maximum flow rate of approximately 10.0 mgd. Groundwater extraction and treatment, pumping and pipeline conveyance, and water storage facilities would also be expanded during these subsequent phases. All water supply facilities for the SRSP, including the Anatolia IV project, will be integrated with the planned Zone 40 surface and groundwater conjunctive use program described in the *Water Forum Plan* (WFP). For a discussion on potential water service impacts, see d) below. The Anatolia IV project will be required to construct the necessary wastewater and water infrastructure facilities to accommodate the proposed land uses. Additionally, project sites were identified for urban growth and planned for urban utility services to fully accommodate the projected sewer flows.

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

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of improvement plans.

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

MM 16.1b Implementation of off-site sewer facility improvements shall not occur until all necessary permits and/or agreements for the proposed improvements have been obtained from the US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of improvement plans.

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

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

Timing/Implementation: Prior final map recordation.

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 16.1a through 16.1c would reduce potential wastewater and water facility construction and expansion impacts to *less than significant*.

c) *Less than Significant/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The potential environmental impacts associated with providing storm drainage facilities were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 9, Drainage and Hydrology, pages 9.11 through 9.15). In addition, see Section VIII: Hydrology and Water Quality of this initial study. The land uses proposed in the Anatolia IV project would increase the rate and volume of drainage runoff from the site; however, implementation of drainage and detention improvements and *Mitigation Measures 8.1 through 8.2*, which was revised from the SDCP/SRSP EIR, would ensure that post-development peak flows are reduced to a least pre-development levels and would mitigate potential storm water drainage and associated environmental impacts to *less than significant*.

d) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* The water supply plan and associated environmental impacts for the SDCP/SRSP areas were evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 7: Water Supply). A conjunctive use program, consistent with the Water Forum Plan (WFP), will ultimately be implemented to supply water to the proposed project site. However, environmental analysis of the Zone 40 Master Plan

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Update and the facilities to implement the groundwater and surface water elements have not been completed, nor has detailed planning or facility design been determined. While it is likely that Zone 40 conjunctive use facilities (groundwater, surface water, and recycled water) will be implemented in a timely manner to serve the projects, such facilities cannot be guaranteed until they are approved (SDCP/SRSP EIR Section 7: Water Supply page 7.60). However, water supply contracts and infrastructure system are currently being finalized for the SDCP/SRSP areas and the "Final" Public Facility Financing Plan will provide the needed funding mechanisms to implement the construction of the proposed water systems. In addition, implementation of MM 16.1c, identified above, will ensure compliance with the CO-20 development cap by only allowing development to proceed for which a safe and reliable long-term water supply has been identified and acquired. Review of the Anatolia IV project is not anticipated to result in any additional water supply impacts than those identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. Therefore, water supply impacts are considered *less than significant*. The reader is referred to Section IX: Drainage and Hydrology of this initial study, for potential water contamination issues.

- e) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See SDCP/SRSP EIR Section Sewer Service 8 and a) above. The SDCP/SRSP areas were identified for urban growth and planned for urban services. Planned sewer facilities and infrastructure will fully accommodate the sewer flows anticipated from the proposed development (SDCP/SRSP EIR, page 8.6); therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.
- f) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* This issue was globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP Final EIR and indicated that the Kiefer Landfill would have adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed projects under buildout conditions (page 6.21). Additionally, the Kiefer Landfill expansion was recently approved, which gives the facility a permitted capacity to serve the growth projected in Sacramento County through 2035; therefore, solid waste impacts are considered less than significant.
- g) *Less than Significant Impact/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* See f) above.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

Discussion of Impacts

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* As noted in Sections I through XVI above, the Anatolia IV project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to biological resources (i.e., special-status species and wetlands), cultural resources, hydrology/water quality, traffic and circulation, public services and utility and service systems.
- b) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Incorporation of all mitigation measures above would reduce any environmental impacts, both short and long-term, to *less than significant*. The proposed project will serve the environmental goals, both long and short-term, of the SDCP/SRSP EIR. Therefore, the proposed project serves both short-term and long-term environmental goals and would have a *less than significant impact*.
- c) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* There are several proposed developments within the SDCP/SRSP areas. The Anatolia IV project, together with other proposed and planned development in the vicinity could result in potentially significant cumulative impacts.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated/Reviewed Under Previous Document.* Potential project impacts such as air quality, transportation/traffic, hydrology/water quality, provision of public services, provision of utilities, and noise could cause substantial adverse effects in human beings, either directly or indirectly.

4.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

4.1 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

INTRODUCTION

This section addresses the project’s potential to contribute to cumulative impacts in the region. CEQA Guidelines Section 15355 defines cumulative impacts as “two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.”

CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for the Anatolia IV project includes all planned and projected development within the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan Planning Area. Several development projects have been planned or are projected to occur both within the City limits and in the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County immediately adjacent to the City limits. Further development is anticipated in the City’s Interim General Plan. Approved and proposed projects in the General Plan Planning Area are listed in **Table 2** below. **Figure 4**, at the end of this section, depicts the locations of most of these projects.

**TABLE 2
SURROUNDING APPROVED AND PROPOSED PROJECTS IN THE PROJECT AREA**

Approved Projects						
Project ¹ Name	Total Acres	Res. Acres	Com. Acres	Residential Units	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation
Sunridge Park	244.2	244.2	N/A	933	Low Density Residential	RD-4, RD-5, RD-7, CMU
Anatolia I	229.8	163.5	N/A	1038	Residential, commercial, park, elementary school	RD-5, RD-7, RD-10
Anatolia II	298	150.7	N/A	955	Residential, commercial, recreation center, park, school	RD-4, RD-5, RD-7, RD-10
Anatolia III	208	208	N/A	879	Low Density Residential, Open Space	RD-4, RD-5
Mather East	44.56	11.9	29.1	129	Commercial, Multi-family, open space	RD-10, LC
Sunrise Douglas Shopping Center	14	N/A	14	N/A	Commercial	LC
Villages of Zinfandel GPA	823	527	18	1833	Residential, Commercial, Public, Recreation	SPA
North Douglas	130.3	120.9	N/A	680	Low Density Residential, Park	RD-5, RD-7, RD-10
Capital Village	117	71.7	32	836	Mixed Use	SPA
Proposed Projects						
Anatolia IV	25	21.6	N/A	203	Residential	RD-10
Rio del Oro	3,828.5	1,931	137	11,608	Mixed-use development, which will include a General Plan Amendment, and Amending the Aerojet SPA Ordinance.	SPA
Suncreek Specific Plan	3,410	2,901	306	12,483	Low density Residential, Medium density Residential, Commercial, Recreation, Open Space, Schools	SPA
Sunridge East	609.4	393.6	25.7	3,042	Residential, commercial, office, and natural preserve	RD-5, RD-7, RD-10, RD-15, LC

4.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Montelena	251.9	158.3	N/A	869	Residential, wetlands preserve, parks, fire station.	RD-4, RD-5, RD-7, RD-10, RD-20
Westborough	1,518	1,000	274	6,000	Residential, business, community and recreational uses	RD-5, RD-10, RD-30, LC, CMU, VCMU, OMU
Glenborough	1,366	801	178	4,810	Residential, commercial and recreational uses	RD-5, RD-10, RD-30, LC, CMU, O
Bradshaw Landing	40.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	360,000-square-foot theater and retail commercial use	LC
Legion of Christ Catholic College	300	N/A	N/A	N/A	Private college campus with residences for 7,000 students and nearly 600 faculty members. The estimated completion date of 2008.	N/A
Stone Creek Apartments	17.2	17.2	N/A	218	Multi-Family Residential within Village of Zinfandel	RD-20
Lot J	78.6	78.6	N/A	368	Residential, parks.	RD-4, RD-5, RD-7, RD-10

Note: Data compiled by Rancho Cordova Planning Staff. Data is accurate as of September 30, 2005.

CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Aesthetics

Implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative visual resource or aesthetic impacts. Thus, ***less than significant*** impacts to aesthetic resource are anticipated under cumulative conditions.

Agricultural Resources

The entire SDCP area, which includes the project site, was specifically identified in the Sacramento County General Plan as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Services Boundary. Issues resulting from (i) new growth in this area, (ii) conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, (iii) compatibility with the surrounding area; and (iv) loss of open space were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP EIR. The project would not result in cumulatively significant loss of agricultural resources or farmlands; therefore, ***less than significant*** impacts are anticipated.

Air Quality

The proposed project would contribute to cumulative air quality impacts in the vicinity. Mitigation measures contained in Section 3: Initial Study III: Air Quality of this MND would reduce the impacts to the greatest extent feasible. The project would result in cumulative adverse air emissions; however, the project's contributions are expected to be ***potentially significant*** unless the mitigation identified in Section 3 of this MND is incorporated, which would reduce the project's air quality related impact to the greatest extent feasible.

Biological Resources

The project would contribute to cumulative biological resource impacts within the SDCP/SRSP areas; however, implementation of the proposed mitigation measures identified in Section 3: Initial Study IV: Biological Resources, of this MND would mitigate the project's contribution to a cumulative loss of biological resources to ***less than significant***.

Cultural Resources

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to an increase in cultural resource impacts. However, mitigation measures identified in Section 3: Initial Study, V. Cultural Resources of this MND, would reduce the project-specific impacts. Thus, the project would have a *less than significant* cumulative impact.

Geology and Soils

Project-related impacts on geology and soils would be site-specific and implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to seismic hazards or water quality impacts associated with soil erosion. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have *no impact* on cumulative geophysical conditions in the region.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The project would contribute to hazards associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials; however, mitigation measures would reduce cumulative hazard conditions to *less than significant*.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts; however, the mitigation measures identified in Section 3: Initial Study VIII: Hydrology and Water Quality reduce the project's potential cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality to *less than significant*.

Land Use and Planning

The Anatolia IV project is part of the Sunridge Specific Plan area, which is the first of a series of specific plans that will implement the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan (approved on July 19, 2002) and the Sacramento County General Plan. The Sunridge Specific Plan provides a detailed framework for development of the Plan Area to implement the guiding principles and policies established in the Community Plan. The Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan (SDCP/SRSP) areas were identified as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Services Boundary, community issues resulting from new growth in this particular location, including land use, increased population, and housing were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP FEIR, page 4.33. Therefore, the project would result in *less than significant* cumulative land use and planning impacts.

Mineral Resources

The proposed project would not result in any site-specific or significant impacts to mineral resources and *less than significant* impacts under cumulative conditions are anticipated.

Noise

Implementation of project would result in temporary and permanent changes in the ambient noise levels in the vicinity; however, the mitigation measures in identified in Section 3: Initial Study XI: Noise, of this MND would mitigate cumulative noise impacts to *less than significant*.

4.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Population and Housing

The Anatolia IV project is part of the Sunridge Specific Plan area, which is the first of a series of specific plans that will implement the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan (approved on July 19, 2002) and the Sacramento County General Plan. The Sunridge Specific Plan provides a detailed framework for development of the Plan Area to implement the guiding principles and policies established in the Community Plan. The Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan (SDCP/SRSP) areas were identified as an Urban Development Area and falls within the Urban Services Boundary, community issues resulting from new growth in this particular location, including land use, increased population, and housing were globally addressed in the SDCP/SRSP FEIR, page 4.33. Therefore, the project would result in *less than significant* cumulative population and housing impacts.

Public Services

The project is not expected to contribute to cumulative public service impacts. The project may result in impacts to fire and police protection during construction. However, these activities are temporary in nature. Additionally, mitigation measures contained in Section 3: Initial Study XIII: Public Services, of this MND would mitigate such impacts. Implementation of the proposed improvements would not result in a cumulative increase in severity of public service impacts. Thus, *less than significant* public services impacts are anticipated.

Recreation

The project includes park and open space components, which would reduce potential impacts on existing park related facilities in the area. The Anatolia IV project is part of the SDCP/SRSP areas, which will provide approximately 2.6 acres of parklands that are not currently available. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative parks and recreation impacts and *less than significant* impacts are anticipated.

Utilities and Service Systems

Construction activities related to the proposed project may result in temporary impacts to utilities and service systems, including water and sewer facilities. Mitigation measures proposed in Section 3: Initial Study XVI: Utilities and Service Systems, of this MND would reduce the project's cumulative impacts to *less than significant*.

Transportation/Circulation

Under cumulative conditions, the Anatolia IV project would not cause any roadways to exceed Sacramento County standards for daily travel under cumulative conditions; however, when considered with other development proposed in the Specific Plan area, the project would exacerbate and contribute to unacceptable conditions at some of the roadways bordering the SRSP area. Mitigation Measures identified in Section 3: Initial Study XV: Transportation and Traffic, of this MND would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative traffic related impacts to *less than significant*.

Water

The water supply plan and associated environmental impacts for the SDCP/SRSP areas were evaluated in the SDCP/SRSP EIR (see Section 7: Water Supply). A conjunctive use program, consistent with the Water Forum Plan (WFP), will ultimately be implemented to supply water to

the proposed project site. However, environmental analysis of the Zone 40 Master Plan Update and the facilities to implement the groundwater and surface water elements have not been completed, nor has detailed planning or facility design been determined. While it is likely that Zone 40 conjunctive use facilities (groundwater, surface water, and recycled water) will be implemented in a timely manner to serve the projects, such facilities cannot be guaranteed until they are approved (SDCP/SRSP EIR Section 7: Water Supply page 7.60). However, water supply contracts and an infrastructure system are currently being finalized for the SDCP/SRSP areas and the "Final" Public Facility Financing Plan will provide the needed funding mechanisms to implement the construction of the proposed water systems. Implementation of MM 16.1c, identified in Section 3: Initial Study XVI: Utility and Service Systems item b), will ensure compliance with the CO-20 development cap by only allowing development to proceed for which a safe and reliable long-term water supply has been identified and acquired. The Anatolia IV project is not anticipated to result in any additional cumulative water supply impacts than those identified in the SDCP/SRSP EIR.




Figure 4
EXISTING, PROPOSED, AND APPROVED PROJECTS



5.0 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, however; there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in Section 3 of this document have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but one or more of such significant effects: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, all potentially significant effects: (a) have been analyzed and adequately addressed in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, or (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, previous Mitigated Negative Declaration, or this Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature H. Anderson Date: 11-9-05
 Printed name: Hilary Anderson For City of Rancho Cordova

Per CEQA Section 15070(b)(1), the project applicant for the proposed project has reviewed and agreed to the mitigation measures contained in this Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Signature Angelo K. Tsakopoulos Date: 10-31-05
 Printed name: ANGELO K. TSAKOPOULOS For _____

6.0 REPORT PREPARATION AND CONSULTATIONS

6.0 REPORT PREPARATION AND CONSULTATIONS

6.1 REPORT PREPARATION

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA- LEAD AGENCY

Paul Junker	Planning Director
Cyrus Abhar	Public Works Director
Bill Campbell	Principal Planner
Hilary Anderson	Environmental Coordinator
Bret Sampson	Environmental Planner

6.2 PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

Darrel Eck	SCWA – Zone 40
Jeff Atterberry	CSD-1
Melanie Spahn	CSD-1
Tammy Urquhart	Sacramento County Department of Transportation
Peter Christensen	SMAQMD
George Booth	Sacramento County Drainage and Flood Control
Rick Blackmarr	Sacramento County Department of County Engineering and Administration

7.0 REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Sacramento County. 2002. *CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations of the Board of Supervisors of Sacramento County for the Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan Project*. July 17, 2002.
- Sacramento County Department of Environmental Review and Assessment. 1999. *Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. March 1999.
- Sacramento County Department of Environmental Review and Assessment. 2001. *Sunrise Douglas Community Plan/Sunridge Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. November 2001.
- Sacramento County. 2002. *Zoning Conditions for the Approval of the SRSP (Sacramento County Zoning Ordinance No. SZC-2002-0015, Section 607-15.)* July 17, 2002.
- Sacramento County. 1993. *Sacramento County General Plan*. 1993.
- Sacramento County. 1993. *Sacramento County General Plan EIR*. 1993.
- Sacramento County. 2002. *Sunridge Specific Plan*. July 17, 2002.