

This section provides an overview of the proposed City of Rancho Cordova General Plan (the "proposed project") and the environmental analysis of the proposed project. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate chapter of Sections 4.1 through 4.13 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures).

2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will provide, to the greatest extent possible, an analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of the General Plan, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This EIR analysis focuses upon potential environmental impacts that could arise from implementation of the General Plan through development of the land uses within the Planning Area, as regulated and guided by General Plan policies and action items. The EIR adopts this approach in order to provide a credible worst-case scenario of the impacts resulting from project implementation.

2.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The City of Rancho Cordova incorporated in July of 2003 and adopted the Sacramento County General Plan and corresponding land use map. Now that the City of Rancho Cordova is incorporated, the City must formulate and adopt a new General Plan that will act as the official policy statement of the City and guide public and private development in the City as well as the preservation of existing natural resources (Government Code Section 65360). The City of Rancho Cordova commenced the preparation of a General Plan in May 2004.

The proposed City of Rancho Cordova General Plan is comprised of a Land Use Map (see Section 3.0, Project Description) and policy document that contains twelve "policy" elements. Each of the elements identifies goals and associated policies and action items, with the general intent to assist and promote the development of the ideas and desires established in the Rancho Cordova Vision Book for the City, adopted by the City Council on August 2, 2004, and thereby made a part of the City's interim General Plan. A brief description and goals for each element are as follows:

LAND USE ELEMENT

The purpose of the Land Use Element is to describe existing and future land use activity in the City. The Element identifies the distribution, location, and intensity of all land use types throughout the City.

- Balance of land uses (Goal LU.1)
- Smart Growth development (Goal LU.2)
- Rancho Cordova as a destination place and leader in the region (Goal LU.3)
- Redevelopment of existing areas (Goal LU.4)

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

The Urban Design Element provides policies and design concepts regarding the form and character of new private development (and public improvements) along with focused plans for areas of the City in need of special design attention.

- Development consistent with the City Building Blocks (Goal UD.1)

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Create a new City identity (Goal UD.2)
- Project identity that contributes to the district and City (Goal UD.3)
- Projects designed in keeping with surrounding development (Goal UD.4)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

This Element is an optional element included in the General Plan so the City's officials can continue to improve the City's prosperity, maintain competitiveness, ensure accessibility to its assets, make sure the market is aware of the City's opportunities, and set fair and equitable rules for development.

- Diversify the economy (Goal ED.1)
- Encourage a wide range of businesses (Goal ED.2)
- Create a Downtown (Goal ED.3)
- Create a convention center (Goal ED.4)
- Establish a redevelopment strategy (Goal ED.5)
- Revitalize existing businesses (Goal ED.6)
- Promote infill (Goal ED.7)
- Attract a balance of businesses (Goal ED.8)

HOUSING ELEMENT

The Housing Element is a comprehensive statement by the City of Rancho Cordova of its current and future housing needs at all income levels.

- Balance Employment and Housing (Goal H.1)
- Neighborhood Preservation and Rehabilitation (Goal H.2)
- Revitalize Existing Multi-Family (Goal H.3)
- Encourage Housing Opportunities (Goal H.4)
- Promote Homeownership (Goal H.5)
- Pursue Sustainable Design (Goal H.6)
- Pursue Housing Resources (Goal H.7)

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

The Circulation Element identifies the components of the City-wide circulation system and their general location and role within the community.

- Future roadway system that meets the City's needs and desires (Goal C.1)
- Safe and attractive pedestrian and bicycle network (Goal C.2)
- Great public transit (Goal C.3)
- Air and rail transportation (Goal C.4)
- A fully funded circulation system (Goal C.5)
- A properly maintained circulation system (Goal C.6)

OPEN SPACE, PARKS AND TRAILS ELEMENT

This Element provides goals, policies, and actions intended to achieve the City's vision for open spaces that are accessible to the community. The Element also considers the relationship of open space mitigation lands adjacent to urban lands.

- World-class Parks and Recreation Programs (Goal OSPT.1)

- Connected System of Open Space (Goal OSPT-2)
- Safe and Continuous Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails (Goal OSPT-3)
- Actively Create and Maintain Trails and Open Space (Goal OSPT-4)

INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES, AND FINANCE ELEMENT

The Infrastructure, Services, and Finance Element works in combination with the Land Use Element to identify feasible funding options to ensure the provision of infrastructure and public services in a timely manner to accommodate the development envisioned and associated land uses proposed under the General Plan.

- Fiscally Sound City (Goal ISF.1)
- Timely Provision of Quality Infrastructure (Goal ISF-2)
- Local Services for Local Needs (Goal ISF-3)
- World-Class Schools (Goal ISF-4)

NATURAL RESOURCES ELEMENT

The management and protection of the many biological resources, creek corridors, storm drainage, hydrology, water supply and quality, geology and mineral resources, agriculture, and the consumption of energy are the focus of the Natural Resources Element.

- Preserve and protect diverse habitats (Goal NR.1)
- Preserve natural wetlands (Goal NR.2)
- Maintain creek corridors (Goal NR.3)
- Plant and preserve high-quality trees (Goal NR.4)
- Protect quantity and quality of water (Goal NR.5)
- Extraction of mineral resources (Goal NR.6)
- Reduce energy consumption (Goal NR.7)
- Promote waste reduction (Goal NR.8)

CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT

This Element seeks to identify and protect areas, sites, and buildings having architectural, historical or cultural significance. The Element provides goals, policies and actions designed to foster preservation of historic resources in the City.

- Positive community image (Goal CHR.1)
- Celebrate cultural diversity and heritage (Goal CHR.2)
- Preserve cultural and historic resources (Goal CHR.3)
- Public support for preservation (Goal CHR.4)

SAFETY ELEMENT

The Safety Element discusses the human and natural safety concerns in the City. The Safety Element works in conjunction with the Infrastructure, Services and Finance Element and the Land Use Element.

- Safe Community for All (Goal S.1)
- Minimize Flood Hazards for Urban Uses (Goal S.2)
- Minimize Seismic Hazards for Residents and Employees (Goal S.3)

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Safe Railroad Crossings (Goal S.4)
- Minimize Risks of Toxic/Hazardous Substance Release (Goal S.5)
- Design Safe Neighborhoods (Goal S.7)
- Maintain Effective Law Enforcement (Goal S.8)
- Reduce Risk to Structures (Goal S.9)

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

This Element provides goals, policies, and actions to improve air quality in the region. This Element emphasizes the effect that land use patterns and resulting transportation behavior have on air quality.

- Ensure a health community (Goal AQ.1)
- Improve air quality through land use (Goal AQ.2)
- Support multiple forms of transportation (Goal AQ.3)
- Support energy conservation (Goal AQ.4)
- Promote educational efforts (Goal AQ.5)

NOISE ELEMENT

This Element defines acceptable noise levels in different areas of the City (residential, office, industrial, etc.) and how those levels will be achieved.

- New Development Free of Noise Disturbances (Goal N.1)
- Mitigate Existing Noise Disturbances (Goal N.2)

2.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid and/or lessen the environmental effects of the project. Further, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that a "no project" alternative be evaluated in an EIR. This alternatives analysis provides a comparative analysis between the project and the selected alternatives. In conjunction with the proposed General Plan Land Use Policy Map, the EIR qualitatively evaluates the following other land use alternatives, which include:

- **ALTERNATIVE 1 – Sacramento County General Plan Alternative (No Project Alternative):**
Under this alternative, the proposed Rancho Cordova General Plan and its associated Land Use Policy Map would not be adopted and the City would revert to the Sacramento County General Plan (Land Use Map and policy document) that was initially adopted by the City upon incorporation as modified by recently approved General Plan amendments (Sunrise-Douglas Community Plan, Sunridge Specific Plan, Villages of Zinfandel, and Capital Village). This would also include the utilization of the transportation improvements identified in the Sacramento County General Plan Transportation Plan (also as modified by recently adopted General Plan amendments [Sunrise-Douglas Community Plan]).
- **Alternative 2 – Existing City Boundary General Plan Alternative (No Project Alternative):**
Under this alternative, the proposed City of Rancho Cordova General Plan (Land Use Map and policy document) would only be implemented within the existing City boundaries and existing sphere of influence. The Sacramento County General Plan would guide development in regions of the Planning Area outside of the City. The Grant

Line West and Westborough Planning Area conceptual land use plans would be modified. The City's Circulation Plan would only be implemented within the existing city limits and sphere of influence.

- **Alternative 3 – Natural Resources Conservation Alternative:** This alternative would generally consist of the same land use concept associated with the proposed General Plan. However, this Alternative modifies the conceptual land plans for several of the Planning Areas to provide further protection of wetland resources and associated habitats. Development potential lost from these modifications were re-allocated where it was consistent with the land use concepts of the proposed General Plan. All other aspects of the proposed General Plan would remain under this alternative (General Plan land use mapping for other portions of the Planning Area and the proposed Roadway System Map).
- **Alternative 4 – Sacramento Area Council of Governments Preferred Blueprint Scenario Alternative:** This alternative would be based on SACOG's Preferred Blueprint Scenario for the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Area, including the circulation plan. Implementation of the SACOG Blueprint Plan would accommodate population growth to a higher degree but would provide less capacity for housing units and potential places of employment than the proposed General Plan.

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City of Rancho Cordova was identified as the Lead Agency for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Rancho Cordova prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Rancho Cordova General Plan that was circulated for public review on February 25, 2005. The NOP included a summary of probable effects on the environment from the implementation of the project. Written comments received in response to the NOP were considered in the preparation of the EIR. The issues raised included: impacts to Caltrans facilities, capacity of and setback from the Keifer landfill, safety concerns associated with design, protection of agriculture, wetlands, fish and wildlife resources, sewer capacity, water supply and coordination with the Water Forum agreements, wildland fire potential, impacts from operation of Mather Airport, consistency of the tunnel for Mather Field with the County Transportation Plan and Mather Field Specific Plan, and coordination of planning with the County of Sacramento. Section 1.0 (Introduction) provides a summary of issues and areas of concern related to the proposed General Plan and the Draft EIR, presented to the City by agencies and the public during the NOP review period. The complete text of the NOP and NOP comments are included as **Appendix 1.0** to this EIR. It should be noted that subsequent to receiving traffic-related comments on the NOP from Caltrans, representatives from the City met with Caltrans on December 13, 2005 and determined that the following analyses should be done for U.S. 50:

- Use of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) peak hour analyses on the freeway mainline only.
- Identification of ramp capacities during peak hours to aid in determining the ultimate number of lanes on the freeway ramps.
- Presentation of six-hour peak volumes (three hour morning peak and three hour evening peak) on Caltrans facilities.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- No merge/diverge/weave analyses at the freeway ramps, and no ramp terminal analyses.

Subsequent to the close of the public review period for the NOP, the Rancho Cordova City Council held a number of public meetings to further refine the policies, actions and land use designations associated with the General Plan. The following additional environmental topics were discussed during such meetings, all of which are addressed in this DEIR:

- Existing mining operations in the Rio del Oro, Grant Line West, and East Planning Areas. The desire to reduce development in the Jackson and other southern and eastern Planning Areas to preserve and protect more vernal pools. Land that contains vernal pools should not be used as mitigation land for Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, even if the land that would be impacted by development contains vernal pools.
- The South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) may eventually delineate areas as wetland/vernal pool preserves that could conflict with Sunrise Douglas Community Plan and Sunridge Specific Plan land uses, as well as the proposed General Plan.
- City could develop its own Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or join the South Sacramento HCP to avoid needing to obtain project-by-project Federal and State Endangered Species permits and achieve a better planned/managed preserve system that can be worked into the overall planning approach in Planning Areas that contain biological resources.
- Phasing of traffic improvements and development in the southern portion of the City, to relieve traffic conditions along Sunrise Boulevard.
- City park and open space standards.

2.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 2.0-1 displays a summary of impacts for the proposed General Plan Land Use Policy Map, City of Rancho Cordova General Plan policies and action items, and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance is indicated both before and after the implementation of each mitigation measure.

For detailed discussions of all mitigation measures and of proposed General Plan policies and action items that would provide mitigation for each type of environmental impact addressed in this EIR, refer to the appropriate environmental topic section (i.e., Sections 4.1 through 4.13.)

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<i>Land Use</i>				
<p>Impact 4.1.1</p>	<p>Implementation of the Rancho Cordova General Plan would not result in the physical division of established communities because the General Plan was designed to focus on redevelopment of existing urbanized areas and siting new development in vacant portions of the Planning Area, rather than developing in a way that might divide established communities. The “building block” concept in the proposed General Plan, and relevant policies and action items, would ensure that such division does not occur.</p>	<p>Policies: LU.1.4, LU.2.2, LU.4.1, LU.4.2, LU.4.4, LU.4.9, ED.1.1, UD.4.3 Action Items: LU.1.4.1, LU.1.4.2, LU.1.4.3, LU.1.4.4, LU.1.4.5, LU.2.2.1, LU.4.1.1, LU.4.1.2, LU.4.2.1, LU.4.4.1, ED.1.1.1, ED.1.1.2, UD.4.3.3, UD.4.3.4</p>	<p>LS</p> <p>None Required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.1.2</p>	<p>Implementation of the General Plan could result in incompatibilities or conflicts between existing and future land uses in the Planning Area, including land located outside of the Rancho Cordova city limits. However, implementation of policy provisions of the General Plan would reduce this potential impact to less than significant impact.</p>	<p>Policies: LU.1.4, LU.2.3, LU.2.6, LU.3.3, LU.3.5, LU.3.8, LU.3.9, NR.6.1, ED.1.1, ED.1.3, UD.1.6, UD.2.3, UD.3.3, UD.4.2, UD.4.3, UD.4.4 Action Items: LU.1.4.1, LU.1.4.2, LU.1.4.3, LU.1.4.4, LU.1.4.5, LU.2.6.1, LU.3.3.1, NR.6.1.1, NR.6.1.2, NR.6.1.3, ED.1.1.1, ED.1.1.2, ED.1.3.1, ED.1.3.2,</p>	<p>LS</p> <p>None Required</p>	<p>LS</p>

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	UD.2.3.1, UD.2.3.2, UD.2.3.3, UD.3.3.1, UD.3.3.2, UD.3.3.3, UD.3.3.4, UD.4.2.1, UD.4.3.3, UD.4.3.4, UD.4.4.2			
<p>Impact 4.1.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan has the potential to conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over parts of the Planning Area that provide for environmental protection.</p>	<p>Policies: LU.2.4, LU.3.3, LU.3.4, LU.3.5, LU.3.11 Action Items: LU.2.4.1, LU.3.3.1</p>	S	None Available	SU
<p>Impact 4.1.4 The Rancho Cordova General Plan has the potential to conflict with the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan, which is the only applicable habitat conservation plan in the Planning Area.</p>	<p>Policies: NR.1.1, NR.1.2, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.1.5, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.2.3, NR.2.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1, NR.4.2, NR.4.3, NR.5.1, NR.5.2, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5 Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.2.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.2.4.1, NR.2.4.2, NR.3.2.1, NR.3.2.2, NR.3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.2, NR.4.1.3,</p>	LS	None Required	

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	<i>NR.4.2.1, NR.4.2.2, NR.4.2.3, NR.4.3.1, NR.4.3.2, NR.4.3.3, NR.4.3.4, NR.5.1.1, NR.5.1.2, NR.5.1.3, R.5.2.1, NR.5.2.2, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4</i>			
Impact 4.1.5 When considered with existing, proposed, planned and approved development in the region, implementation of the Rancho Cordova General Plan has the potential to result to contribute cumulative land use conditions in the region that result in significant impacts to the physical environment.	Policies: LU.2.4, LU.3.3, LU.3.4, LU.3.5, LU.3.11 Action Items: LU.2.4.1, LU.3.3.1	CC	None Available	SU
Agriculture				
Impact 4.2.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the loss of important farmlands (Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, etc) as designated by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.	Policy: UD.2.3 Action Item: UD.2.3.1	S	MM 4.2.1a The following shall be added as policies to the Land Use Element under Goal LU.1: While agricultural uses are anticipated to be phased out within the City Limits, the City recognizes the right of these uses to continue as long as individual owners/farmers desire. The City shall require development to protect one acre of existing farmland of equal or higher quality	SU

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>for each acre of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance that would be converted to non-agricultural uses. This protection may consist of the establishment of farmland conservation easement, farmland deed restriction, or other appropriate farmland conversion in perpetuity, but may also be utilized for compatible wildlife conservation efforts. The farmland to be preserved shall be located within Sacramento County and must have adequate water supply to support agricultural use. As part of the consideration of land areas proposed to be protected, the City shall consider the benefits of preserving farmlands in proximity to other protected lands.</p> <p>MM 4.2.1b</p> <p>The following shall be added an action item to the Land Use Element under Goal LU.1:</p> <p>The City shall ensure that the following standards are met regarding agricultural conservation easement content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions of an accurate legal document that prohibits any activity that substantially impairs or diminishes the agricultural productivity of the land. • Protection of any existing water 	

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			rights necessary to maintain agricultural uses and retain such water rights for on-going use on the agricultural land. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interests in the agricultural land shall be held in trust by an entity acceptable to the City and/or the City in perpetuity. 	
Impact 4.2.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in the placement of urban uses adjacent to agricultural uses within and adjacent to the City.	Policies: LU.1.4, LU.2.1, UD.2.3, UD.4.2 Action Items: LU.1.4.3, LU.1.4.4, LU.1.4.5, LU.2.1.1, UD.2.3.1	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.2.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in a conflict with existing Williamson Act contracts.	Policies: UD.2.3 Action Items: LU.1.4.4, LU.1.4.5, UD.2.3.1	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.2.4 Implementation of the General Plan Land Use Map Book along, with other proposed development in Sacramento County, would contribute to the additional conversion of important farmlands to other uses and may increase agriculture/urban interface conflicts.	Policies: UD.2.3, LU.1.4, LU.2.1, LU.1.5, UD.2.3, UD.2.3, UD.4.2 Action Items: LU.1.4.3, LU 1.4.4, LU 1.4.5, LU.2.1.1, UD.2.3.1	CC	None Available	SU

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<i>Population Housing and Employment</i>				
Impact 4.3.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Land Use Map would include land uses that promote the increase in population, housing, and employment to the area, and thus induce substantial growth.	Policies: H.1.2, H.1.5, H.2.2, H.2.4, H.2.5, H.2.6, H.2.7, H.3.2, H.4.1, H.6.2, H.6.3, LU.1.3, LU.1.4, LU.2.3, LU.2.4, LU.2.7, LU.4.1 Action Items: H.2.2.2, H.2.5.1, H.2.5.2, LU.1.4.1, LU.2.7.1, LU.2.7.2	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.3.2 Implementation of the General Plan may result in the displacement of housing and/or persons due to the construction of infrastructure necessary to serve new development or revitalization efforts.	No Applicable Policies or Actions	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.3.3 Buildout in the planning area, under the proposed General Plan Land Use Map, would include substantial population, housing unit and employment increases.	Policies: H.1.2, H.1.5, H.2.2, H.2.4, H.2.5, H.2.6, H.2.7, H.3.2, H.4.1, H.6.2, H.6.3, LU.1.4, LU.2.3, LU.2.4, LU.2.7, LU.4.1 Action Item: H.2.2.2, H.2.5.1, H.2.5.2, LU.1.4.1, LU.2.7.1, LU.2.7.2	CC	None Available	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<i>Hazards and Human Health</i>				
<p>Impact 4.4.1 Implementation of the General Plan would include the routine transportation of hazardous materials on Planning Area roadways.</p>	<p>Policies: S.1.1, S.5.4, S.5.5, S.5.6</p> <p>Action Item: S.1.1.1, S.5.4.1, S.5.4.2, S.5.5.1, S.5.5.2, S.5.6.1, S.5.6.2</p>	LS	None Required	LS
<p>Impact 4.4.2 The Planning Area consists of land uses having the potential to result in an increased risk of release of hazardous materials.</p>	<p>Policies: LU.1.4, NR.8.1, S.1.1, S.1.3, S.5.1, S.5.2, S.5.1, S.5.3, S.5.4, S.5.5</p> <p>Action Items: LU.1.4.3, LU.1.4.4, NR.8.1.6, S.1.1.1, S.1.3.1, S.5.2.1, S.5.3.1, S.5.3.2, S.5.3.3, S.5.4.1, S.5.4.2, S.5.5.1, S.5.5.2</p> <p>Goals: S.5</p>	PS	<p>MM 4.4.2 The following shall be added as a policy to the Safety Element under Goal SA.1:</p> <p>The City shall require written confirmation from applicable local, regional, state, and federal agencies that known contaminated sites have been deemed remediated to a level appropriate for land uses proposed prior to the City approving site development or provide an approved remediation plan that demonstrates how contamination will be remediated prior to site occupancy. This documentation will specify the extent of development allowed on the remediated site as well as any special conditions and/or restrictions on future land uses.</p>	LS

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact 4.4.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would locate development within an airport land use plan, potentially resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area.	Policies: LU.3.3, LU.3.5	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.4.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could impair implementation of or physically interfere with the Sacramento County Multi-Hazard Disaster Plan (SCMDP).	No Applicable Policies or Actions	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.4.5 Persons could be exposed to contaminated soil or groundwater during development of previously contaminated sites or sites undergoing remediation.	Policies: LU.1.4, NR.8.1, S.1.1, S.1.3, S.5.1, S.5.2, S.5.1, S.3, S.5.4, S.5.5 Action Items: LU.1.4.3, LU.1.4.4, NR.8.1.6, S.1.1.1, S.1.3.1, S.5.2.1, S.5.3.1, S.5.3.2, S.5.3.3, S.5.4.1, S.5.4.2, S.5.5.1, S.5.5.2 Goals: S.5	LCC	None Required	LS
<i>Transportation and Circulation</i>				
Impact 4.5.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in traffic volumes that would result in deficient level of service	Policies: C.1.2 Action Items:	S	None Available	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
conditions in year 2030.	C.1.2.1, C.1.2.2			
Impact 4.5.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would exacerbate unacceptable operations on eastbound and westbound U.S. 50 during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.	Policies: C.5.1, C.5.2, C.5.3 Action Items: C.5.3.1, C.5.3.2	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.5.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in traffic volumes, which could increase the potential opportunities for safety conflicts as well as potential conflicts with emergency access.	Policies: C.5.1, C.5.2, C.5.3 Action Items: C.5.3.1, C.5.3.2	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.5.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in the demand for public transit service (e.g., bus and light rail service).	Policies: C.3.1, C.3.2, C.3.3, C.3.4 Action Items: C.3.1.1, C.3.1.2, C.3.1.3, C.3.1.4, C.3.1.5, C.3.2.1, C.3.3.1, C.3.4.1	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.5.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in an increase in the demand for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.	Policies: C.2.1, C.2.2, C.2.3, C.2.4, C.2.5, C.2.6, C.2.7, C.2.8, C.2.9 Action Items: C.2.4.1, C.2.4.2, C.2.5.1, C.2.5.2, C.2.5.3, C.2.5.4, C.2.5.5, C.2.5.6, C.2.7.1, C.2.7.2, C.2.8.1, C.2.8.2,	LS	None Required	LS

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	C.2.8.3, C.2.8.4, C.2.8.5, C.2.8.6, C.2.8.7, C.2.8.8, C.2.8.9 Goals: C.2			
Impact 4.5.6 When considered with existing, proposed, planned and approved development in the region, implementation of the Rancho Cordova General Plan would contribute to cumulative traffic volumes in the region that result in significant impacts to level of service and operations.	Policies: C.5.1, C.5.2, C.5.3 Action Items: C.5.3.1, C.5.3.2	CC	None Available	SU
Impact 4.5.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would contribute to the cumulative demand for public transit service (e.g., bus and light rail service).	Policies: C.3.1, C.3.2, C.3.3, C.3.4 Action Items: C.3.1.1, C.3.1.2, C.3.1.3, C.3.1.4, C.3.1.5, C.3.2.1, C.3.3.1, C.3.4.1	LCC	None Required	LCC
Impact 4.5.8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would contribute to cumulative demands for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.	Policies: C.2.1, C.2.2, C.2.3, C.2.4, C.2.5, C.2.6, C.2.7, C.2.8, C.2.9 Action Items: C.2.4.1, C.2.4.2, C.2.5.1, C.2.5.2, C.2.5.3, C.2.5.4, C.2.5.5, C.2.5.6, C.2.7.1, C.2.7.2,	LCC	None Required	LCC

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance	
	C.2.8.1, C.2.8.2, C.2.8.3, C.2.8.4, C.2.8.5, C.2.8.6, C.2.8.7, C.2.8.8, C.2.8.9 Goals: C.2				
<i>Air Quality</i>					
Impact 4.6.1	The implementation of the proposed City of Rancho Cordova General Plan land uses would conflict with the land use assumptions used 1994 SMAQMD Regional Ozone Attainment Plan.	Policies: AQ.1.1 Action Items: AQ.1.1.1, AQ.1.1.2, AQ.1.1.3	PS	None Available	SU
Impact 4.6.2	Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in short-term emissions generated by construction and demolition activities that would affect local air quality and could result in health and nuisance-type impacts in the immediate vicinity of individual construction sites as well as contribute to particulate matter and regional ozone impacts.	Policies: AQ.1.1, AQ.1.2, AQ.2.1, AQ.2.2, AQ.2.3, AQ.2.4, AQ.3.1, AQ.3.2, AQ.3.3, AQ.3.4, AQ.4.1 Action Items: AQ.1.1.1, AQ.1.1.2, AQ.1.1.3, AQ.1.2.1, AQ.1.2.2, AQ.1.2.3, AQ.2.1.1, AQ.2.3.1, AQ.2.4.1, AQ.3.4.1, AQ.3.4.2, AQ.4.1.1, AQ.4.1.2, AQ.4.1.3, AQ.4.1.4, AQ.4.1.5, AQ.4.1.6	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.6.3	Implementation of the proposed	Stationary Source	S	MM 4.6.3a The following mitigation	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>General Plan would increase air pollutant emissions from operational activities of land uses within the Planning Area will exceed thresholds for ROG and NOx, and other federal or state emissions standards.</p>	<p>Reduction Policies and Actions Policies: AQ.4.1, AQ.4.2, AQ.4.4 Action Items: AQ.4.1.1, AQ.4.1.2, AQ.4.1.3, AQ.4.1.4, AQ.4.1.5, AQ.4.1.6, AQ.4.2.1, AQ.4.2.2, AQ.4.2.3, AQ.4.2.4, AQ.4.2.5, AQ.4.4.1 Mobile Source Reduction Policies and Actions Policies: AQ.2.1, AQ.2.2, AQ.2.3, AQ.2.4, AQ.3.1, AQ.3.2, AQ.3.2.4, AQ.3.3, AQ.3.4 Action Items: AQ.2.1.1, AQ.2.2.1, AQ.2.2.2, AQ.2.3.1, AQ.2.4.1, AQ.2.4.2, AQ.3.1.1, AQ.3.1.2, AQ.2.1.1, AQ.3.2.1, AQ.3.2.2, AQ.3.2.3, AQ.3.3.1, AQ.3.3.2, AQ.3.4.1, AQ.3.4.2, AQ.3.4.3</p>		<p>measure shall be added as a policy under General Plan Goal AQ.1:</p> <p>The City shall prohibit wood-burning open masonry fireplaces in all new development. Fireplaces with EPA-approved inserts, EPA-approved stoves, and fireplaces burning natural gas will be allowed.</p> <p>MM 4.6.3b</p> <p>The following mitigation measure shall be added as a policy under General Plan Goal AQ.1:</p> <p>The City shall develop an incentive program to encourage homeowners to replace high-pollution emitting non-EPA-certified wood stoves that were installed before the effective date of the applicable EPA regulation with newer cleaner-burning EPA-certified wood stoves.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.6.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would include sources of</p>	<p>Policies:</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.6.4a The following change is made to General Plan Policy</p>	<p>SU</p>

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
toxic air contaminants that may affect surrounding land uses. Sensitive land uses may also be located near existing sources toxic air contaminants.	AQ.2.1, AQ.4.1, AQ.4.2, AQ.4.4 Action Items: AQ.2.1.1, AQ.4.1.1, AQ.4.1.2, AQ.4.1.3, AQ.4.1.4, AQ.4.1.5, AQ.4.1.6, AQ.4.2.1, AQ.4.2.2, AQ.4.2.3, AQ.4.2.4, AQ.4.2.5, AQ.4.4.1		AQ.4.2.5: Consider a <u>Adoption</u> of an ordinance that limits the amount of time diesel-powered trucks, buses, and other heavy vehicles may <u>idle in accordance with California Air Resources Control Board rules for mobile TAC sources.</u> MM 4.6.4b The following shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal AQ.2: Utilize the guidelines in the California Air Resources Control Board Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective when evaluating new development requests that either would generate toxic air contaminant emissions near sensitive receptors or locate new sensitive receptors near existing sources of air toxic emissions or order to minimize health hazards.	
Impact 4.6.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would include sources that may expose sensitive receptors to construction and long-term odorous emissions.	Policies: <i>LU.1.4</i> Action Items: <i>LU.1.4.3</i>	PS	MM 4.6.5 The following mitigation measure shall be added as a new policy under General Plan Goal AQ.1: Require odor impact analyses	LS

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			be conducted for evaluating new development requests that either could generate objectionable odors that may violate SMAQMD Rule 402 or any subsequent rules and regulations regarding objectionable odors near sensitive receptors or locate new sensitive receptors near existing sources of objectionable odors. Should objectionable odor impacts be identified, odor mitigation shall be required in the form of setbacks, facility improvements or other appropriate measures.	
<p>Impact 4.6.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan along with potential development of the Planning Area would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter.</p>	<p>Stationary Source Reduction Policies and Actions</p> <p>Policies: AQ.4.1, AQ.4.2, AQ.4.4</p> <p>Action Items: AQ.4.1.1, AQ.4.1.2, AQ.4.1.3, AQ.4.1.4, AQ.4.1.5, AQ.4.1.6, AQ.4.2.1, AQ.4.2.2, AQ.4.2.3, AQ.4.2.4, AQ.4.2.5, AQ.4.4.1</p> <p>Mobile Source Reduction Policies and Actions</p>	CC	None Available	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance	
	Policies: AQ.2.1, AQ.2.2, AQ.2.3, AQ.2.4, AQ.3.1, AQ.3.2, AQ.3.2.4, AQ.3.3, AQ.3.4, AQ.5.1, AQ.5.2 Action Items: AQ.2.1.1, AQ.2.2.1, AQ.2.2.2, AQ.2.3.1, AQ.2.4.1, AQ.2.4.2, AQ.3.1.1, AQ.3.1.2, AQ.2.1.1, AQ.3.2.1, AQ.3.2.2, AQ.3.2.3, AQ.3.3.1, AQ.3.3.2, AQ.3.4.1, AQ.3.4.2, AQ.3.4.3, AQ.5.1.1, AQ.5.1.2				
<i>Noise</i>					
Impact 4.7.1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in subsequent development projects and cause an increase in construction noise levels that would exceed City of Rancho Cordova noise standards.	Policies: N.1.1, N.1.4, N.1.5 Action Items: N.1.4.1, N.1.4.2, N.1.4.3	PS	MM 4.7.1 The following shall be added as a new policy under Goal N.1: To the extent feasible and appropriate, the City shall require the use of temporary construction noise control measures for public and private project that may include the use of temporary noise barriers, temporary relocation of noise-sensitive land uses or other appropriate measures.	SU
Impact 4.7.2	Implementation of the proposed	Policies:	S	None Available	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
 March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
 Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
General Plan would result in increases in traffic noise levels that would be in excess of City of Rancho Cordova noise standards.	N.1.1, N.1.5, N.1.6, N.2.1, N.2.2, N.2.3, N.2.4 Action Items: N.1.6.1, N.2.1.1, N.2.2.1, N.2.3.1, N.2.4.1			
Impact 4.7.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in future stationary noise sources that generate noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards for non-transportation noise sources.	Policies: N.1.1, N.1.2, N.1.3, N.1.4, N.1.5, N.2.3, N.2.4 Action Items: N.1.2.1, N.1.2.2, N.1.2.3, N.1.3.1, N.1.3.2, N.1.4.1, N.1.4.2, N.1.4.3, N.2.3.1, N.2.4.1	PS	None Available	SU
Impact 4.7.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the creation of new noise-sensitive land uses within the 65 dB CNEL noise contours contained within the Mather Airport CLUP. Additionally, the implementation of the General Plan would result in the creation of new noise-sensitive land uses within over-flight areas of Mather Airport, thereby presenting the potential for annoyance from single event noise.	Policies: LU.3.10, N.1.1, N.1.2 Action Items: N.1.2.11 N.1.2.2 N.1.2.3	S	MM 4.7.4 The following shall be added as a new Policy under Goal N.1: New residential development shall be prohibited within the 60 CNEL Mather Airport Policy Area and new residential development shall only be allowed inside of the 60 CNEL Mather Airport Policy Area if the following conditions are met: 1. Noise insulation is provided in all new residential dwelling units that reduces interior noise	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>levels to 45 dB with windows closed in any habitable room.</p> <p>2. Prospective buyers are notified through the Public Report prepared by the California Department of Real Estate disclosing the fact that the parcel is located within the Mather Airport Policy Area.</p> <p>3. An Avigation Easement is recorded on the property acknowledging that the property is located within the Mather Airport Policy Area. The easement shall grant the right of flight and unobstructed passage of all aircraft into and out of Mather Airport. The Avigation Easement shall be granted to the County of Sacramento, recorded with the Sacramento County Recorder and filed with the County Department of Airports.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.7.5 Implementation of the General Plan could expose future land uses and residents to light rail and public transit related noise.</p>	<p>Policies: N.1.1 N.1.2, N.1.5, N.2.3, N.2.4</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None Required</p>	<p>LS</p>

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	Action Items: N.2.3.1, N.2.4.1			
Impact 4.7.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan in combination with regional growth and traffic conditions (pass-through traffic) would increase transportation noise along area roadways.	Policies: N.1.1, N.1.2, N.1.5, N.2.2, N.2.3, N.2.4 Action Items: N.2.2.1, N.2.3.1, N.2.4.1	CC	None Available	SU
Impact 4.7.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with regional growth in surrounding communities outside of the Planning Area, would increase stationary noise.	Policies: N.1.1, N.1.2, N.1.3, N.1.4, N.2.3, N.2.4 Action Items: N.1.2.1, N.1.2.2, N.1.2.3, N.1.3.1, N.1.3.2, N.1.4.1, N.1.4.2, N.2.3.1, N.2.4.1	CC	None Available	SU
Impact 4.7.8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan in combination with regional growth in the Planning Area and surrounding communities would subject more noise-sensitive land uses to airport noise.	Policies: LU.3.10, N.1.1, N.1.2 Action Items: N.1.2.11, N.1.2.2, N.1.2.3	LCC	None Required	LCC
<i>Geology and Soils</i>				
Impact 4.8.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, and the resulting increase in population, employment, and development activity within the Planning Area, may expose people, structures, and development to ground	Policies: S.3.1, S.3.2 Action Items: S.3.1.1, S.3.2.1, S.3.2.2	LS	None Required	LS

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
shaking and seismic hazards as a result of fault activity.				
Impact 4.8.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would include substantial construction and site preparation activities. These activities increase soil erosion, especially from wind and water, and siltation of local drainages during construction, excavation and grading activities.	Policies: NR.5.5 Action Items: NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.8.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan may place development in areas with unstable soils.	Policies: S.3.2 Action Items: S.3.2.1, S.3.2.2	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.8.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could impact areas where soils are may be incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	Policies: ISF.3.4, ISF.4.2 Action Items: ISF.2.6.1, ISF.2.6.2, ISF.2.6.3	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.8.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the loss of availability of aggregate resources, which are locally important due to their use by the construction community in development of the area.	Policies: NR.6.1, LU.1.4 Action Items: NR.6.1.1, NR.6.1.2, NR.6.1.3	S	MM 4.8.5 The following will be added under Goal NR.8 as a new policy: While mining activities are anticipated to be phased out within the City, the City recognizes the right of these uses to continue, and will require setbacks, buffers, screening and other appropriate measures to allow for the continued operation of mining	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			activities.	
Impact 4.8.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with existing, planned, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development, would not contribute to cumulative geologic and soil impacts, as the impacts would be site-specific and not additive in character.	Policies: NR.5.5, S.3.2 Action Items: NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4, S.3.2.1, S.3.2.2	LCC	None Required	LCC
Impact 4.8.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, together with past, present, and probable future projects in the area, would result in a cumulatively significant loss of mineral resources in the region.	Policies: NR.6.1, LU.1.4 Action Items: NR.6.1.1, NR.6.1.2, NR.6.1.3	CC	None Available	SU
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Impact 4.9.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in the discharge of polluted runoff, discharge that could cause harm to the biological integrity of waterways, adversely impact water quality standards, or otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality.	Policies: NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5 Action Items: NR.3.2.1, NR.3.2.2, NR.3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4	PS	MM 4.9.1a The following shall be added as a new policy under Goal NR.5: Continue to cooperate and participate with the County, other cities and the Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding compliance with the joint National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES No. CAS082597) or any subsequent permit and support water quality improvement projects in order to maintain compliance with regional, state and federal	LS

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>water quality requirements.</p> <p>MM 4.9.1b</p> <p>The following mitigation measure shall be added as an action item under Policy NR.5.3:</p> <p>Future land uses that are anticipated to utilize hazardous materials or waste shall be required to provide adequate containment facilities to ensure that surface water and groundwater resources are protected from accidental releases. This shall include double-containment, levees to contain spills, and monitoring wells for underground storage tanks, as required by local, state and federal standards.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.9.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in the degradation of groundwater quality resulting from future land uses.</p>	<p>Policies: NR.5.3, NR.5.4</p> <p>Action Items: NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 4.9.2</p> <p>The following shall be added as a new policy under Goal NR.5:</p> <p>The City shall require groundwater impact evaluations be conducted for the Grant Line West, Westborough, Aerojet, Glenborough, Mather and Jackson Planning Areas to determine whether urbanization of these areas would adversely impact groundwater remediation activities associated with Mather and Aerojet prior to</p>	<p>LS</p>

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			the approval of large-scale development. Should an adverse impact be determined, a mitigation program shall be developed in consultation with applicable local, state and federal agencies to ensure remediation activities are not impacted. This may include the provision of land areas for groundwater remediation facilities, installation/extension of necessary infrastructure or other appropriate measures.	
<p>Impact 4.9.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and storm water runoff rates throughout the Planning Area, which could result in potential flooding impacts. However, the General Plan contains adequate General Plan policies and action items that address drainage and flooding issues.</p>	<p>Policies: S.2.1, S.2.2, S.1.13, S.2.3</p> <p>Action Items: S.2.1.1, S.2.1.2, S.2.1.3, S.2.2.1, S.2.2.2, S.2.2.3, S.2.2.4, S.2.2.5, S.2.2.6, S.2.2.7, S.2.2.8, S.2.2.9, S.2.3.1, S.2.3.2, S.2.3.3</p>	LS	None Required	LS
<p>Impact 4.9.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase demand for water supply and require increased groundwater production and the use of surface water supplies. This additional water supply demand would result in significant effects on the physical</p>	<p>Policies: NR.4.2, NR.5.1, NR.5.2, ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.4, ISF.2.7, LU.2.5</p> <p>Action Items:</p>	S	<p>MM 4.9.4 Modify the text of Action Item ISF.2.4.1 and ISF.2.4.2 as follows:</p> <p><i>Action ISF.2.4.1 The following shall be required for all development projects, excluding subdivisions:</i></p>	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
environment.	NR.4.2.2, NR.4.2.3, NR.5.1.1, NR.5.1.2, NR.5.1.3, NR.5.2.1, NR.5.2.2, ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.4.1, ISF.2.4.2, ISF.2.7.1, LU.2.5.1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>An assured water supply and delivery system shall be available at the time of project approval. The water agency providing service to the project may provide several alternative methods of supply and/or delivery, provided that each is capable individually of providing water to the project. <u>However, assurance of water supply shall identify that the water agency has legal entitlement to the water source and that the water source has long term reliability (at least 20 years) under normal, dry and multiple dry years.</u></i> • <i>All required water infrastructure for the project shall be in place at the time of project approval, or shall be assured through the use of bonds or other sureties to the City's satisfaction. Water infrastructure may be phased to coincide with the phased development of large-scale projects.</i> <p><i>Action ISF.2.4.2 The following shall be required for all subdivisions to the extent permitted by state law:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposed water supply and delivery systems shall be identified at the time of tentative map approval to the satisfaction of the City. The water agency providing service to the project may provide several alternative methods of supply and/or delivery, provided that each is capable individually of providing water to the project.</i> • <i>The agency providing water service to the subdivision shall demonstrate prior to the approval of the Final Map by the City that</i> 	

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p><i>sufficient capacity shall be available to accommodate the subdivision plus existing development, and other approved projects in the same service area, and other projects which have received commitments for water service. <u>This assurance of water supply shall identify that the water agency has legal entitlement to the water source and that the water source has long term reliability (at least 20 years) under normal, dry and multiple dry years.</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Offsite and onsite water infrastructure sufficient to provide adequate water to the subdivision shall be in place prior to the approval of the Final Map or their financing shall be assured to the satisfaction of the City, consistent with the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act.</i> <i>Offsite and onsite water distribution systems required to serve the subdivision shall be in place and contain water at sufficient quantity and pressure prior to the issuance of any building permits. Model homes may be exempted from this policy as determined appropriate by the City, and subject to approval by the City.</i> 	
<p>Impact 4.9.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan and potential development of the Planning Area would include substantial grading, site preparation, and an increase in urbanized development.</p>	<p>Policies: NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5 Action Items: NR.3.2.1, NR.3.2.2, NR.3.3.1, NR.3.4.1,</p>	<p>CC</p>	<p>None Available</p>	<p>LCC</p>

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4			
<p>Impact 4.9.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the Planning Area, which could contribute to cumulative flood conditions along the American River, Sacramento River, Cosumnes River, and local waterways. However, the General Plan contains adequate General Plan policies and action items that address drainage and flooding issues.</p>	<p>Policies: S.2.1, S.2.2, S.1.13, S.2.3, NR.5.5</p> <p>Action Items: S.2.1.1, S.2.1.2, S.2.1.3, S.2.2.1, S.2.2.2, S.2.2.3, S.2.2.4, S.2.2.5, S.2.2.6, S.2.2.7, S.2.2.8, S.2.2.9, S.2.3.1, S.2.3.2, S.2.3.3, NR.5.5.3</p>	LCC	None Required	LCC
<p>Impact 4.9.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would contribute to an increased demand for water supply requiring increased groundwater production and the use of surface water supplies that could result in significant environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Policies: NR.4.2, NR.5.1, NR.5.2, ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.4, ISF.2.7, LU.2.5</p> <p>Action Items: NR.4.2.2, NR.4.2.3, NR.5.1.1, NR.5.1.2, NR.5.1.3, NR.5.2.1, NR.5.2.2, ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.4.1, ISF.2.4.2,</p>	CC	None Available	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	ISF.2.7, LU.2.5.1			
<i>Biological Resources</i>				
<p>Impact 4.10.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of endangered, threatened, rare, proposed, and candidate status as well as plant species identified by the California Native Plant Society with a rating of List 1B (i.e. rare, threatened or endangered plants).</p>	<p>Policies: NR.1, NR.1.2, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.1.5, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.2.3, NR.2.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5, NR.6.1</p> <p>Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.2.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.2.4.1, NR.2.4.2, NR.3.2.1, NR 3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.3, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4</p>	S	<p>MM 4.10.1a The following shall be incorporated into the Natural Resources Element as a policy under Goal NR.1:</p> <p>The City shall require a biological resources evaluation for private and public development projects in areas identified to contain or possibly contain listed plant and/or wildlife species based upon the City's biological resource mapping provided in the General Plan EIR or other technical materials. This evaluation shall be conducted prior to the authorization of any ground disturbance.</p> <p>MM 4.10.1b The following measure shall be incorporated as an action item immediately under the above policy (MM 4.10.1a):</p> <p>For those areas in which special status species are found or likely to occur or where the presence of species can be reasonably inferred, the City shall require mitigation of impacts to those species.</p>	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>MM 4.10.1c</p> <p>Mitigation shall be designed by the City in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and shall emphasize a multi-species approach to the maximum extent feasible. This may include development or participation in a habitat conservation plan.</p> <p>The following measure shall be incorporated into the Natural Resources Element as a policy under Goal NR.1:</p> <p>The City shall encourage creation of habitat preserves that are immediately adjacent to each other in order to provide interconnected open space areas for animal movement.</p> <p>MM 4.10.1d</p> <p>The following measure shall be incorporated into the Natural Resources Element as an action item under Policy NR.1.4:</p> <p>The City shall adopt and maintain a Noxious Weed Ordinance. The Noxious</p>	

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			<p>MM 4.10.1e</p> <p>Weed Ordinance shall include regulatory standards for construction activities that occur adjacent to natural areas to inhibit the establishment of noxious weeds through accidental seed import.</p> <p>The following measure shall be incorporated into the Natural Resources Element as a policy under Goal NR.2:</p> <p>The City shall require that drainage improvements that discharge into areas of wetlands to be preserved are, to the maximum extent feasible, designed to mimic the undeveloped surface water flow conditions of the area in terms of seasonality, volume and flow velocity.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.10.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in direct and indirect loss of habitat and individuals of animal and plant species of concern and other non-listed special status species.</p>	<p>Policies:</p> <p>NR.1.1, NR.1.2, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.1.5, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.2.3, NR.2.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1, NR.5.1, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5, NR.6.1</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>None Available</p>	<p>SU</p>

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.2.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.2.4.1, NR.2.4.2, NR.3.2.1, NR 3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.3, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4			
Impact 4.10.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the loss of foraging habitat for raptors, migratory birds, and other wildlife.	Policies: NR.1.1, NR.1.2, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.1.5, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.2.3, NR.2.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1, NR.4.2, NR.5.3 Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.2.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.2.4.1, NR.2.4.2, NR.3.2.1, NR.3.2.2, NR , .3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.2, NR.4.1.3, NR.4.2.2, NR.4.2.3, NR.4.3.1, NR.4.3.2, NR.4.3.3, NR.4.3.4,	S	MM 4.10.3 The following measure shall be incorporated into the Natural Resources Element as a policy under Goal NR.1: The City shall require that impacts to riparian habitats be mitigated at a no net loss of existing function and value based on field survey and analysis of the riparian habitat to be impacted. No net loss may be accomplished by avoidance of the habitat, restoration of existing habitat, or creation of new habitat, or through some combination of the above.	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
 March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2			
Impact 4.10.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in substantial adverse impacts to and the potential loss of jurisdictional waters of the U.S.	Policies: NR.1.1, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.1.5, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.2.3, NR.2.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.5.1, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5 Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.2.4.1, NR.2.4.2, NR.3.2.1, NR 3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.5.3, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.10.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would interfere substantially with the movement of several special status and common wildlife species.	Policies: NR.1.1, NR.1.2, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.1.5, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.2.3, NR.2.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1, NR.5.1, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5, NR.6.1	S	The following measure identifies changes to policy NR.3.2. Deletions are shown as a strike through and new text is <u>underlined</u> . MM 4.10.5a Modify Policy NR.3.2 to read: Create or retain the natural topographic relief and meandering alignment of natural creek corridors in the construction of new channels and the modification of	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.2.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.2.4.1, NR.2.4.2, NR.3.2.1, NR 3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.3, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4		<p>existing channels, and discourage prohibit the placement of concrete within creeks and channels.</p> <p>The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan as new policies under Goal NR.1.</p> <p>MM 4.10.5b The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan as a new policy under Goal NR.1:</p> <p>The City shall avoid the placement of new roadways within habitat preserves to the maximum extent feasible.</p> <p>MM 4.10.5c The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan as a new policy under Goal NR.1:</p> <p>In such cases where habitat preserves are crossed by a roadway, or where two adjacent preserves are separated by a roadway, the roadway shall be designed or updated with wildlife passable fencing separating the roadway from the</p>	

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
			preserve and/or shall incorporate design features that allow for the movement of wildlife across or beneath the road without causing a hazard for vehicles and pedestrians on the roadway.	
Impact 4.10.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the loss of native and landmark trees.	Policies: NR.1.1, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.2.2, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.4, NR.4.1 Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.3	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.10.7 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any adopted biological resources recovery or conservation plan of any Federal or State agency.	No Applicable Policies or Actions	No Impact		No Impact
Impact 4.10.8 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, together with past, present, and probable future projects in the Planning Area and larger regional context would result in a cumulatively significant loss of biological resources in the region.	Policies: NR.1.1, NR.1.2, NR.1.3, NR.1.4, NR.1.5, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.2.3, NR.2.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1,	CC	None Available	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	NR.4.2, NR.5.3 Action Items: NR.1.1.1, NR.1.2.1, NR.1.3.1, NR.1.4.1, NR.2.2.1, NR.2.4.1, NR.2.4.2, NR.3.2.1, NR.3.2.2, NR 3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.2, NR.4.1.3, NR.4.2.2, NR.4.2.3, NR.4.3.1, NR.4.3.2, NR.4.3.3, NR.4.3.4, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2			
<i>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</i>				
Impact 4.11.1 Adoption of the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan could result in the potential disturbance of cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated prehistoric/historic artifacts and features) and human remains.	Policies: CHR.1.1, CHR.1.2, CHR.1.3, CHR.3.1, CHR.3.2, CHR.3.3, CHR.3.4, CHR.4.1 Action Items: CHR.1.1.1, CHR.1.1.2, CHR.1.1.3, CHR.1.1.4, CHR.1.1.5, CHR.1.1.6, CHR.1.2.1, CHR.1.2.2, CHR.3.1.1, CHR.3.1.2, CHR.3.1.3, CHR.3.2.1,	PS	None Available	SU

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	CHR.3.2.2, CHR.3.2.3, CHR.3.2.4, CHR.3.3.1, CHR.3.3.2, CHR.3.3.3, CHR.3.3.4, CHR.3.4.1, CHR.3.4.2, CHR.4.1.1, CHR.4.1.2			
Impact 4.11.2 Adoption of the Rancho Cordova General Plan could result in the potential disturbance of paleontological resources (i.e., fossils and fossil formations).	Action Items: CHR.3.3.4	PS	MM 4.11.2 The following text change shall be made to Action CHR.3.3.3: Require historic resources <u>and paleontological studies</u> (i.e., archaeological and historical investigations) for all applicable discretionary projects, in accordance with CEQA regulations. The studies should identify <u>paleontological, historic</u> or cultural resources in the project area, determine their eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, and provide mitigation measures for any resources in the project area that cannot be avoided.	LS
Impact 4.11.3 Adoption of the Rancho Cordova General Plan along with foreseeable development in the region could result in the disturbance of cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and	Policies: CHR.1.1, CHR.1.2, CHR.1.3, CHR.3.1, CHR.3.2, CHR.3.3,	CC	None Available	SU

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
isolated artifacts and features) and human remains.	CHR.3.4, CHR.4.1 Action Items: CHR.1.1.1, CHR.1.1.2, CHR.1.1.3, CHR.1.1.4, CHR.1.1.5, CHR.1.1.6, CHR.1.2.1, CHR.1.2.2, CHR.3.1.1, CHR.3.1.2, CHR.3.1.3, CHR.3.2.1, CHR.3.2.2, CHR.3.2.3, CHR.3.2.4, CHR.3.3.1, CHR.3.3.2, CHR.3.3.3, CHR.3.3.4, CHR.3.4.1, CHR.3.4.2, CHR.4.1.1, CHR.4.1.2			
Impact 4.11.4 Adoption of the Rancho Cordova General Plan along with any foreseeable development in the region could result in the potential disturbance of paleontological resources (i.e., fossils and fossil formations).	Action Items: CHR.3.3.4	LCC	None Required	LCC

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<i>Public Services and Utilities</i>				
Impact 4.12.1.1 Implementation of the General Plan would result in the need for additional fire protection and emergency medical equipment and facilities that could result in physical environmental impacts.	Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.4, ISF.2.5, S.9.1, S.9.2, S.9.3 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, S.9.1.1, S.9.1.2, S.9.1.3, S.9.1.4, S.9.1.5, S.9.1.6, S.9.1.7, S.9.1.8	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.112.1.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in safety hazards associated with wildland fires in residential areas adjacent to open space and natural areas.	Policies: S.9.1, S.9.2, S.9.3 Action Items: S.9.1.1, S.9.1.2, S.9.1.3, S.9.1.4, S.9.1.5, S.9.1.6, S.9.1.7, S.9.1.8	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.12.1.2 Implementation of the General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development (based on Sacramento County, and the cities of Folsom, Elk Groove, Citrus Heights, Galt, Lodi, and Sacramento General Plans land use projections), would increase the population within the SMFD service area, requiring additional fire and emergency medical	Policies: ISF 2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.4, ISF.2.5, S.9.1, S.9.2, S.9.3 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1,	LCC	None Required	LS

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
services and related facilities.	ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, S.9.1.1, S.9.1.2, S.9.1.3, S.9.1.4, S.9.1.5, S.9.1.6, S.9.1.7, S.9.1.8			
Impact 4.12.2.1 Implementation of the General Plan would increase the Planning Area population and would result in additional commercial, industrial and recreational uses in the Planning Area uses, which may result in additional law enforcement protection facilities that could result in physical environmental impacts.	Policies: ISF 2.1, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.4, ISF.2.5, S.7.1, S.8.1, S.8.2, S.8.3, S.8.4 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, S.7.1.1, S.7.1.2, S.8.1.1	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.12.2.2 The neighborhood design, home design, street design, and other features associated with implementation of the General Plan could reduce the ability of the City of Rancho Cordova Police Department to enforce the law and respond to crime and other emergencies in the project area.	Policies: S.7.1, S.8.1, S.8.2, S.8.3, S.8.4, ISF.2.2 Action Items: S.7.1.1, S.7.1.2, S.8.1.1, ISF.2.2.1	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.12.2.3 Implementation of the General Plan and other reasonably foreseeable development in southeastern Sacramento County (based on Sacramento County land use projections) would increase the population within the Planning Area and surrounding area and would require additional law enforcement	Policies: S.7.1, S.8.1, S.8.2, S.8.3, S.8.4, ISF.2.2 Action Items: S.7.1.1, S.7.1.2, S.8.1.1, ISF.2.2.1	LCC	None Required	LCC

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
 March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
services and related facilities under cumulative conditions.				
Impact 4.12.3.1 Implementation the General Plan would require additional treatment capacity, storage capacity, and other conveyance facilities to meet the projected water demands.	Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.4, ISF.2.5, ISF.2.6, ISF.2.7, ISF.2.8, ISF.3.1 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.4.1, ISF.2.4.2, ISF.2.7.1, ISF.2.8.1, ISF.2.8.2, ISF.3.1.1, ISF.3.1.2, ISF.3.1.3, ISF.3.1.4	S	None Available	SU
Impact 4.12.3.2 Implementation of the General Plan would contribute to the need for additional treatment capacity, storage capacity, and other conveyance facilities to meet cumulative water demands with SCWA, GSWC and Cal-Am.	Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.6, ISF.2.7, NR.5.1, NR.5.2, NR.5.3, NR.5.4, NR.5.5 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2 , ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.6.1, ISF.2.6.2, ISF.2.6.3, ISF.2.7.1, NR.5.1.1, NR.5.1.2, NR.5.1.3, NR.5.2.1,	CC	None Available	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	NR.5.2.2, NR.5.3.1, NR.5.3.2, NR.5.3.3, NR.5.4.1, NR.5.4.2, NR.5.4.3, NR.5.5.1, NR.5.5.2, NR.5.5.3, NR.5.5.4			
<p>Impact 4.12.4.1 Implementation of the Rancho Cordova General Plan would substantially increase wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and may require additional treatment capacity to accommodate anticipated demands that would result in a physical effect on the environment.</p>	<p>Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.6, ISF.2.7, LU.2.5</p> <p>Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.6.1, ISF.2.6.2, ISF.2.6.3, ISF.2.7.1, LU.2.5.1</p>	S	None Available	SU
<p>Impact 4.12.4.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in addition to other reasonably foreseeable development in eastern Sacramento County (based on the land use projections established in the Sacramento County General Plan), would substantially increase in wastewater flows and require additional infrastructure and treatment capacity that would result in a physical effect on the environment.</p>	<p>Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.6, ISF.2.7, LU.2.5</p> <p>Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.6.1, ISF.2.6.2, ISF.2.6.3, ISF.2.7.1, LU.2.5.1</p>	CC	None Available	SU
<p>Impact 4.12.5.1 Implementation of the General Plan would increase solid waste generation</p>	<p>Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2,</p>	S	<p>MM 4.12.5.1 The following shall be added as</p>	LS

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant
 City of Rancho Cordova
 March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
 Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
and the demand for related services.	NR.8.1, NR.8.2, NR.8.3, NR.8.4, NR.8.5, NR.8.6, NR.8.7 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, NR.8.1.1, NR.8.1.2, NR.8.1.3, NR.8.1.4, NR.8.1.5, NR.8.1.6, NR.8.2.1, NR.8.4.1, NR.8.5.1		a new policy under Goal LU.1: Property buffering for the Kiefer landfill of a 2,000-foot buffer around the permitted footprint of the landfill shall be required. planned with the landfill's operation in mind. Where appropriate, land use density, buffers, or other measures should be used when planning future land uses near the landfill.	
Impact 4.12.5.2 The proposed project, in addition to proposed and approved projects in the region area, would generate solid waste that would require expanded collection and disposal services.	Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, NR.8.1, NR.8.2, NR.8.3, NR.8.4, NR.8.5, NR.8.6, NR.8.7 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, NR.8.1.1, NR.8.1.2, NR.8.1.3, NR.8.1.4, NR.8.1.5, NR.8.1.6, NR.8.2.1, NR.8.4.1, NR.8.5.1	LCC	None Required	LCC
Impact 4.12.6.1 Implementation of the project would increase student enrollment in the Planning Area and require the construction of new schools and related facilities to serve the anticipated demand.	Policies: ISF.4.1, ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3 Action Items: ISF.4.1.1, ISF.4.1.2, ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.2.1,	LS	None Required	LS

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	<i>ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3</i>			
<p>Impact 4.12.6.2 Implementation of the General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development (based on General Plan land use projections for Sacramento County, Folsom, and Elk Grove) proposed in eastern Sacramento County would result in a cumulative increase in student enrollment and require additional schools and related facilities to accommodate the growth.</p>	<p>Policies: ISF.4.1, ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3</p> <p>Action Items: ISF.4.1.1, ISF.4.1.2, ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3</p>	LCC	None Required	LCC
<p>Impact 4.12.7.1 Implementation of the General Plan would increase the demand for existing facilities and require additional parks and recreational facilities to accommodate the anticipated growth associated with the General Plan.</p>	<p>Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, UD.3.3, OSPT.1.1, OSPT.1.2, OSPT.1.3, OSPT.1.4, OSPT.1.5, OSPT.1.6, OSPT.2.1, OSPT.2.2, OSPT.2.3, OSPT.2.4, OSPT.3.1, OSPT.3.2, OSPT.3.3, OSPT.4.1, OSPT.4.2</p> <p>Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, UD.3.3.1, UD.3.3.2, UD.3.3.3, UD.3.3.4, OSPT.1.1.1, OSPT.1.1.2, OSPT.1.1.3, OSPT.1.4.1, OSPT.1.4.2,</p>	LS	None Required	LS

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant
*City of Rancho Cordova
March 2006*

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

*City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	OSPT.1.5.1, OSPT.1.5.2, OSPT.1.5.3, OSPT.1.6.1, OSPT.1.6.2, OSPT.2.1.1, OSPT.2.1.2, OSPT.2.1.3, OSPT.2.1.4, OSPT.2.1.5, OSPT.2.1.6, OSPT.2.1.7, OPST.2.2.1, OPST.2.3.1, OSPT.2.3.1, OSPT.2.3.2, OSPT.3.1.1, OSPT.3.1.2, OSPT.3.1.3, OSPT.3.1.4, OSPT.3.2., OSPT.3.3.1, OSPT.4.1.1, OSPT.4.1.2, OSPT.4.2.1, OSPT.4.2.2, OSPT.4.2.3 Goals: OSPT.3, OSPT.4			
Impact 4.12.7.3 Implementation of the General Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development would require additional park and recreation facilities within the Planning Area boundaries and CRPD's service area	Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, UD.3.3, OSPT.1.1, OSPT.1.2, OSPT.1.3, OSPT.1.4,	LCC	None Required	LCC

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
boundaries.	OSPT.1.5, OSPT.1.6, OSPT.2.1, OSPT.2.2, OSPT.2.3, OSPT.2.4, OSPT.3.1, OSPT.3.2, OSPT.3.3, OSPT.4.1, OSPT.4.2 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, UD.3.3.1, UD.3.3.2, UD.3.3.3, UD.3.3.4, OSPT.1.1.1, OSPT.1.1.2, OSPT.1.1.3, OSPT.1.4.1, OSPT.1.4.2, OSPT.1.5.1, OSPT.1.5.2, OSPT.1.5.3, OSPT.1.6.1, OSPT.1.6.2, OSPT.2.1.1, OSPT.2.1.2, OSPT.2.1.3, OSPT.2.1.4, OSPT.2.1.5, OSPT.2.1.6, OSPT.2.1.7, OPST.2.2.1, OPST.2.3.1, OSPT.2.3.1, OSPT.2.3.2, OSPT.3.1.1, OSPT.3.1.2,			

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
 March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
	OSPT.3.1.3, OSPT.3.1.4, OSPT.3.2.1, OSPT.3.3.1, OSPT.4.1.1, OSPT.4.1.2, OSPT.4.2.1, OSPT.4.2.2, OSPT.4.2.3, Goals: OSPT.3, OSPT.4			
Impact 4.12.8.1 Implementation of the General Plan would substantially increase demand for electrical, natural gas, telephone and related infrastructure.	Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.7, ISF.2.8 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.7.1, ISF.2.8.1, ISF.2.8.2	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.12.8.2 Implementation of the proposed project as well as potential development in the surrounding areas (based on Sacramento County General Plan land use projections) would result in cumulative utility service impacts.	Policies: ISF.2.1, ISF.2.2, ISF.2.3, ISF.2.7, ISF.2.8 Action Items: ISF.2.1.1, ISF.2.1.2, ISF.2.1.3, ISF.2.1.4, ISF.2.2.1, ISF.2.3.1, ISF.2.3.2, ISF.2.3.3, ISF.2.7.1, ISF.2.8.1,	LCC	None Required	LCC

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance	
	ISF.2.8.2				
<i>Visual Resources/Light and Glare</i>					
Impact 4.13.1	Implementation of the proposed General Plan Land Use Map will not result in substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway.	No Applicable Policies or Actions	No Impact	None Required	No Impact
Impact 4.13.2	Implementation of the General Plan will encourage new development and redevelopment activities that could potentially degrade existing scenic vistas.	No Applicable Policies or Actions	LS	None Required	LS
Impact 4.13.3	Implementation of the General Plan will encourage new development and redevelopment activities that could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Planning Area.	Policies: LU.1.4, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1, NR.4.2, NR.4.3, UD.1.2, UD.2.3, UD.4.2 Action Items: LU.1.4.1, LU.1.4.2, LU.1.4.3, LU.1.4.4, NR.3.2.1, NR.3.2.2, NR.3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.2, NR.4.1.3, NR.4.2.1, NR.4.2.2, NR.4.2.3, NR.4.3.1, NR.4.3.2, NR.4.3.3, NR.4.3.4, UD.2.3.1, UD.4.2.1	PS	MM 4.13.3 The following shall be added as a new policy under Goal LU.1: Create development standards in the Zoning Code and design guidelines in the Citywide Design Guidelines to specifically address the compatibility of high-rise development in the Downtown Planning Area with consideration of those issues unique to high-rise development (visual intrusion, distant viewshed, shadowing of adjacent properties, glare, wind tunnel effects, emergency service, interruption of electronic transmissions, traffic and parking, noise and vibration).	SU

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant
City of Rancho Cordova
March 2006

LS – Less Than Significant
 CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Impact	General Plan Policies and Action Items	Level of Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<p>Impact 4.13.4 Implementation of the General Plan Land Use Map would create new sources of daytime glare, and substantially change nighttime lighting and illumination levels in the Planning Area, associated with new and redevelopment activities.</p>	<p>Policies: UD.4.2</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None Required</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p>Impact 4.13.5 Implementation of the General Plan will encourage new development and redevelopment activities that would contribute to the cumulative alteration of existing landscape characteristics of the region.</p>	<p>Policies: LU.1.4, NR.2.1, NR.2.2, NR.3.1, NR.3.2, NR.3.3, NR.3.4, NR.4.1, NR.4.2, NR.4.3, UD.1.2, UD.2.3, UD.4.2</p> <p>Action Items: LU.1.4.1, LU.1.4.2, LU.1.4.3, LU.1.4.4, NR.2.2.1, NR.3.2.1, NR.3.2.2, NR 3.3.1, NR.3.4.1, NR.3.4.2, NR.3.4.3, NR.4.1.1, NR.4.1.2, NR.4.1.3, NR.4.2.1, NR.4.2.2, NR.4.2.3, NR.4.3.1, NR.4.3.2, NR.4.3.3, NR.4.3.4, UD.2.3.1, UD.4.2.1</p>	<p>CC</p>	<p>None Available</p>	<p>SU</p>

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial