

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section includes minor edits to the Draft EIR. These modifications resulted in response to comments received during the Draft EIR public review period. The revisions presented herein do not result in new significant environmental impacts, do not constitute significant new information, nor do they alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis. Changes are provided in revision marks (underline for new text and ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text).

4.2 CHANGES AND EDITS TO THE DRAFT EIR

1.0 INTRODUCTION

There were no errata changes to this section.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Refer to Section 2 of the Final EIR for changes to Section 2.0 of the Draft EIR.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND ASSUMPTIONS USED

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.1 Land Use

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.2 Population/Housing/Employment

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.3 Human Health/Risk of Upset

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.4 Traffic Impact Analysis

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.5 Environmental Noise Assessment

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.6 Air Quality Impact Evaluation

Mitigation measure **MM 4.6.1b** on page 4.6-23 of the Draft EIR has been changed as follows:

4.0 ERRATA

~~"Applicant shall pay SMAQMD's off site construction mitigation fees (amount to be determined by SMAQMD upon approval of Air Quality Plan).~~

~~*Timing/Implementation: ——— Prior to ground disturbance."*~~

"In order to fully mitigate the construction related emissions, applicant shall pay SMAQMD an off-site mitigation fee as specified in the construction mitigation spreadsheet, which is attached in **Appendix 4.6**.

Timing/Implementation: The fee will be paid in total or as tentative maps get approved prior to issuance of any grading permit and/or ground disturbance."

The following text has been added to the top of page 4.6-24 of the Draft EIR:

"Even after the application of this "standard construction mitigation" the project's construction emissions will be significant. In order to further mitigate the construction emissions, the applicant will pay an off-site mitigation fee of \$823,771 to SMAQMD. SMAQMD uses construction mitigation fee to fund cost-effective emission reduction projects in the Sacramento Federal Ozone Nonattainment Area. Examples of these projects include repowering off-road construction equipment with newer engines that meet more stringent emission standards, retrofitting diesel engines with diesel catalyst technology, providing incentives for the use of lower-emission fuels, and other cost effective strategies. SMAQMD establishes the value of NOx at the cost effectiveness standard established by the California Air Resources Control Board for the Carl Moyer Incentive Program. The Carl Moyer Program is a state funded program for reducing emissions from off-road equipment. All off-road site mitigation fees for this project shall be based on the 2005 NOx value of \$13,600 per ton. The off-site mitigation fee for this particular project is shown in Appendix 4.6 and reflects the \$13,600 per ton cost as well as the specific emissions calculated for this project. This fee can be submitted either as a total amount for an entire project or it can be phased over time as the project is built on a \$/acre basis. In all cases, it or its relative portion should be submitted prior to the issuance of any grading permit for the area which gives rise to the impact."

The text on page 4.6-25 of the Draft EIR has been changed as follows:

~~"Annexation into the County Service Area #10 would fund shuttle bus service and other transportation demand management services resulting from the project's implementation. Additional measures of the Preserve at Sunridge Air Quality Plan, which would be implemented as part of the project include but are not limited to, a grid style street system without cul de sacs or dead end streets, informational kiosks, and bicycle programs to facilitate efficient and safe access."~~

"On November 7, 2005, the City of Rancho Cordova approved the formation of a Transit Related Services Special Tax Area. The special tax zone, and the purpose of the special tax, is to provide transportation demand management programs as well as a source of funding for the overall citywide transit plan. The programs and service would support the City's 30% trip reduction goal. The services would benefit residential and non-residential uses with a tax zone created for the "Preserve at Sunridge." Yearly costs range from \$48 to \$80 per dwelling unit and \$1,763 to \$2,051 per acre for commercial and other uses with a yearly inflation. Rates are calculated on an annual inflator formula and are based on the Consumer Price Index or six percent, whichever is less.

"Shuttle (shuttle and/or bus) service that would connect the tax zone for the Preserve area to light rail stations and job centers will be the primary service provided by the funding. This service is planned to continue until Regional Transit or other service provider extends bus service to the site area. Transit-related services means providing, operating, maintaining, and subsidizing transit-related services and all supporting facilities, infrastructure, programs and incentives that benefit the residents or the special tax area. The special tax area will ensure that the residents of the Preserve project will have the following programs and services available to them:

- Guaranteed Ride Home
- Bicycle incentives
- Transportation plans for employees
- Transportation Coordinator (TC) training
- Transit subsidies
- Educational programs
- Infrastructure support
- Commute Mode and Program Success Servicing"

A new mitigation measure **MM 4.6.4** has been added to the text on page 4.6-26 of the Draft EIR and reads as follows:

"**MM 4.6.4** The proponent shall implement the revised Air Quality Mitigation Plan, endorsed by SMAQMD, as included in Appendix 4.6 of the Final EIR. The revised Air Quality Mitigation Plan will serve as partial mitigation for the operational emissions of the project.

Timing/Implementation: Through all phases of the project.

Enforcement/Timing: The City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department/SMAQMD.

4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

The text on page 4.7-33 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

"The projected annual water demand for the Preserve at Sunridge is approximately 1,319 1,493 acre-feet per year Af/yr, which includes an additional 7.5 percent to account for system losses."

The text on page 4.7-33 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"The WSA for the Preserve at Sunridge, which was approved by the SCWA Board of Directors on December 7, 2004, meets the requirements based on Zone 40's conjunctive use program as described in the Zone 40 WSMP, the Water Forum Agreement, SCWA's 2000 Urban Water Management Plan, and other relevant documents."~~

"The revised WSA for the Preserve at Sunridge will be approved by SCWA Board of Directors on March 14, 2006, which will meet the requirements based on Zone 40's conjunctive use program as described in the Zone 40 WSMP, the Water Forum Agreement, SCWA's 2000 Urban Water Management Plan, and other relevant documents. The revised WSA is included in **Appendix 4.7** of this FEIR."

4.0 ERRATA

Table 4.7-3 on page 4.7-34 of the Draft EIR has been deleted as follows:

**TABLE 4.7-3
THE PRESERVE AT SUNRIDGE'S ANTICIPATED WATER DEMANDS**

Land Use	Acreage	Unit Water Demand Factor ¹ (af/acre/yr)	Water Demand (af/yr)
Rural Estates	-	1.33	-
Single Family	332.9	2.89	962.1
Multi Family (Low Density)	-	3.7	-
Multi Family (High Density)	5.4	4.12	22.3
Commercial	18.9	2.75	52.0
Industrial	-	2.71	-
Public	34.9	1.04	36.3
Public Recreation	44.6	3.46	154.3
Mixed Land Use	-	2.51	-
Right of Way	-	0.21	-
Vacant	87.2	-	-
Urban Reserve ²	-	2.75	-
Total			1,227.0
SCWA System Losses (7.5%)			92.0
Total Water Demand			1,319.0

Source: SCWA WSA for the "Preserve at Sunridge" (December, 2004)

Notes: 1. The unit water demands are consistent with the Water Supply Master Plan and the WFA.

2. Urban Reserve is a special planning designation for project areas not having an assigned land use

Table 4.7-3 on page 4.7-34 of the Draft EIR has been replaced with the following table:

**TABLE 4.7-3
THE PRESERVE AT SUNRIDGE'S ANTICIPATED WATER DEMANDS**

Land Use	Area (in acres)	Unit Water Demand Factor (AF/acre)	Water Demand (AF/yr)
Single-Family	93.5	2.89	270.2
Multi-Family (low density)	198.8	3.7	735.6
Multi-Family (high density)	11.2	4.12	46.1
Commercial	21.6	2.75	59.4
Public/Quasi-Public	12.0	1.04	12.5
Recreation	76.5	3.46	264.7
Vacant	116.5		-

Land Use	Area (in acres)	Unit Water Demand Factor (AF/acre)	Water Demand (AF/yr)
Subtotal	530.1		1,388.4
System Losses			104.1
Total Demand			1,493

4.8 Geology and Soils

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.9 Biological Resources

The text on Page 4.9-13 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“The Swainson’s hawk nests primarily within riparian corridors in the San Joaquin Valley; however, the Swainson’s hawk also nests in stands with few trees in grasslands and croplands if they are located adjacent to or within close proximity to suitable foraging habitat.”~~

“The Swainson’s hawk nests primarily within riparian corridors in the San Joaquin Valley as well as in Sacramento, Yolo, and Solano counties.”

Mitigation Measure MM 4.9.1a on Page 4.9.31 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

“MM 4.9.1a Prior to the approval of grading and improvement plans or prior to any ground-disturbing activities, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall preserve, to the satisfaction of the City, suitable Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to ensure 1:1 mitigation of habitat value for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat lost as a result of the project, as determined by the City in consultation with DFG and a qualified biologist. The 1:1 habitat value shall be based on Swainson’s hawk nesting distribution and an assessment of habitat quality, availability, and use within the City’s Planning Area. If specific data for Rancho Cordova’s Swainson’s hawk habitat is not available at the time this mitigation measures is being implemented, the mitigation ratio shall be consistent with the 1994 California Department of Fish and Game Swainson’s Hawk Guidelines included in the “Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks (Buteo swainson) in the Central Valley of California.” Such mitigation shall be accomplished through either the transfer of fee title or perpetual conservation easement. The mitigation land shall be located within the known foraging area and within Sacramento County. The City, in consultation with DFG, will determine the appropriateness of the mitigation land. Prior to approval of such mitigation, the City shall consult with DFG regarding the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation. If mitigation is accomplished through conservation easement, then such easement shall ensure the continued management of the land to maintain Swainson’s hawk foraging values, including but not limited to ongoing agricultural uses and the maintenance of all existing water rights associated with the

~~land. The conservation easement shall be recordable and shall prohibit any activity which substantially impairs or diminishes the lands capacity as suitable Swainson's hawk habitat. The project applicant shall transfer said Swainson's hawk mitigation land, through either conservation easement or fee title, to a third party, non-profit conservation organization (Conservation Operator), with the City and DFG named as third party beneficiaries. The Conservation Operator shall be a qualified conservation easement land manager that manages land as its primary function. Additionally, the Conservation Operator shall be a tax-exempt non-profit conservation organization meeting the criteria of Civil Code Section 815.3(a) and be selected or approved by the City, in consultation with DFG. The City, in consultation with DFG and the Conservation Operator, shall approve the content and form of the conservation easement. The City, DFG and Conservation Operator shall each have the power to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. The Conservation Operator shall monitor the easement in perpetuity to assure compliance with the terms of the easement. The project applicant shall pay to the City an endowment fee, in an amount determined by the City, in consultation with DFG and the Conservation Operator, which will produce sufficient interest in perpetuity to operate, maintain, manage, and enforce such conservation easement. The endowment funds shall either be submitted to the City to be distributed to an appropriate third party non-profit conservation agency, or they shall be submitted directly to the third party non-profit conservation agency in exchange for an agreement to manage and maintain the lands in perpetuity. The Conservation Operator shall not sell, lease, or transfer any interest of any conservation easement or mitigation land it acquires without prior written approval of the City and DFG. If the Conservation Operator ceases to exist, the duty to hold, administer, manage, maintain and enforce the interest shall be transferred to another entity acceptable to the City and DFG. The Rancho Cordova Planning Department shall ensure that mitigation habitat is properly established and is functioning as habitat by conducting regular monitoring of the mitigation site(s) for the first 10 years after establishment of the easement. The project applicant shall preserve 0.75 acre of similar Swainson's hawk foraging habitat for each acre lost, within a ten mile radius of the subsequent project site. The current design therefore would require the permanent preservation of 341.18 acres of similar habitat within 10 miles of the project site. This land shall be protected through a fee title or conservation easement acceptable to the City after consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game. Additionally, the project applicant is responsible for the cost of the conservation easement or fee title. The preserved 74.37 acres on site can be assumed to partially fulfill this requirement when the conservation easement for this area is established.~~

or

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

or

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

~~Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of improvement and construction plans.~~

Timing/Implementation: Prior to approval of grading and improvement plans and construction plans prior to any ground-disturbing activity.

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

Mitigation Measure MM 4.9.2b on Page 4.9.34 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

"MM 4.9.2b

A standard set of best management practices shall be employed when working in areas within 250 feet of off-site vernal pool habitat and on-site preserved vernal pool habitat. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be developed and implemented during construction of the proposed project and the creation of the vernal pools and wetlands at the off-site creation site. The plan shall include the following measures to avoid and minimize impacts to all wetlands. These measures, and all other permit requirements, will be included in contract specifications and will be implemented by the contractor.

1. Implement erosion control measures during construction. Installation of temporary erosion control devices will be an integral part of construction. Sedimentation fences, as detailed in the drawings, will be used to contain polluted or turbid runoff from the site of work. Other methods of temporary erosion control, including but not limited to hay bale check dams, shall be employed to protect riparian areas, streams and water courses, and all other areas susceptible to damage from runoff. Hay bale check dams will be installed as specified and as detailed in the drawings or as directed by the contractor. Erosion control devices will be installed concurrently with construction earthwork.
2. Remove cover vegetation as close to the time of construction as practicable.
3. Confine construction equipment and associated activities to the construction corridor.

4.0 ERRATA

4. Reestablish streambank contours following construction and install permanent erosion control as needed.
5. Prohibit refueling of construction related equipment within 100-feet of the aquatic environment.
6. Maintain hazardous materials spill kits in proximity to aquatic crossings.
7. Comply with state and federal permits.
8. Perform proper sediment control.
9. Implement the spill prevention and response plan.
10. Monitor construction activities near specified drainage and riparian areas.
11. Remove all construction spoils, remaining construction materials and miscellaneous litter for proper off-site disposal.
12. Post-construction monitoring and supplemental revegetation where needed.

This measure shall be included in all project plans and specifications, and all applicable features shall be shown on project plans.

Timing/Implementation: Submittal of plan prior to the approval of any grading plans or any groundbreaking activity. On-going during all construction and for required post-construction time periods for the project site and the off-site vernal pool and wetland creation site.

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

A new mitigation measure (**MM 4.9.2c**) has been added to Page 4.9.35 of the Draft EIR.

"MM 4.9.2c The applicant shall submit a Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan to mitigate for impacts to vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat, which describes the specific method(s) to be implemented to avoid and/or mitigate any off-site project related impacts. This detailed Wetland Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), regulations, and the City of Rancho Cordova Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance. A copy of the 404 permit and the biological opinion shall be provided to the City and the Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall ensure the following to the satisfaction of the City:

- The location of the proposed vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat site(s) and a detailed map of showing the acreage, distribution, and type of wetlands to be created to ensure no net loss in wetland habitat acreage, values and functions. The compensation wetlands shall be designed to, at a minimum: meet or exceed the hydrophytic conditions and operating functions of the existing wetlands proposed for impact.
- Include a monitoring plan to assess whether the compensation wetlands are functioning as intended. Specific performance standards for hydrologic, floral, and faunal parameters shall be proposed to determine success of the created wetlands. The monitoring plan shall specify the corrective measures/modifications to be implemented in the event that monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met.
- Include 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.
- Require that fencing be installed around all existing vernal pools that are within fifty feet of any haul route, spoil zone, stockpile zone, creation zone, or other construction area. The fencing shall be of high visibility material and limit access to the project site. Fencing shall be placed no closer than 10-feet to the delineated, verified perimeter of existing vernal pools.
- A qualified biological resources monitor, approved by the City be on the site(s) to ensure compliance with identified mitigation for the duration of all the proposed activities. The construction manager shall submit bi-annual compliance reports to City monitor for review for a period of five years.
- The vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat site shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to the onset of construction for the presence of raptor and federal and state listed bird nesting sites, unless it is determined that construction will occur outside of the breeding season for all species likely to occur on site or observed present. If active nesting sites are observed present all state and federal guidelines pertaining to active nesting sites shall be strictly adhered to in consultation with a qualified biologist.
- The applicant shall grant full access to the vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat site to the City's for the monitoring of construction activities and mitigation compliance. Access shall be granted during all construction activities and the City monitor may issue stop work orders if mitigation non-compliance is identified.
- The applicant shall specify measures for reuse or disposal of excavated material is suitable for use at project site, the plan should minimize the elapsed time between excavation and reuse and provide adequate stockpile coverage and protection from wind and water erosion during the entire storage period. If excavated material is unsuitable for reuse at the project site, the plan shall include specific information regarding the eventual reuse or disposal site, transportation method(s), disposal reuse management, and schedule.

4.0 ERRATA

- The Avoidance/Mitigation Plan shall include a spill prevention and response plan to the satisfaction of the City.
- All disturbed areas shall be revegetated by the following methods: hydroseeding, drill seeding, or spreading of upland seed bearing soil. The method of revegetation shall be approved by a qualified wetland specialist and to the satisfaction of the City.
- Incorporate the use of non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacture's specifications to all inactive construction areas. Use non-toxic binders to exposed areas after cut and fill operations and hydroseed areas. The vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat site shall be watered as directed by the City of Rancho Cordova Department Public Works and the SMAQMD with the frequency shall be based on the type operation, soil and wind exposure.
- To reduce air emissions, idling time for all construction vehicles shall be limited to a maximum of 10 minutes. Additionally, the City may educe or curtail construction during high ambient pollutant concentrations, including but not limited to, ceasing construction during peak-hour vehicular traffic on adjacent or nearby roadways. Additionally, all land clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall be suspended when winds exceed 20 mph.
- All inactive storage/stock piles are covered and that all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or shall maintain at two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between the top of the load and top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) section 23114.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to site disturbance/grading and throughout all construction activities associated with the off-site vernal pool and creation site.

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

4.10 Cultural and Paleontological Resource

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.11 Visual Resources/Light and Glare

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.12 Public Services and Utilities

The text under **Impact 4.12.2.1** "Law Enforcement Service Standards" on page 4.12-9 of the Draft EIR has been added as follows:

Consultation with the Rancho Cordova Police Department was conducted in order to determine the impact to law enforcement, consistent with mitigation measure PS-6 of the SDCP/SRSP FEIR (SDCP/SRSP FEIR, p. 6.16) and a less than significant impact will result.

The text under **Impact 4.12.7.1** "Increased Demand for Park and Recreational Facilities" on page 4.12-45 of the Draft EIR has been added as follows:

The environmental effects associated with the construction and operation of these on-site parks have been considered in the technical sections of this EIR and a less than significant impact will result.

The following text has been added to page 4.12-45 of the DEIR for **Impact 4.12.7.2** "Inconsistency with General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1"

Impact 4.12.7.2 The layout of the proposed project does not meet the requirements of City of Rancho Cordova Draft General Plan Policy OSPT.1.1.

The text under **Impact 4.12.8.1** "Electrical Services" on page 4.12-50 of the Draft EIR has been added as follows:

The project would not result in any physical effects to electrical service that were not previously analyzed and less than significant impacts would result.

The text **Impact 4.12.8.2** "Natural Gas, Telephone, and Cable Television Infrastructure" on page 4.12-50 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

Implementation of the proposed project would require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure to serve the proposed project. This would be a **Less than potentially significant** impact.

The text on page 4.12-27 of the Draft EIR has been deleted as follows:

~~"SUNRISE DOUGLAS 2 (SUNCREEK) GROUNDWATER TREATMENT PLANT~~

~~"According to modeling conducted by Boeing, wells for this facility need to be located south of Kiefer Road where they will not be threatened by contaminant plumes to the north. Because the usable aquifer thickness in the area is relatively small, only a small two (2) to three (3) well groundwater treatment plant is planned for construction within the proposed SPS area. The anticipated maximum day capacity from this facility is 4,000 gpm. According to SCWA, there is also the possibility of routing raw water supplies from the ERWF to the Suncreek WTP during the interim period until the Central WTP is constructed and providing water to the NSA, which will be evaluated as the Suncreek development application proceeds. This facility is considered the long term replacement supply for wells SCWA lost in the Mather/Sunrise portion of the system due to groundwater contamination."~~

Table 4.12-6 on page 4.12-28 of the Draft EIR has been deleted as follows:

4.0 ERRATA

**TABLE 4.12-6
ANTICIPATED MAXIMUM DAY WATER DEMANDS IN THE NSA**

Demand areas	Maximum day demand (gpm)
Cal Am Replacement Supply	2,500
American States Replacement Supply	3,400
Rio Del Oro (Cal Am)	4,857
Rio Del Oro (Zone 41)	6,045
Anatolia	2,926
Montelena (includes DJ Enterprises)	849
The Preserve ¹	1,665
Sunridge Park	873
Suncreek ²	4,471
East Side Properties ³	2,232
North Douglas I and II	520
Sunrise Douglas Community Plan	5,357
Lot J ⁴	321
Mather New Growth	6,667
American States (shut off in future)	1,000
Total	43,683

Notes: ¹ Sunridge Park
² Sunrise Douglas 2
³ Douglas 104, Galaxidas Property, Grantline 208, and Pappas Property.
⁴ Cresleigh Homes

5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY

There were no errata changes to this section.

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO PROJECT: EXISTING LAND USES ALTERNATIVE

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.3** "Underground Storage Tank Contamination" has been changed to **Impact 4.3.6** on page 6.0-6 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.2** "Potential Exposure to Groundwater contamination" has been changed to **Impact 4.3.5** on page 6.0-6 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-10 of the Draft EIR:

"Construction Noise Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.4)

"Project construction activities would generate noise levels in excess of established noise standards. Construction of the proposed project would elevate noise levels within the project area, and would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90

dB at a distance of 50 feet, which is considered a potentially significant impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses would not involve construction or site preparation activities, which would elevate temporary noise levels on the project site. No temporary noise increases would occur that exceed City standards and no impacts would occur."

The text under **Impact 4.7.6** "Cumulative Water Quality" on page 6.0-12 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved and proposed development in the area may degrade water quality due to the deposition of pollutants generated from construction and operational activities and result in a potentially significant cumulative impact. If this alternative were implemented, local water quality would still be affected by surrounding projects; however, the total cumulative impact would be reduced and considered less than cumulatively considerable. No impacts would result under the No Project Alternative."~~

The numbering of **Impact 4.9.10** "Cumulative Biological Resources" has been changed to **Impact 4.9.11** on page 6.0-13 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been deleted on page 6.0-14 of the Draft EIR due to absence of significant impacts:

~~"Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)~~

~~"The proposed project, combined with other adjacent projects would require additional acillities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. This is considered a potentially significant cumulative impact. If this alternative were implemented, the project site would not be developed. This alternative would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services."~~

The text on page 6.0-14 has been added to the DEIR:

Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.4)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result in potentially significant impacts. As indicated, no disturbance of the land would occur if the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative were implemented; therefore, no impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources would result.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-14 under **Impact 4.11.4**:

Impact 4.11.4 Implementation of the Preserve at Sunridge project in combination with other projects would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare in the area, and contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impact. The No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative would not involve the construction of these light sources, the area would remain in its current undeveloped state, and no impacts would occur.

The numbering of **Impact 4.12.7.2** "Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure" has been changed to **Impact 4.12.8.2** on page 6.0-14 of the Draft EIR.

4.0 ERRATA

The following text has been added to page 6.0-14 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.4.2 “Cumulative Wastewater Impacts” Implementation of the project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development within SRCSD service area, would result in an increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity. The project’s contribution could be **potentially significant**. If the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative were implemented, there would be no impacts.

The following text has been added on page 6.0-15 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.7.2 The layout of the proposed project does not meet the requirements of the City of Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1. This would be a **potentially significant** impact. If the No Project: Existing Land Uses Alternative were implemented, the site would remain undeveloped and no additional park needs would result. This Alternative is consistent with General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1

ALTERNATIVE 2 – NO PROJECT – APPROVED SUNRISE DOUGLAS COMMUNITY PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The following text has been added to page 6.0-19 of the Draft EIR:

“Population, housing and employment increases and significant impacts on regionally projected growth (**Impact 4.2.1**)

“Under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan alternative, less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment would result because Alternative 2 would provide 1,636 units and 60 acres of commercial uses.”

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.3** “Underground Storage Tank Contamination” has been changed to **Impact 4.3.6** on page 6.0-19 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.2** “Potential Exposure to Groundwater contamination” has been changed to **Impact 4.3.5** on page 6.0-19 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.5.4** “Construction Noise Within the Project Area” on page 6.0-26 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

“Implementation of mitigation measure ~~MM 4.5.4~~, which addresses construction related noise impacts, would reduce the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative’s construction noise impacts to less than significant. **Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable** with implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.5.4**.”

The numbering of **Impact 4.5.7** “Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments” has been changed to **Impact 4.5.6** on page 6.0-26 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **MM 4.5.7a** through **MM 4.5.7c** has changed to **MM 4.5.6a** through **MM4.5.6c** on page 6.0-26 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.6.1** “Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter” on page 6.0-26 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“Mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with this alternative to less than significant. Although implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would assist in reducing particulate matter construction emissions, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** if this alternative were implemented.”~~

The text under **Impact 4.6.2** “Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide” on page 6.0-27 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would reduce this alternative’s NOx related construction emissions to **less than significant**. Although implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would assist in reducing NOx construction emissions, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** if this alternative were implemented.”~~

The text under **Impact 4.7.6** “Cumulative Water Quality” on page 6.0-28 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“The No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would result in similar cumulative water quality impacts as the proposed project. There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and implementation of this alternative would contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area. If this alternative were implemented, local water quality would still be affected by surrounding projects; however, the total cumulative impact would be reduced and considered **less than cumulatively considerable**.”~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.1** “Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species” on page 6.0-29 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“Even with implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c would result in **less than significant impacts**.”~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.2** “Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species” on page 6.0-29 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“Even if mitigation measures MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, the reduction in preserved acreage associated with this alternative would result in significant indirect impacts to these species. Implementation of MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b would result in **less than significant impacts**.”~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.3** “Loss of Habitat” on page 6.0-29 of the Draft EIR has been deleted as follows:

~~“More habitat acreage would be disturbed under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative when compared to the proposed project (495 acres versus 455 acres) because this alternative does not include a wetland preserve or natural open space area; therefore, **potentially significant impacts** would result.”~~

The numbering of **Impact 4.9.10** “Cumulative Biological Resources” has been changed to **Impact 4.9.11** on page 6.0-30 of the Draft EIR.

4.0 ERRATA

The text on page 6.0-31 has been added to the DEIR:

Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.4)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result in **cumulatively considerable** impacts. The construction activities associated with the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include excavation, adversely affect on-site paleontological resources; therefore, potentially significant impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.10.2** would reduce this alternative's potential paleontological resource impacts to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-31 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.11.4

Implementation of the Preserve at Sunridge project in combination with other projects would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare in the area, and contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impact. Although the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would include fewer dwelling units which would reduce light and glare, this alternative would introduce new light and glare sources on a currently undeveloped site and potentially significant impacts would occur. If the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative were implemented, Mitigation measures **MM 4.11.2a** and **MM 4.11.2b** would reduce potential light and glare impacts to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

The text under **Impact 4.12.1.2** "Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services" on page 6.0-31 of the Draft EIR has been deleted due to absence of significant impacts.

~~"Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)~~

~~"The proposed project, combined with other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. This is considered a potentially significant cumulative impact. Implementation of the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Plan Alternative would contribute to the demand for these services in the SDGP area and result in potentially cumulatively considerable impacts."~~

The following text has been added to page 6.0-32 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.4.2

"Cumulative Wastewater Impacts" Implementation of the project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development within SRCSD service area, would result in an increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity. The project's contribution could be **potentially significant**. Under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Land Use Plan alternative, implementation of MM4.12.4.2 would ensure that development would not proceed until wastewater service is ensured and would fully mitigate the project's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable.

The numbering of **Impact 4.12.7.2** "Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure" has been changed to **Impact 4.12.8.2** on page 6.0-32 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added on page 6.0-32 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.7.2 The layout of the proposed project does not meet the requirements of the City of Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1. This would be a **potentially significant** impact. Under the No Project: Approved Sunrise Douglas Community Land Use Plan Alternative, 30.7 acres of parkland would be needed. This alternative would provide 17.3 acres of parkland. Although fewer units would occur relative to the proposed project, there would be a deficit of 13.4 acres of parkland below the projected need, not satisfying General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1 and producing a potentially significant impact. However implementation of MM 4.12.7.2 would result in **less than significant** impacts.

ALTERNATIVE 3 – AQUATIC RESOURCE HABITAT ALTERNATIVE

The following text has been added to page 6.0-33 of the Draft EIR:

"Under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative, **less than significant** impacts on population, housing and employment would result because Alternative 3 would provide 2,003 units and 17 acres of commercial."

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.3** "Underground Storage Tank Contamination" has been changed to **Impact 4.3.6** on page 6.0-34 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.2** "Potential Exposure to Groundwater contamination" has been changed to **Impact 4.3.5** on page 6.0-34 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-37 of the Draft EIR as follows:

"Transportation and Circulation

"A comparison of the proposed project and the No Project: Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative is provided below for each significant transportation and circulation impact identified in Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).

"Baseline Plus Project Conditions:

"Roadway Segment Impacts under Baseline Conditions (**Impact 4.4.1**)

"Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on a deficiently operating roadway located within the project area (see Table 4.4-10). This would be a significant impact for the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project under Baseline conditions would result in the following impacts to study area roadways:

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,000 vehicles per day to Mather Boulevard between Femoyer Street and Douglas Road and would cause the LOS to

4.0 ERRATA

change from LOS E to LOS F. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.

- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Douglas Road between Mather Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.18, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.
- The addition of project traffic would add about 3,300 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Folsom Boulevard and White Rock Road, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.06, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.
- The addition of project traffic would add about 1,800 vehicles per day to Sunrise Boulevard between Kiefer Boulevard and SR 16, and cause an increase in the V/C ratio of 0.09, which would exceed the City's 0.05 threshold for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F under "No Project" conditions. Portions of this roadway facility are within both the City and unincorporated portion of Sacramento County.
- Implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in an approximately 26 percent reduction in vehicle trips than the proposed project during both the AM and PM peak hours (approximately 747 daily vehicle trips). Nevertheless, the roadway segments likely would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions and the volume-to-capacity ratios would likely increase by greater than 0.05 if this alternative were implemented. Potentially significant impacts would still occur with this alternative; however, impacts would be lessened relative to the proposed project. Mitigation measures **MM 4.4.1a, 4.4.1b, and 4.4.1d** would reduce roadway segment impacts on Femoyer, Mather Boulevard, Zinfandel Drive, Douglas Road, and Sunrise Boulevard to less than significant under Baseline Conditions. However, impacts to roadway segments on Sunrise Boulevard (i.e., between White Rock Road and Folsom Boulevard) would remain significant and unavoidable even if mitigation measure **MM 4.4.1c** and this alternative were implemented."

The text under **Impact 4.5.4** "Construction Noise Within the Project Area" on page 6.0-41 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

"Implementation of mitigation measure ~~MM 4.5.4~~, which addresses construction related noise impacts, would reduce the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative's construction noise impacts to ~~less than significant~~. Impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** with implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.5.4** under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative."

The numbering of **Impact 4.5.7** "Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments" has been changed to **Impact 4.9.6** on page 6.0-42 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **MM 4.5.7a** through **4.5.7c** has changed to **MM 4.5.6a** through **MM 4.5.6c** on page 6.0-42 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.6.1** "Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter" on page 6.0-42 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative to **less than significant**. Although implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.1 would assist in reducing particulate matter construction emissions, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** if this alternative were implemented."~~

The text under **Impact 4.6.2** "Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide" on page 6.0-42 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would reduce the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative's NOx related construction emissions to **less than significant**. Although implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would assist in reducing NOx construction emissions, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable if this alternative were implemented."~~

The text under Impact 4.7.6 "Cumulative Water Quality" on page 6.0-44 of the Draft EIR has been deleted as follows:

~~There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and implementation of this alternative would contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area.~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.1** "Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species" on page 6.0-44 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Even with implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative were implemented. **Less than significant** impacts would result with implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c."~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.2** "Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species" on page 6.0-45 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Even if mitigation measure MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, implementation of the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in significant indirect impacts to these species. **Less than significant** impacts would result with implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b."~~

The numbering of **Impact 4.9.10** "Cumulative Biological Resources" has been changed to **Impact 4.9.11** on page 6.0-46 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-46:

Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources (**Impact 4.10.4**)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would have the potential to impact paleontological resources during site preparation and construction activities and **cumulatively considerable** impacts would result. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.2 would reduce this alternative's potential paleontological resource impacts to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

4.0 ERRATA

The following text has been added to page 6.0-47:

Impact 4.11.4 Implementation of the Preserve at Sunridge project in combination with other projects would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare in the area, and contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impact. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would also introduce new sources of light and glare into the area, but these sources would be reduced due to less intense development associated with this alternative. However, light and glare impacts would remain potentially significant if this alternative were implemented. Mitigation measure **MM 4.11.2a** and **MM 4.11.2b** would reduce potential light and glare impacts to less than to **less than cumulatively considerable** for the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative.

The text under **Impact 4.12.1.2** "Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services" on page 6.0-47 has been deleted from the Draft EIR due to absence of significant impact:

~~"Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)~~

~~"The proposed project and other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. The Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative would result in cumulatively considerable fire protection and emergency medical services."~~

The following text has been added to page 6.0-47 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.4.2 "Cumulative Wastewater Impacts" Implementation of the project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development within SRCSD service area, would result in an increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity. The project's contribution could be **potentially significant**. Under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative, implementation of MM4.12.4.2 would ensure that development would not proceed until wastewater service is ensured and would fully mitigate the project's contribution to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

The numbering of **Impact 4.12.7.2** "Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure" has been changed to **Impact 4.12.8.2** on page 6.0-47 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added on page 6.0-47 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.7.2 The layout of the proposed project does not meet the requirements of the City of Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1. This would be a **potentially significant** impact. Under the Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative, 37.6 acres of parkland would be needed. This alternative would provide 37.3 acres of parkland. Although fewer units would occur relative to the proposed project, there would be a deficit of 0.3 acres of parkland below the projected need, not satisfying General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1 and producing a **potentially significant impact**.

However implementation of MM 4.12.7.2 would result in **less than significant** impacts.

ALTERNATIVE 4 – EXISTING MORRISON CREEK ALTERNATIVE

The following text has been added to page 6.0-49 of the Draft EIR:

“Under the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative, **less than significant** impacts on population, housing and employment would result because this alternative would provide 2,659 units and 17 acres of commercial.”

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.3** “Underground Storage Tank Contamination” has been changed to **Impact 4.3.6** on page 6.0-49 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.2** “Potential Exposure to Groundwater contamination” has been changed to **Impact 4.3.5** on page 6.0-49 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **Impact 4.5.5** “Transit System Impacts Under Baseline Conditions” has been changed to **Impact 4.4.5** on page 6.0-54 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.5.4** “Construction Noise Within the Project Area” on page 6.0-57 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.5.4**, which addresses construction related noise impacts, would reduce the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative’s construction noise impacts to less than significant.~~

“Impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** with implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.5.4** under the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative.”

The numbering of **Impact 4.5.7** “Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments” has been changed to **Impact 4.5.6** on page 6.0-57 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **MM 4.5.7a** through **MM 4.5.7c** has changed to **MM 4.5.6a** through **MM 4.5.6c** on page 6.0-57 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.6.1** “Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter” on page 6.0-58 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“Mitigation measure **MM 4.6.1** would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative to **less than significant**. Although implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.6.1** would assist in reducing particulate matter construction emissions, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** if this alternative were implemented.”~~

The text under **Impact 4.6.2** “Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide” on page 6.0-58 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~“Mitigation measure **MM 4.6.2** would reduce the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative’s NOx related construction emissions to **less than significant**. Although implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.6.2** would assist in reducing NOx construction emissions, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** if this alternative were implemented.”~~

4.0 ERRATA

The text under **Impact 4.7.6 "Cumulative Water Quality"** on page 6.0-60 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

While local water quality would be affected by surrounding projects, the total cumulative impact would be reduced ~~but~~ and less than cumulative considerable impacts would occur.

~~There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would also contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area.~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.1 "Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species"** on page 6.0-60 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Even with implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if this alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, will result in less than significant impacts to biological resources."~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.2 "Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species"** on page 6.0-60 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Even if mitigation measure MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in significant indirect impacts to these species. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b will result in less than significant impacts to biological resources."~~

The numbering of **Impact 4.9.10 "Cumulative Biological Resources"** has been changed to **Impact 4.9.11** on page 6.0-62 to the Draft EIR.

The following text on page 6.0-63 of the Draft EIR has been deleted as follows due to absence of significant impact:

~~"Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)~~

~~"The proposed project and other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. Implementation of the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would result in cumulatively considerable impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services."~~

The following text has been added to page 6.0-62 of the DEIR:

Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.4)

The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would have the potential to impact paleontological resources during site preparation activities, but the impacts would be less than the proposed project due to the larger onsite preserve. This alternative would result in similar impacts to these resources as the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.10.2 would reduce this alternative's potential paleontological resource impacts to less than cumulatively considerable.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-63 under **Impact 4.11.4**:

Impact 4.11.4 Implementation of the Preserve at Sunridge project in combination with other projects would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare in the area, and contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impact. The Existing Morrison Creek Alternative would introduce new sources of light and glare into the area, but these sources would be reduced due to less intense development. However, light and glare impacts would remain potentially significant if this alternative were implemented. If the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative were implemented, mitigation measure **MM 4.11.2a** and **MM 4.11.2b** would reduce potential light and glare impacts to **less than cumulatively considerable.**

The following text has been added to page 6.0-63 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.4.2 **“Cumulative Wastewater Impacts”** Implementation of the project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development within SRCSD service area, would result in an increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity. The project’s contribution could be **potentially significant**. Under the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative, implementation of MM4.12.4.2 would ensure that development would not proceed until wastewater service is ensured and would fully mitigate the project’s contribution to **less than cumulatively considerable.**

The numbering of **Impact 4.12.7.2** “Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure” has been changed to **Impact 4.12.8.2** on page 6.0-63 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added on page 6.0-63 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.7.2 The layout of the proposed project does not meet the requirements of the City of Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1. This would be a **potentially significant** impact. Under the Existing Morrison Creek Alternative, 49.9 acres of parkland would be needed. This alternative would provide 59.4 acres of parkland. Fewer units would occur relative to the proposed project, including an excess of 9.5 acres of parkland above the projected need. This alternative is consistent with General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1 and **less than significant** impacts would result.

Alternative 5 – Blueprint Alternative

The text on page 6.0-65 of the Draft EIR has been added as follows:

Population, housing and employment increases and significant impacts on regionally projected growth (**Impact 4.2.1**)

4.0 ERRATA

Under the Blue Print Alternative, **less than significant** impacts on population, housing and employment will result because this alternative would provide 2,101 units and 11.3 acres of commercial.

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.3** "Underground Storage Tank Contamination" has been changed to **Impact 4.3.6** on page 6.0-66 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **Impact 4.3.2** "Potential Exposure to Groundwater contamination" has been changed to **Impact 4.3.5** on page 6.0-66 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.4.3** "Roadway Impacts on Sunrise Boulevard" on page 6.0-70 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

"Mitigation measure **MM 4.4.3** requires the construction of the Sunrise Boulevard reliever and associated interchange with U.S. 50 to relieve unacceptable conditions on Sunrise Boulevard; however, significant and unavoidable impacts would result (see **Table 4.4-12**) even if **MM 4.4.3** were implemented in association with the ~~Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative~~ **Blue Print Alternative.**"

The numbering of **Impact 4.5.5** "Transit System Impacts Under Baseline Conditions" has been changed to **Impact 4.4.5** on page 6.0-71 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added on page 6.0-74 of the Draft EIR:

"Construction Noise Within the Project Area (Impact 4.5.4)

"Project construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of established noise standards. Construction of the proposed project would elevate noise levels within the project area, and would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet, which is considered a potentially significant impact. The Blueprint Alternative would involve construction and site preparation activities that would also elevate temporary noise levels on the project site that would generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. The reduction in developable acreage would not reduce this impact substantially when compared to the proposed project and **potentially significant** impacts would occur. Impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** with implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.5.4** under the Blueprint Alternative."

The numbering of **Impact 4.5.7** "Cumulative Traffic Noise on Future Developments" has been changed to **Impact 4.5.6** on page 6.0-74 of the Draft EIR.

The numbering of **MM 4.5.7a** through **MM 4.5.7c** has changed to **MM 4.5.6a** through **4.5.6c** on page 6.0-74 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.6.1** "Construction Emissions – Particulate Matter" on page 6.0-74 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

"~~Mitigation measure **MM 4.6.1** would reduce the PM construction impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative to **less than significant**. Although implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.6.1** would assist in reducing particulate matter construction emissions, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** if this alternative were implemented.~~"

The text under **Impact 4.6.2** "Construction Emissions – Nitrogen Oxide" on page 6.0-75 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would reduce the Blueprint Alternative's NOx related construction emissions to less than significant. Although implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.6.2 would assist in reducing NOx construction emissions, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable if this alternative were implemented."~~

The numbering of **Impact 4.6.4** "Cumulative Operational Emissions – Ozone Precursors" has changed to **Impact 4.6.6** on page 6.0-75 of the Draft EIR.

The text under **Impact 4.7.4** "Construction Impacts" on page 6.0-76 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required as part of mitigation measure MM 4.7.4, which would reduce the construction water quality impacts associated with the Blueprint Alternative to this less than significant."~~

The text under **Impact 4.7.6 "Cumulative Water Quality"** on page 6.0-76 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"There is no feasible measure to mitigate cumulative water quality impacts and the The Blueprint Alternative would contribute to less than cumulatively considerable water quality impacts in the area.~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.1** "Direct Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species" on page 6.0-76 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"The proposed project would result in the loss of 455 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat. Even with implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, significant direct impacts to these species would occur if the Blueprint Alternative were implemented. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 4.9.1a through MM 4.9.1c, will result in less than significant impacts."~~

The text under **Impact 4.9.2** "Indirect Effects to Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species" on page 6.0-77 of the Draft EIR has been modified as follows:

~~"Even if mitigation measure MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b were implemented, the Blueprint Alternative scenario would result in significant indirect impacts to these species. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.9.2a and MM 4.9.2b will result in less than significant impacts."~~

The numbering of **Impact 4.9.10** "Cumulative Biological Resources" has been changed to **Impact 4.9.11** on page 6.0-78 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been deleted on page 6.0-79 of the Draft EIR due to absence of significant impacts:

~~"Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services (Impact 4.12.1.2)"~~

4.0 ERRATA

~~"The proposed project and other adjacent projects would require additional facilities and equipment for fire protection and emergency services. The Blueprint Alternative would result in cumulatively considerable impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services."~~

The following text has been added to page 6.0-79 of the DEIR:

Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources

Impact 4.10.4 The proposed project could damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the Blueprint Alternative would also have the potential to impact paleontological resources, which may be disturbed or destroyed by grading and excavation activities and similar **cumulatively considerable** impacts would result relative to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.10.2** would reduce this alternative's potential paleontological resource impacts to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-79:

Impact 4.11.4 Implementation of the Preserve at Sunridge project in combination with other projects would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare in the area, and contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impact. The Blueprint Alternative would include similar land uses, which would introduce new sources of light and glare onto the existing rural site. This alternative would result in fewer residential units and commercial acreage than the proposed project, which would reduce sources of light and glare; however, **potentially significant** impacts would be anticipated. Mitigation measure **MM 4.11.2a** and **MM 4.11.2b** would reduce potential light and glare impacts to **less than cumulatively considerable** for the Blueprint Alternative.

The following text has been added to page 6.0-79 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.4.2 "Cumulative Wastewater Impacts" Implementation of the project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development within SRCSD service area, would result in an increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity. The project's contribution could be **potentially significant**. Under the Blueprint Alternative, implementation of MM4.12.4.2 would ensure that development would not proceed until wastewater service is ensured and would fully mitigate the project's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable.

The numbering of **Impact 4.12.7.2** "Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure" has been changed to **Impact 4.12.8.2** on page 6.0-79 of the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added on page 6.0-79 of the DEIR:

Impact 4.12.7.2 The layout of the proposed project does not meet the requirements of the City of Rancho Cordova Interim General Plan

Policy OSPT. 1.1. This would be a **potentially significant** impact. Under the Blueprint Alternative, 39.4 acres of parkland would be needed. This alternative would provide 39.8 acres of parkland. Fewer units would occur relative to the proposed project and an excess of 0.4 acres of parkland above the projected need would result. This alternative is consistent with General Plan Policy OSPT. 1.1 and **less than significant** impacts would result.

Table 6.0-5 starting on page 6.0-85 of the DEIR has been modified as follows:

**TABLE 6.0-5
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

Environmental Categories	<i>Proposed Project (Impact Significance)</i>	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Population/Housing/Employment	<i>Project Impacts</i>	W	S	S	S	S
Population, housing and employment increases and significant impacts on regionally projected growth (Impact 4.2.1)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because project would include 2,703 residential units and 17 acres of commercial uses. (LTS)	Potentially significant impacts on regionally projected growth because Alternative 1 would not include residential units or employment opportunities and growth would occur elsewhere (PS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 2 would provide 1,636 units and 60 acres of commercial uses (LTS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 3 would provide 2,003 units and 17 acres of commercial (LTS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 4 would provide 2,659 units and 17 acres of commercial (LTS)	Less than significant impacts on population, housing and employment because Alternative 5 would provide 2,101 units and 11.3 acres of commercial (LTS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	PS	(LTS)	(LTS)	(LTS)	(LTS)
Human Health/Risk of Upset	<i>Project Impacts</i>	B	S	S	S	S
Potential exposure to groundwater contamination (Impact 4.3.2) (Impact 4.3.5)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	No potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)	Potential exposure to contaminated groundwater (PS)
Level of Significance	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

4.0 ERRATA

Environmental Categories	Proposed Project (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
After Mitigation						
Underground Storage Tank Contamination (Impact 4.3.3) Exposure to Existing Hazardous Containing Materials and Soils Impact 4.3.6	Undiscovered underground storage tanks on the project site, potentially contaminating soils and/or groundwater (PS)	<u>Hazardous containing material and undiscovered underground storage tanks</u> (PS)	<u>Hazardous containing material and undiscovered underground storage tanks</u> (PS)	<u>Hazardous containing material and undiscovered underground storage tanks</u> (PS)	<u>Hazardous containing material and undiscovered underground storage tanks</u> (PS)	<u>Hazardous containing material and undiscovered underground storage tanks</u> (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Transportation	Project Impacts	B	B	B	B	B
Impacts to study area roadway segments under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.1, 4.4.3, 4.4.7 and 4.4.12)	Worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on a deficiently operating roadways (S) Baseline: Impact 4.4.1: S Interim: Impact 4.4.7: S Cumulative: Impact 4.4.12: S	No roadway segment impacts	1,067 fewer dwelling units and approximately 40% reduction in residential trips; however, approximately 63% increase in AM peak hour and 86% increase in PM peak hour trips from larger commercial area (S) Baseline: Impact 4.4.1: S Interim: Impact 4.4.7: S Cumulative: Impact 4.4.12: S	700 fewer dwelling units and approximately 26 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (PS/S) Baseline: Impact 4.4.1: PS Interim: Impact 4.4.7: S Cumulative: Impact 4.4.12: S	44 fewer dwelling units and approximately 2 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S/PS/LTS) Baseline: Impact 4.4.1: PS Interim: Impact 4.4.7: S Cumulative: Impact 4.4.12: S/LTS	602 fewer dwelling units and approximately 22 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S/PS/LTS) Baseline: Impact 4.4.1: PS Interim: Impact 4.4.7: LTS Cumulative: Impact 4.4.12: LTS/S
Level of	(LTS/SU)		(LTS/SU/LCC/C	(LTS/SU/CC/	SU/LTS/LCC/CC	(SU/LTS/LCC/C

Environmental Categories	Proposed Project (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Significance After Mitigation	<p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.1:</u> <u>LTS/SU</u></p> <p><u>Interim:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.7:</u> <u>LTS/ SU</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.12:</u> <u>LCC/CC</u></p>	N/A	<p><u>C)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.1:</u> <u>LTS/SU</u></p> <p><u>Interim:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.7:</u> <u>LTS</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.12:</u> <u>LCC/CC</u></p>	<p><u>LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.1:</u> <u>LTS/SU</u></p> <p><u>Interim:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.7:</u> <u>LTS</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.12:</u> <u>LCC/CC</u></p>	<p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.1:</u> <u>LTS/SU</u></p> <p><u>Interim:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.7:</u> <u>LTS</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.12:</u> <u>LCC/CC</u></p>	<p><u>C)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.1:</u> <u>LTS/SU</u></p> <p><u>Interim:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.7:</u> <u>LTS</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.12:</u> <u>LCC/CC</u></p>
Impacts to study area intersections under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.2, 4.4.8 and 4.4.13)	<p>Worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections <u>(S/LTS)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>Impact 4.4.2: S</u></p> <p><u>Interim: 4.4.8: S</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>S/LTS</u> <u>Impact 4.4.13:</u></p>	No intersection related impacts N/A	<p>1,067 fewer dwelling units and approximately 40% reduction in residential trips; however, approximately 63% increase in AM peak hour and 86% increase in PM peak hour trips from larger commercial area <u>(S/LTS)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u></p> <p><u>Interim: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.8):</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative: LTS</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.13):</u></p>	<p>700 fewer dwelling units and approximately 26 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips <u>(S)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u></p> <p><u>Interim: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.8):</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.13): S</u></p>	<p>44 fewer dwelling units and approximately 2 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips <u>(S)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u></p> <p><u>Interim: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.8):</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.13): S</u></p>	<p>602 fewer dwelling units and approximately 22 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips <u>(S)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u></p> <p><u>Interim: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.8):</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.13): S</u></p>
Level of Significance After Mitigation	<p><u>(SU/CC/LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: SU</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u></p>	N/A	<p><u>(SU/CC/LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: SU</u></p>	<p><u>(SU/CC/LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: SU</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u></p>	<p><u>SU/CC/LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: SU</u></p>	<p><u>(SU/CC/LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline: SU</u> <u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u></p>

4.0 ERRATA

Environmental Categories	<i>Proposed Project (Impact Significance)</i>	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	<u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.8): <u>Cumulative: CC/LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.13)		<u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u> <u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.8): <u>Cumulative: CC/LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.13):	<u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.8): <u>Cumulative: CC/LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.13):	<u>(Impact 4.4.2):</u> <u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.8): <u>Cumulative: CC/LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.13):	<u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.8): <u>Cumulative: CC/LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.13):
Impacts to the Sunrise Boulevard Corridor (Impact 4.4.3)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)	No impacts to the Sunrise Corridor	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SU	N/A	SU	SU	SU/LTS	SU
Freeway mainline impacts under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.4, 4.4.9, and 4.4.14)	Exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential unit threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan (S) <u>Baseline: S</u> (Impact 4.4.4): <u>Interim: S</u> (Impact 4.4.9): <u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.14)	No freeway mainline related impacts	1,067 fewer dwelling units and approximately 40% reduction in residential trips; however, approximately 63% increase in AM peak hour and 86% increase in PM peak hour trips from larger commercial area (S) <u>Baseline: S</u> (Impact 4.4.4): <u>Interim: S</u> (Impact 4.4.9): <u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.14)	700 fewer dwelling units and approximately 26 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S) <u>Baseline: S</u> (Impact 4.4.4): <u>Interim: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.9): <u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.14)	44 fewer dwelling units and approximately 2 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S) <u>Baseline: S</u> (Impact 4.4.4): <u>Interim: S</u> (Impact 4.4.9): <u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.14)	602 fewer dwelling units and approximately 22 percent reduction in daily vehicle trips (S) <u>Baseline: S</u> (Impact 4.4.4): <u>Interim: S</u> (Impact 4.4.9): <u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.14)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	<u>(SU/CC)</u> <u>Baseline: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.4):	N/A	<u>(SU/CC)</u> <u>Baseline: SU</u>	<u>(SU/CC)</u> <u>Baseline: SU</u>	<u>(SU/CC)</u> <u>Baseline: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.4):	<u>(SU/CC)</u> <u>Baseline: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.4):

Environmental Categories	Proposed Project (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	<p><u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.9):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: CC</u> (Impact 4.4.14)</p>		<p>(Impact 4.4.4):</p> <p><u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.9):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: CC</u> (Impact 4.4.14)</p>	<p>(Impact 4.4.4):</p> <p><u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.9):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: CC</u> (Impact 4.4.14)</p>	<p><u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.9):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: CC</u> (Impact 4.4.14)</p>	<p><u>Interim: SU</u> (Impact 4.4.9):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: CC</u> (Impact 4.4.14)</p>
Transit impacts under Baseline, Interim, and Cumulative Conditions (Impacts 4.4.5, and 4.4.10, and 4.4.15)	<p><u>Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova</u> (P and/S)</p> <p><u>Baseline: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.5)</p> <p><u>Interim: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>No increase in transit demand or impacts to transit facilities</u></p> <p><u>N/A</u></p>	<p><u>Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova</u> (P and/S)</p> <p><u>Baseline: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.5)</p> <p><u>Interim: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova</u> (P and/S)</p> <p><u>Baseline: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.5)</p> <p><u>Interim: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova</u> (P and/S)</p> <p><u>Baseline: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.5)</p> <p><u>Interim: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>Increase demand for transit service in the City of Rancho Cordova</u> (P and/S)</p> <p><u>Baseline: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.5)</p> <p><u>Interim: PS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative: S</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>
Level of Significance After Mitigation	<p><u>(LTS/LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.5):</p> <p><u>Interim: LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>N/A</u></p>	<p><u>(LTS/LCC)</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.5):</p> <p><u>Interim: LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>LTS/LCC</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.5):</p> <p><u>Interim: LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>LTS/LCC</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.5):</p> <p><u>Interim: LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>	<p><u>LTS/LCC</u></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> <u>LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.5):</p> <p><u>Interim: LTS</u> (Impact 4.4.10):</p> <p><u>Cumulative:</u> <u>LCC</u> (Impact 4.4.15):</p>
Noise	Project Impacts	B	S	S	S	S
Noise-producing uses within the project area (Impact 4.5.2)	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses	No new noise producing sources over existing conditions	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses	Exceedance of the City's maximum Noise Element standards at the residential uses

4.0 ERRATA

Environmental Categories	<i>Proposed Project (Impact Significance)</i>	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	(PS)		(PS)	(PS)	(PS)	(PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Construction noise (Impact 4.5.4)	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. (PS)	No construction noise impacts	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. (PS)	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. (PS)	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. (PS)	Construction noise levels range from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS <u>SU</u>	N/A	LTS <u>SU</u>	LTS <u>SU</u>	LTS <u>SU</u>	LTS <u>SU</u>
Cumulative traffic noise on future developments (Impact 4.5.6)	Future traffic noise levels at a distance of 75 feet from the future Jaeger Road are predicted to exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)	No residences constructed and no cumulative noise impacts	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)	Exceed the City's 60-65 dB Ldn range of acceptable noise levels for residential outdoor activity areas (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LCC	N/A	LCC	LCC	LCC	LCC
Air Quality	<i>Project Impacts</i>	B	BW	B	B	S
Construction air emissions (Impact 4.6.1 and 4.6.2)	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (652.7 pounds per day), which exceeds SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85 pounds per day	No construction air related emissions	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (541 pounds per day), which exceeds SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (489 pounds per day), which exceeds SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (580 pounds per day) and exceed SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85	Temporary increases in particulate matter (PM10 and PM 2.5) and dust emissions (652.7 pounds per day) and exceed SMAQMD's construction threshold of 85

Environmental Categories	Proposed Project (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	of NOx (S)		pounds per day of NOx (S)	pounds per day of NOx (S)	pounds per day of NOx (S)	pounds per day of NOx (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SU	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Operational air emissions – ozone (Impact 4.6.4)	Generate 352.2 pounds of ROG and 262.6 pounds of NOx per day, which exceeds SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)	No operational emission impacts would occur	Generate 292 pounds of ROG and 218 pounds of NOx per day, which exceeds the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)	Exceed the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)	Exceed the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)	Exceed the SMAQMD's significance threshold of 65 pounds per day (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SU	N/A	SU	SU	SU	SU
Cumulative Operational air impacts (Impact 4.6.6)	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)	No contribution to cumulative operational air impacts	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)	Cumulatively considerable operational emission impacts (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SU <u>CC</u>	N/A	SU <u>CC</u>	SU <u>CC</u>	SU <u>CC</u>	SU <u>CC</u>
Hydrology and Water Quality	Project Impacts	B	S	S	S	S
Surface Water Quality (Impact 4.7.2)	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)	No surface water quality impacts	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)	Affect both surface water quality and runoff (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Construction Impacts (Impact 4.7.4)	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts	No construction water quality related impacts	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts	Potentially significant construction water quality impacts

4.0 ERRATA

Environmental Categories	Proposed Project (Impact Significance)	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
	(PS)		(PS)	(PS)	(PS)	(PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Drainage (Impact 4.7.5)	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)	No site preparation or drainage impacts	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage Improvements (PS)	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)	Potentially significant impacts from extensive drainage improvements (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Cumulative Water Quality (Impact 4.7.6)	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts (PS) CC	No contribution to cumulative water quality impacts	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts (PS) CC	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts (PS) CC	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts (PS) CC	Contribute to cumulatively considerable water quality impacts (PS) CC
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS LCC	N/A	LTS LCC	LTS LCC	LTS LCC	LTS LCC
Biological Resources	Project Impacts	B	W	B	B	S
Direct Impacts to endangered, threatened, rare species (impact 4.9.1)	The project would result in the loss of 454.90 acres of foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk, the direct loss of 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and the direct loss of 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat (S)	No direct impact to these species	The direct loss of 495 acres of Swainson’s hawk habitat and 20 acres of vernal pool shrimp habitat. (S)	The direct loss of 290 acres of Swainson’s hawk habitat and 5.8 acres of vernal pool shrimp habitat (S)	The direct loss of 426 acres of Swainson’s hawk habitat and 10 acres of vernal pool shrimp habitat (S)	The direct loss of 454.90 acres of Swainson’s hawk habitat, 14.1 acres of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat, and 15.65 acres of vernal pool tadpole shrimp habitat (S)
Level of	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Environmental Categories	<i>Proposed Project (Impact Significance)</i>	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Significance After Mitigation						
Indirect Impacts to endangered, threatened, rare species (impact 4.9.2)	Indirect adverse effects to 455 acres of habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species (S)	No indirect impact to these species	Convert 495 acres to urbanized uses, resulting in indirect effects to the habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, and rare animal species. (S)	The loss of approximately 290 acres resulting in indirect impacts to these species (S)	The loss of approximately 426 acres resulting in indirect impacts to these species (S)	The loss of approximately 455 acres resulting in indirect impacts to these species (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Loss of Habitat Impacts (Impacts 4.9.3, 4.9.4)	Loss of foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds and other forms of wildlife other than Swainson’s hawk, and the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools (S)	No impacts or loss of habitat	Loss of 495 acres of foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds and other forms of wildlife other than Swainson’s hawk, and direct loss of 15.39 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools (S)	The loss of approximately 290 acres of habitat and direct loss of 5.8 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat (S)	The loss of approximately 426 acres of habitat and the direct loss of 10.2 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat (S)	Loss of foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds and other forms of wildlife other than Swainson’s hawk, and the direct loss of 10.46 acres of northern hardpan vernal pools (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Loss of Jurisdictional Waters (Impact 4.9.5)	Filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands (S)	No impacts or loss of jurisdictional waters	Filling of 21.26 acres of jurisdictional wetlands. (S)	Filling of 5.8 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat (S)	Filling of 10.2 acres of hardpan vernal pool habitat (S)	Filling of 15.65 acres of jurisdictional wetlands (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impacts to movement corridors (Impact	Interfere substantially with the	No movement corridor related impacts	Interfere substantially with the	Would not interfere or impede	Would not interfere or impede	Interfere substantially with the

4.0 ERRATA

Environmental Categories	<i>Proposed Project (Impact Significance)</i>	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
4.9.6)	<i>movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp (S)</i>		movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp (S)	movement in this corridor (S) <u>LTS</u>	movement in this corridor (S) <u>LTS</u>	movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	<u>SU</u>	N/A	SU	SU <u>LTS</u>	SU <u>LTS</u>	SU
Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources (Impact 4.9.10) 4.9.11	<i>Result in a cumulatively significant loss of biological resources in the region. (S)</i>	No cumulative impacts to biological resources	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)	Cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources in the region (S)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	SU <u>CC</u>	N/A	SU <u>CC</u>	SU <u>CC</u>	SU <u>CC</u>	SU <u>CC</u>
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	<i>Project Impacts</i>	B	S	S	S	S
Undiscovered Prehistoric Resources, Historic Resources, and Human Remains (Impact 4.10.1)	<i>Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)</i>	Would not disturb or impact undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)	Potential disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric resources, historic resources, and human remains (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	<u>LTS</u>	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Paleontological Resources (Impact 4.10.2)	<i>Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)</i>	Would not damage or destroy undiscovered paleontological resources <u>and no impact would result</u> (PS) <u>N/A</u>	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)	Potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources (PS)
Level of Significance	<u>LTS</u>	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Environmental Categories	<i>Proposed Project (Impact Significance)</i>	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
After Mitigation						
<u>Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources</u> (Impact 4.10.4)	<u>Potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources</u> <u>CC</u>	Potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources <u>CC</u>	Potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources <u>CC</u>	Potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources <u>CC</u>	Potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources <u>CC</u>	Potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources <u>CC</u>
<u>Level of Significance After Mitigation</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>
Visual Resources/Light and Glare	<i>Project Impacts</i>	B	S	S	S	S
Light and Glare (Impact 4.11.2)	<i>Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area</i> <i>(PS)</i>	No new light and glare sources would be introduced (PS) <u>LTS</u>	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<u>Cumulative Alteration to Visual Character</u> Impact 4.11.4	<u>Light and glare contribute to cumulative visual and aesthetic related impacts</u> <u>S</u>	No new light and glare sources would be introduced <u>LTS</u>	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)	Introduce new sources of light and glare in the area (PS)
<u>Level of Significance After Mitigation</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>
Public Services and Utilities	<i>Project Impacts</i>	B	S	S	S	S
Design-Related Safety Concerns (Impact 4.12.2.2)	<i>Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area</i> <i>(PS)</i>	No effect on police department’s service ability	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)	Affect the ability of the police department to serve the area (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

4.0 ERRATA

Environmental Categories	<i>Proposed Project (Impact Significance)</i>	No Project Alternative (Impact Significance)	No Project – With Approved SDCP Land Use Plan - Alternative 2 (Impact Significance)	Aquatic Resource Habitat Alternative - Alternative 3 (Impact Significance)	Existing Morrison Creek Alternative - Alternative 4 (Impact Significance)	Blueprint Alternative - Alternative 5 (Impact Significance)
Cumulative Wastewater Impacts (Impact 4.12.4.2)	<u>Result in an increase in Wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity (PS)</u>	No effect on cumulative wastewater impacts	Increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity PS	Increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity PS	Increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity PS	Increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity PS
Level of Significance After Mitigation	<u>LCC</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>	<u>LCC</u>
Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure (Impact 4.12.7.2) Impact 4.12.8.2	<u>Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)</u>	Would not require extension of existing infrastructure	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)	Require the extension of natural gas, telephone, and cable infrastructure (PS)
Level of Significance After Mitigation	LTS	N/A	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Overall Impact Comparison	N/A	B	S	B	B	S

Notes: B = Better, S = Same, W = Worse () = Level of significance without mitigation. LTS = Less than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

A quantitative comparison is provided, where available, for impacts that were analyzed in Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of the Draft EIR. No quantitative data was available for Human Health/Risk of Upset, Hydrology and Water Quality, Geology and Soils, and Cultural, Paleontological Resource, Visual Resources, or Public Services. The classifications of B, S and W were based on available quantitative and qualitative information for the proposed project and the four alternatives.

7.0 LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROJECT



The following text has been added to page 7.0-1 of the Draft EIR:

Note: These impacts were inadvertently omitted from Section 7.0, however these impacts were included in Sections 4.1-4.12 of the DEIR.

“Transportation and Circulation

“Impact 4.4.1 Implementation of the project under Baseline conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on certain deficiently operating roadways located within the project area. This would be a **significant** impact.

“Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measures MM “MM 4.4.1a, MM 4.1.1b and MM 4.4.1d is considered **significant and unavoidable** in the short term and **less than significant** ultimately.

“Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM 4.4.1C** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

“Impact 4.4.2 Implementation of the project will result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections at study intersections under Baseline conditions resulting in a **significant** impact.

“Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measures **MM 4.4.2a** through **MM 4.4.2g** are considered **significant and unavoidable**.

“Impact 4.4.3 Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable LOS conditions along the Sunrise Boulevard corridor in excess of the 6,500 residential building lot threshold set forth in Zoning Condition 48 associated with the Sunridge Specific Plan. This is a **significant** impact.

“Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM 4.4.3** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

“Impact 4.4.4 Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US-50 under Baseline conditions. This is considered a **significant** impact.

“Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM 4.4.4** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

“Impact 4.4.7 Implementation of the project under Interim Year (2014) conditions would result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways located within the project area. This would be a **significant** impact.

“Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM4.4.1a** is considered **significant and unavoidable** in the short term and **less than significant** ultimately.

“Impact 4.4.8 Implementation of the project in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 volume-to-capacity ratio at signalized intersections or a 5 second or

4.0 ERRATA

greater delay at unsignalized intersections at under Interim Year (2014) conditions resulting in a **significant** impact.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with these mitigation measures **MM 4.4.8a-e** are considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Impact 4.4.9 Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US-50 under Interim Year (2014) conditions. This is considered a **significant** impact.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM 4.4.4** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Impact 4.4.12 Impact of the project will result in the worsening of already deficient LOS and/or an increase of 0.05 or greater of the volume-to-capacity ratio on deficiently operating roadways as well as trigger some roadways to exceed the City's LOS D standards located within the project area under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios. This is considered a **significant** impact

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measures **MM 4.4.12a through MM4.4.12d** and **MM 4.4.12f** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measures **MM 4.1.12b** and **MM 4.4.12e** is considered **significant and unavoidable** in the short term and **less than significant** ultimately.

"Impact 4.4.13 Implementation of the project will result in the worsening of already deficient LOS, an increased of 0.05 volume-to-capacity at signalized intersections, cause a 5 second or greater delay at unsignalized intersections as well as trigger some intersections to exceed the City's LOS D standards at study area intersections under Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions with both the Hazel Avenue Extension Scenarios resulting in a **significant** impact.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measures **MM 4.4.13a** and **MM 4.4.13h** is considered **significant and unavoidable** in the short term and **less than significant** ultimately.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measures **MM 4.4.13b** through **MM 4.4.13g**, **MM 4.4.13i**, and **MM 4.4.13j** are considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Impact 4.4.14 Implementation of the project will exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound US-50 under cumulative conditions. This is considered a **significant** impact.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM 4.4.4** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Noise

"Impact 4.5.4 Project construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of established noise standards. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM 4.5.4** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Air Quality

"Impact 4.6.1 Implementation of the proposed project would result in temporarily increased Particulate Matter levels in the immediate vicinity during construction. This is considered a **significant** impact.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with the mitigation measures **MM 4.6.1a** and **MM 4.6.1b** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Impact 4.6.2 Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in temporarily increased Nitrogen Oxide Emissions greater than the SMAQMD threshold of 85 pounds per day. This is considered a **significant** impact.

"Note: The resulting level of significance with mitigation measure **MM 4.6.2** is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Impact 4.6.4 Development of the project would result in increases in emission of both ozone precursors. This is considered a **significant** impact.

"Note: No mitigation measures are proposed for this impact. The resulting level of significance is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

"Biological Resources

"Impact 4.9.6 Implementation of the project will interfere substantially with the movement of vernal pool tadpole shrimp. This is considered a **significant** impact.

"Note: There is no feasible mitigation other than redesigning the proposed project to keep Morrison Creek intact. This is a **significant and unavoidable** impact."

8.0 REPORT PREPARERS

There were no errata changes to this section.

APPENDICES

1.0 Notice of Preparation and NOP Comments

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.0 ERRATA

3.0 Proposed Amendments to the SDCP and the General Plan and Special Planning Area Zoning Handbook

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.0 Consistency Table Analysis

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.4 Traffic Impact Analysis

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.5 Environmental Noise Analysis

There were no errata changes to this section.

4.6 Air Quality Impact Evaluation

The Appendix (URBEMIS-2002 Output) of the Air Quality Impact Evaluation for the Preserve at Sunridge in **Appendix 4.6** has been replaced with a new URBEMIS run using the latest version 8.7, which was done upon recommendation from the SMAQMD. Additionally, the Air Quality Plan in **Appendix 4.6** has been replaced with the revised Air Quality Plan, which is endorsed by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.

4.7 SCWA Revised Water Demand Calculation

SCWA revised the water demand calculations for the Preserve at Sunridge project (see **Section 4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality** of this Errata, above). The revised water demand calculation is included in **Appendix 4.7** of this FEIR. Additionally, SCWA has indicated that the SCWA Board of Directors will approve the revised Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for the Preserve at Sunridge project on March 14, 2006, which will meet the requirements based on Zone 40's conjunctive use program as described in the Zone 40 WSMP, the Water Forum Agreement, SCWA's 2000 Urban Water Management Plan, and other relevant documents (Cole, March 2006).

4.8 Biological Resource Memos

Three memos were submitted regarding the biological analysis of the Draft EIR. Christopher Rogers from EcoAnalysts submitted a memo on behalf of the City on April 8, 2005. Dr. Ken Whitney from Foothill Associates submitted a memo on behalf of the project proponents on February 3, 2006. The City prepared an additional memo on March 5, 2006. All of these memos are included in **Appendix 4.9** of this FEIR.