APPENDIX A

INITIAL STUDY

Initial Environmental Study

1. **Project Title:** Rio del Oro

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rancho Cordova
3121 Gold Canal Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Hilary Anderson (916) 361-8384

4. **Project Location:** The subject property is the former McDonnell-Douglass property, consisting of approximately 3,828.5± acres. The property is located south of White Rock Road, north of Douglas Road, and east of Sunrise Boulevard. The site is located south of Interstate Highway 50, within the City of Rancho Cordova, in eastern Sacramento County.

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Elliott Homes, Inc.
80 Iron Point Circle, Suite 110
Folsom, CA 95630-8574

6. **General Plan Designation(s):** The property currently carries General Plan designations of Intensive Industrial, Extensive Industrial and Extensive Industrial with Aggregate Resource Overlay. As part of the project, the General Plan designations will be changed to Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Commercial and Office, Intensive Industrial, Public/Quasi Public, and Open Space and Recreation.

7. **Zoning:** The current zoning designations of the project site is SPA (AG-80) Agriculture – 80-acre min., SPA (M-2) Heavy Industrial, SPA (IR) Industrial Reserve, and M-2 Heavy Industrial.

8. **Description of the Project:** The Proposed Project is a mixed-use development, which will include a General Plan Amendment, and Amending the Aerojet SPA Ordinance. **Table 1** below summarizes the proposed land use designations put forth by the Proposed Project.

TABLE I
PROPOSED LAND USES

Land Use	Acres	Units
Single Family Residential	1,546	7,730
Medium Density Residential	248	1,984
High Density Residential	95	1,900
Village Commercial	30	--
Shopping Center	50	--
Commercial Mixed Use	24	--
Business Park	26	--
Industrial Office Park	281	--
Industrial Park	36	--
Public	5	--
High School/Middle School	100	--
Continuation School	6	
Elementary School	56	--
Community Park	103	--
Neighborhood Parks	68	--

Land Use	Acres	Units
Storm Water Detention	109	--
Lake/Open Space	31	--
Future Wetland Mitigation Bank	463	--
Drainage Parkway	122	--
Private Recreation	51	--
Open Space	60	--
Open Space Preserve	16	--
Landscaping	50	--
Greenbelts	49	--
Major Roads	203.5	--
Totals	**3828.5**	**11,614**

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The area surrounding the project site has historically been used for dry land farming and grazing. Surrounding land uses include: the Security Industrial Park and Aerojet lands to the south and east; industrial lands along the Sunrise Corridor to the west and to the east; the Sacramento Mather Airport and agricultural uses to the west, and additional agricultural lands to the south and east. The SunRidge Specific Plan area is located south of the proposed project area. The Sacramento County Landfill is located near the intersection of Grant Line Road and Kiefer Boulevard, south of the project site.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).**

    1. State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
    2. Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA)
    3. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
    4. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
    5. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)
    6. U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
    7. Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC)
    8. Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
    9. Folsom Cordova School District
    10. Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
    11. Department of Health Services (DHS)
    12. Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The following checklist provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project followed by the CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance. There are 16 specific environmental issues evaluated within the checklist. Following the CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance there is a NEPA evaluation of Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.

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

☒	Aesthetics	☒	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☒	Public Services
☐	Agricultural Resources	☒	Hydrology/Water Quality	☒	Recreation
☒	Air Quality	☒	Land Use and Planning	☒	Transportation/ Traffic
☒	Biological Resources	☐	Mineral Resources	☒	Utilities & Service Systems
☒	Cultural Resources	☒	Noise	☒	Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐	Geology and Soils	☒	Population and Housing		

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis on this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but must analyze only the effect that remains to be addressed.

☐ I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

	December 12, 2003
Signature	Date
Hilary Anderson	City of Rancho Cordova
Printed Name	For

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Rio del Oro project, as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. A "Less than Significant Impact" applies when the proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This category also applies when the impact has been previously addressed and it has been determined that there are no new impacts created by the project. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.

4. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

5. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact". The initial study must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

6. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.

7. Preparers are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individual contacts should be cited in the discussion.

8. Impacts that were originally classified as potentially significant on previous documents may now be indicated as less than significant. These particular impacts will be marked as "Less than Significant Impact" if the Specific Plan does not create any new impacts for the project area than those previously evaluated.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project is located on a previously disturbed, though undeveloped site in Rancho Cordova. The region surrounding the site has historically been used for industrial purposes, though recent commercial and residential development is changing the visual character of the region. There are no substantial scenic vistas associated with this site that would be impaired by development. However, the site is at the eastern fringe of urban development, with potential views of the foothills and the Sierra Nevada. As such, this project may result in a potentially significant impact to scenic vistas.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* In the report conducted by Sierra Nevada Arborists, dated February 11, 2003, a total of 4,026 trees were observed on the subject property. The overwhelming majority of these trees are Cottonwoods (*Populus fremontii*). Of all the trees on site, 1,520 were considered to be trees of significance (i.e., non-oak species measuring 18"DBH and larger, as well as all native oaks species measuring 6" DBH and larger). Forty-seven (47) of the trees of significance are native oaks. This project will likely result in the removal of a large number of these trees of significance, including the native oaks, creating a potentially significant impact. The inclusion of the large open spaces, community parks, greenbelts, and the wetland mitigation bank may provide additional opportunity for retaining many of these trees. The site does not contain any natural rock outcroppings, though there are large undulations and expanses of dredger tailings, which are a result of past mining operations at the site. These topographic features will likely be eliminated or highly modified through development of the site. The site is not located within the jurisdiction of a state scenic highway and does not contain any historic buildings.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The site is presently undeveloped, though the ground has been heavily disturbed by past mining operations. The resulting mounds and undulations have been vegetated by Cottonwood trees, which have improved the visual character of the site. Removal of these mounds and trees could degrade the visual character of the site. As such, the proposed project may result in a potentially significant impact to the visual character of the site and surrounding sites.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project will introduce new sources of light, glare and nighttime illumination, as is typical with residential and commercial development. The total impact of the introduced lighting is likely to be significant, as the site is presently on the edge of the City, with little development to the east. As a result, the lighting at the eastern perimeter of the site will be especially noticeable across the grasslands. The level and location of lighting is not known at this time, but may potentially impact scenic resources and/or wildlife.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site has not recently been used for agricultural purposes and its development will not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland). As such, there will be a less than significant impact on Farmland, and other significant agricultural resources.

b) *No Impact.* The project site does not contain any parcels under Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no impact. Additionally the site is not zoned for agricultural purposes.

c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The outlying regions of the City of Rancho Cordova and the northeastern portion of the City of Elk Grove contain active agricultural production facilities. As the greater Sacramento area grows, there will be increasing pressure to develop many of these parcels for non-agricultural purposes. This project site is located in a predominantly industrial region where there are no agricultural uses. As such, this project will not result in the conversion of Farmland.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project may exceed recently established standards and pollutant thresholds of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). Additional analysis is needed to determine the exact impact of this development. Additional residential and commercial development will introduce proportionate amounts of air pollution through vehicle emissions and other sources. The impact is likely to be potentially significant.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The City of Rancho Cordova is located within the Sacramento Federal Ozone Nonattainment Zone. The SMAQMD measures ozone levels, based on Federal standards, and is evaluated based on numbers of ozone violations per year. As the large majority of air pollutants come from mobile sources, it is likely that the development of this site will significantly contribute to the emission of ozone precursors in the region, which may cause the region to violate established standards.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The development of this site will likely draw additional vehicles to the region, which will contribute to the emission of ozone precursors and other air pollutants. Ozone precursors, including Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Nitrogen Oxides (NOX) are considered to be criteria pollutants and are generally produced by mobile sources. Additional air quality analysis is appropriate to determine the exact level of impact resulting from this project.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The emissions from this project are likely to be similar to other air pollution caused by urban development. The project will not likely create substantial local pollution concentrations that would be detrimental or harmful to sensitive receptors. However, when cumulatively considered, the project would increase air pollution levels in the region, which exposes sensitive receptors to unhealthy levels of pollution.

e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project is not expected to create objectionable odors affecting substantial numbers of people. This is considered a less than significant impact. However, the Sacramento Rendering Plant could impact proposed residences. As part of its adoption of the SunRidge Community Plan, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors imposed on the applicants mitigation obligations that should result in very effective odor controls on the Sacramento Rendering Plant. Such controls should avoid the occurrence of odor problems in the Rio del Oro area. Nevertheless, the EIR will address these issues in more detail.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a-c) *Potentially Significant Impacts.* A wetland delineation was conducted by Gibson and Skordal in June of 1999, and later verified by the Army Corps of Engineers in January 2000. The delineation identified a total of 73.64 acres of jurisdictional waters including wetlands on the Rio Del Oro property. Approximately 15.4 acres included in the delineation are located in branchiopod habitat. Branchiopod habitats include eighty-eight (88) seasonal depressions, thirty-four (34) riparian wetlands, two (2) vernal pools, and two (2) seasonal ponds. Federally listed branchiopod species identified in the survey area include the vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchineta lynchi*) and the vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardi*). Project implementation may require grading, excavating, and filling of seasonal depressions, wetlands, and vernal pools supporting federally listed branchiopods. This is considered a potentially significant impact requiring the completion of an EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS will evaluate project specific impact on special-status species.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* There were no migratory species identified at the site. However, the project could interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, migratory wildlife corridors, or native wildlife nursery sites. This considered a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* There are a number of trees on the project site including oaks, cottonwoods, and elderberry shrubs. Gibson and Skordal conducted elderberry surveys on the project site during July and August of 2000. The survey identified three hundred and twenty nine (329) elderberry shrubs on the project site. The elderberry plant is the exclusive host plant of the federally threatened valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus).* Of the three hundred and twenty nine (329) elderberry plants in the study area three hundred and twenty one (321) are associated with riparian habitat and forty-one (41) contained beetle exit holes. Impacts to elderberry shrubs would be considered significant. The EIR/EIS will evaluate project-specific impacts to the existing elderberry shrubs.

f) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Currently, there is not an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for Sacramento County. However, the South County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) is currently under development. The proposed project may conflict with this plan once it is implemented. This is considered a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in " 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to " 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* In the Cultural Resource Assessment prepared by Peak & Associates, Inc., October 4, 1999, there were no observable historic resources encountered at the site. However, the site investigation excluded the tailings, or rock piles that cover approximately seventy percent (70%) of the site. The tailings are a result of dredging, whereby massive amounts of gravel and rocks are removed from a waterway and the waste rock matter is piled on adjacent land. It is likely that the dredging indirectly may have destroyed historic resources that might have been hidden below the surface. As the dredging operations occurred between 1915 and 1962, they do not, in themselves, represent a significant historic resource. However, it is possible that the tailings may also contain historic resources that were dredged and stacked along with the rock wastes. The removal of the tailings, which will occur with this proposal, may inadvertently remove or destroy any historic resources. It should be noted that these potential resources have most likely lost their integrity due to mining practices and would not qualify as a historic resource.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Similar to the impact on historic resources, there exists a potentially significant impact on archaeological resources that may exist within the tailings at the site. If present on the site, these archaeological resources would also be removed or destroyed with the removal of the tailings.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Similar to the impact on historic resources, there exists a potentially significant impact on paleontological resources that may exist within the tailings at the site. If present on the site, these paleontological resources would also be removed or destroyed with the removal of the tailings.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* There are no known cemeteries on the project site; however, due to the large Native American population in the past, the primary concern is the disturbance of hidden or unmarked sites, such as gravesites of areas of spiritual significance, which may not contain any surface evidence of occupancy. As the cultural resource assessment did not address the land beneath the tailings, it cannot be known

whether there are formal or informal burial sites on the property. As such, there may be a potentially significant impact on burial sites or human remains.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a)

(i) *Less than Significant Impact.* The potential for impacts to public safety resulting from surface fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or other seismic hazards is not considered to be an issue of significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic history of the area.

(ii) *Less than Significant Impact.* See response to a (i) above. The potential for strong seismic ground shaking is not a significant environmental concern due to the infrequent seismic activity of the area; however any development would be required to comply with any seismic standards enforced by the UBC.

(iii) *Less than Significant Impact.* See response to a (i) above. The soil type of the project site consists of fine sandy loams, gravelly loams, Red-Bluff Redding complex and silt loams, which do not significantly contribute to ground failure or

liquefaction. The unstable cobble tailings at the surface of the site will be removed and are not suited for reuse as fill on site.

(iv) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is characterized by flat terrain and gently sloping topography with very low potential for landslides.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Grading activities associated with development of the current project would remove the tailings and vegetative cover, and would expose soils to wind and surface water runoff. The project is subject to the Sacramento County Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, which establishes administrative procedures, standards of review and enforcement procedures for controlling erosion, sedimentation, and disruption of existing drainage. It is possible that grading activities will result in excessive wind or surface water runoff that may affect the federally recognized wetlands. As such, additional analysis is necessary to assess the potentially significant impact resulting from erosion.

c) *Less than Significant Impact.* The soil groups present on the project site have high percentages of clay, which expand with wetting and drying conditions. These soils present a mild geologic hazard due to high-shrink swell potential. This is impact is likely to be less than significant.

d) *Less than Significant Impact.* See c) above.

e) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not use a septic tank system or other alternative wastewater systems. The project would likely be served by the extension of Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) facilities.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The Revised Hazardous Materials Study produced by Environmental Resources Management (ERM) indicates that there are several significant pollutants currently on-site. Due to historic rocket testing, a landfill, and propellant burning on the site, soil and groundwater at the site contain trichloroethene (TCE) and other volatile organic compounds. In 1991, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) issued an Imminent and Substantial Endangerment Order (ISEO) to address the issue of TCE detected in county well W-18. In 1994 a second ISEO was negotiated. The site was then divided into 11 primary study areas and responsibility for performing the required investigations was divided between Mc Donnell Douglas and Aerojet General Corporation based upon previous usage. Although soil and groundwater remediation continues to occur

at the site, the routine transport and disposal of the contaminants may create a potentially significant impact. Impacts associated with the removal of hazardous materials will be further analyzed in the corresponding EIR/EIS.

b) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* ERM identified several significant pollutants at the project site. However, mitigation measures will be included in the corresponding EIR/EIS to reduce project-specific impacts and ensure the safe removal of identified hazardous materials. Remediation will be required to adhere to current federal and state hazardous material disposal laws.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The applicant has proposed the construction of several schools within the project site. Currently, volatile organic compounds impact groundwater and soil throughout the site. Remediation must occur prior to project implementation and will adhere to current hazardous material disposal laws. The potential impacts on proposed educational facilities will be further evaluated in the corresponding EIR/EIS.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site has not been identified as a hazardous material site pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5. However, ERM identified several organic contaminants in both the soil and groundwater found on-site. The corresponding EIR/EIS will evaluate potential impacts associated with the presence of hazardous materials and their proper disposal.

e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project site is located within two miles of the Sacramento Mather Airport. Therefore, potential impacts may result from the implementation of the proposed project. However, these impacts will be addressed and mitigated in the corresponding EIR/EIS.

f) *No Impact.* The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

g) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with the *Sacramento County Multi-hazard Disaster Plan, the Sacramento County Area Plan* or any other adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Increased traffic resulting from the proposed project may increase emergency services response times. Therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the corresponding EIR/EIS.

h) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is currently designated as Industrial and is not adjacent to any wildlands. Furthermore, implementation of the project would not intermix residences or structures with identified wildlands. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☒	☐	☐	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☒	☐	☐	☐
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☒	☐	☐	☐
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☒	☐	☐	☐
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	☒	☐	☐	☐
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Construction of the proposed project would create new sources of urban runoff. Unless the runoff is controlled, it would generate new runoff pollutants such as oil, gasoline, and other chemicals potentially affecting water quality. The effluent discharges from the project may violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The site may utilize groundwater resources or wells to obtain water. Based on a Conceptual Drainage Study conducted by Wood Rodgers, February 2003, approximately forty-eight percent (48%) of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces. This will greatly reduce the potential for groundwater recharge that might ordinarily occur. Additional hydrologic studies would be necessary to determine the exact impact of the reduction in permeability. As such, this project will have a potentially significant impact on groundwater resources and potential for recharge.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project would increase drainage rates that could result in flooding and erosion. The Conceptual Drainage Study determined that the entire site is within the watershed of Morrison Creek, which would transport runoff to the Folsom South Canal and, ultimately, to Mather Lake. With increased impermeability, the additional runoff to Morrison Creek/Folsom South Canal/Mather Lake might exceed capacity and result in flooding. This impact may be potentially significant.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See c) above.

e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See c) above.

f) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See c) above.

g) *Potentially Significant Impact.* According to the Conceptual Drainage Study, Morrison Creek has not been studied by FEMA for its flooding potential. Therefore, the site is not depicted on current FEMA maps and the entire project site is located outside the 500-year floodplain, as determined by FEMA. As such, additional analysis on the flooding potential of Morrison Creek and the site are recommended to determine the exact flood threat of the site. This impact may be potentially significant.

h) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See g) above.

i) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See g) above.

j) *No Impact.* The project site is not located near the Pacific Ocean, nor is it near a large water body that would be capable of creating a seiches or tsunami.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion of Impacts

a) *No Impact.* The subject property is largely undeveloped, as is the land to the east of the site. Development at this site will not disrupt any community, as it will occur at the eastern boundary of urban development. Furthermore, the project will be part of a new growing community.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The nature of this project is the re-designation of the property from intended industrial uses to a combination of predominantly residential and supporting commercial and public uses. The land use plan currently in effect, the Sacramento County General Plan (adopted upon incorporation of the City of Rancho Cordova), identifies the need and appropriateness of heavy industrial uses at this site and has assigned a series of applicable General Plan designations. The proposed General Plan and zoning designations for this site will clearly conflict with the applicable land use plan, including the Sacramento County General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, and all area plans. Additionally, the development of single-family residential uses in areas designated for industrial uses may offset the balance that the Sacramento County General Plan was designed and adopted to achieve. The displacement of these designated industrial use areas from a previously approved and suitable site may necessitate their relocation elsewhere. Development of heavy industrial uses at offsite locations may result in additional negative impacts on the environment. Therefore, implementation of this project would conflict with existing land use plans and create a potentially significant impact.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Currently, there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) in Sacramento County. However, the South County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) is currently under development. The proposed project may conflict with this plan once it is implemented. This is considered a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is not identified by the California Division of Mines and Geology or in the Sacramento County General Plan as a high quality resource area. Though the site was historically mined for gravel, planned growth and development in the area will preclude the extended mining and recovery of potential mineral resources (such as aggregates) in the project area. Therefore, this impact will be less than significant.

b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The Sacramento County General Plan does not designate the site as a mineral resource zone, and the applicable land use plans do not designate this site for mineral resource recovery. As such, the development of the site will not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The impact of this development will be less than significant.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The site is located within close proximity of existing industrial uses and portions of the site are within two miles of the runways at Mather Airport. Mather Airport currently serves as a commercial cargo airport and contains two runways. Future plans include expansion of commercial cargo use of the airport. The development of residential uses within close proximity of this airport may result in the exposure of people to significant levels of airport-related noise. Additional analysis into the exact nature of the airport, flight paths, anticipated expansion of service, and actual noise levels is necessary to determine the true noise impact. Due to the location of industrial uses and a commercial airport within two miles of the project site, noise impacts are likely to be potentially significant.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* There are no anticipated groundborn vibration or noise sources associated with the residential uses of this project. During the construction process, however, there will be groundborn vibrations caused by truck and heavy equipment traffic. This potential impact warrants additional analysis, as it may be potentially significant.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The development of residential uses is unlikely to produce sustained or permanent levels of noise beyond generally accepted levels. Though the ambient noise level will be greater than what currently exists on the undeveloped site, it is

not likely to exceed acceptable standards for residential development. The construction process, however, will likely require the use of heavy equipment over an extended period of time. There will likely be significant noise impacts resulting from the clearing and grading of the site to accommodate development at this site. Due to the enormous undertaking required to remove the tailings from the site, the noise-generating processes are likely to occur over a period of years. Though this impact will not be permanent, it will extend over an extended period of time and, as such, will be potentially significant.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See c) above.

e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See a) above.

f) *No Impact.* There are no private airports within the vicinity of the site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project will occur on a site that has been designated for industrial development and will require a General Plan amendment and rezoning to achieve compliance. This project will ultimately result in the construction of approximately 12,000 new homes, which will constitute a significant addition to the housing stock of the region. The project will directly induce substantial population growth in the area by providing additional homes. This impact is potentially significant and will affect a variety of public resources, facilities, and services.

b) *No Impact.* There are no existing residences at the site. As such, there will be no impact on existing housing.

c) *No Impact.* There are no inhabitants of the property and there will be no displacement as a result of this project. As such, there will be no impact resulting from displacement of people.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project will ultimately require additional fire services in order to serve the proposed development. The development may likely necessitate the construction of a fire station within the new development, as it is not likely that the existing fire services will be capable of serving the proposed development. Additional facilities will likely be necessary. As such, the impact will be potentially significant. This impact will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project will require the extension of law enforcement services to meet the needs of the proposed development. The region is currently served by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, which serves the recently incorporated City of Rancho Cordova. As the level of service and number of officers is a function of population, the additional development will require a proportionate number of additional officers and services, and potentially new facilities, which may impact the environment. The impact on law enforcement services is potentially significant. This impact will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Construction of the proposed residential units would generate additional students. The project proposes six elementary schools, two middle schools, and a high school. Construction of these facilities may result in a potentially significant impact on the physical environment on the project site. This impact will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Construction of the residential units would generate the need for additional parkland. The project proposes the construction of a nine community, neighborhood and mini parks, a greenbelt system, and a private recreation facility. The construction of these facilities may result in a significant environmental impact. This impact will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.

e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project will require the extension of a variety of additional public services to accommodate the new development at this site including public libraries, hospitals, community services, and other related public uses. The additional demand for these public services may require the construction of additional facilities to provide service to this development. The construction of these facilities may result in a potentially significant impact. This impact will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* The project proposes 171± acres of community and neighborhood parks, 51± acres of private recreation, and 523± acres of open space and wetlands. The parks and open space areas would be generally distributed throughout the project site and should adequately accommodate local recreation needs. As such, the project will likely result in a less than significant impact on outside recreation facilities with the projects incorporated design features.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* As the recreation facilities are proposed to be located near the proposed wetland mitigation bank, and because the exact nature of the project drainage has not been determined, it is possible that the construction and extended use of these facilities may impact the wetland mitigation bank. Specifically, the 51± acre private recreation space is in close proximity to the wetlands and an incompatible recreational use may create significant noise, lighting, water quality, or related impacts on the wetlands. As such, the development of the recreational facilities may result in a potentially significant impact on the environment.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* In the Transportation Analysis conducted by Fehr & Peers, October, 2002, several significant roadway sections were identified as requiring significant upgrades in order to accommodate this project. Based on models provided in the Analysis, Sunrise Boulevard would operate at a Level of Service (LOS) F, an unacceptable condition, between Folsom Boulevard and Florin Road. Additionally, Grant Line Road would need to be widened from 2 to 4 lanes between White Rock Road and Douglas Road, Douglas Road would need to be widened from 4 to 6 lanes between Eagles Nest Road and Jaeger Road, Sunrise Boulevard would need to widened from 4 to 6 lanes between Douglas Road and Grant Line Road, and White Rock Road would need to be widened from 4 to 6 lanes between Zinfandel Drive and Jaeger Road. These recommendations were made based on preliminary sketches of the proposed roadways. Because of the significant improvements that would be necessary to accommodate this project, the impact on the existing roadway network is potentially significant.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* As the project cannot be accommodated within the existing roadway network, additional improvements will be necessary to handle the additional traffic generated by this project. Under the Sacramento County General Plan, which now functions as the General Plan for the City of Rancho Cordova, roadways are considered sufficient if they are able to operate at LOS E or better. This project would result in the degradation of several existing roadways to unacceptable Levels of Service of E and F. As

such, this project would potentially result in a significant impact on existing roadways to unacceptable levels.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project does not involve any aviation-related uses but is located within two miles of the Sacramento Mather Airport. Also, the project site may be located within the airport safety zones or within the approach and departure paths for aircraft using the airport. Therefore, a potentially significant impact may occur and additional analysis is needed to determine the exact risk.

d) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project does not include agriculture uses, so is not anticipated that farm equipment will be traveling on roadways outside the project site and would not be adversely affected by the implementation of the project. However, as there existing agricultural uses in the region, the expansion of roadways and increased traffic may slightly impact agricultural traffic.

e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* As the surrounding roadways are not capable of handling the increased traffic from this site, it is likely that the additional traffic and congestion will prohibit full and timely emergency access to the site. As such, there will be potentially significant impacts on emergency access resulting from this project.

f) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project is anticipated to contain commercial, residential, parks, and light industrial uses. Each of the land uses will be required to provide sufficient on-site parking to accommodate the anticipated demand. At the time of development of each component, City parking requirements will be enforced to ensure adequate parking. The impact on parking will be less than significant.

g) *Potentially Significant Impact.* As the project would produce a significant number of additional housing units, including multi-family residences, it is very likely that additional regional mass transit service will be needed to adequately serve the development. The existing bus lines along Sunrise Boulevard would likely be significant impacted by additional ridership. Similarly, additional riders would impact the light-rail service at Folsom Boulevard. As such, it is likely that this project would result in a potentially significant impact on alternative transportation programs (SACRT website).

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The project would likely tie into the existing SRCSD interceptor system. Due to the scale of the project, this impact will be potentially significant and will likely require the construction of additional facilities to treat and accommodate additional the additional wastewater. It is unlikely that existing facilities will be capable of accommodating the additional wastewater generated from this project. This impact will be potentially significant.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See a) above.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See Section VIII, Hydrology and Water Quality, c).

d) *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed residential development will require significant water supplies. As such, additional water sources or entitlements will need to be secured in order to provide service to the development. The impact on water supply will be potentially significant.

e) *Potentially Significant Impact.* See a) above.

f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The development will ultimately produce a significant volume of solid waste that will likely be disposed of in the Kiefer Landfill, which is operated by Sacramento County Waste Management & Recycling. The landfill is 660 acres in size, meets federal, state and local statues, and is capable of accommodating the additional solid waste. At this point, it is likely that the impact on solid waste management will be less than significant.

g) *Less than Significant Impact.* See f) above.

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

Discussion of Impacts

a) *Potentially Significant Impact.* As noted above, the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to biological resources (i.e., wildlife species, wetlands, etc.), and cultural and historical resources.

b) *Potentially Significant Impact.* There are several proposed developments near the project site. The proposed project, together with other development nearby, could have significant cumulative impacts.

c) *Potentially Significant Impact.* Potential project impacts such as air quality, transportation/traffic, hydrology/water quality, provision of public services, and noise could cause substantial adverse effects in human beings, either directly or indirectly. These issues/impact areas will be further addressed in the EIR/EIS.

XVIII. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Federal requirements relating to environmental justice are addressed in this section. Executive Order Number 12989, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Federal Register, February 16, 1994, p. 7629) was issued in 1994 and states:

> *"To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review, each Federal Agency shall make environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of it's programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations..."*

The proposed project could adversely affect minority populations and low-income populations by raising housing prices in the project vicinity. This is a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

References

ECORP Consulting, Inc. *Section 404 Individual Permit Application for Rio Del Oro.* November 2002.

ECORP Consulting, Inc. *Rare Plant Study.* August 1, 2003.

Environmental Resources Management. *Revised Hazardous Materials Technical Study for The Inactive Rancho Cordova Test Site and Associated Lands.* March 2003.

Fehr & Peers. *Supplemental Transportation Analysis for Rio Del Oro Development.* March 2003.

Fehr & Peers. *Transportation Analysis for Rio Del Oro Development.* October 2002.

Gibson & Skordal. *Elderberry Survey-Rio Del Oro Property, Sacramento County, California.* September 2000.

Gibson & Skordal. *Jurisdictional Delineation Rio Del Oro Property.* June 1999.

Gibson & Skordal. *Listed Vernal Pool Branchiopods Wet Season Survey, Rio Del Oro Property.* August 2000.

Gibson & Skordal. *Listed Vernal Pool Branchiopods 2001 Wet Season Survey.* July 2001.

Peak & Associates. *Cultural Resource Assessment for The Proposed Rio Del Oro Project Area, Sacramento County,* California. October 1999.

Sacramento County. *Sacramento County General Plan.* 1993

Sierra Nevada Arborists. *Tree Inventory for Rio Del Oro Project, Sacramento County, California.* February 2003.

Wood Rodgers. *Conceptual Sewer Study for Rio Del Oro, Sacramento County, California.* May 2003.

Wood Rodgers. *Rio Del Oro Conceptual Drainage Study for Project Rezone and Plan Amendment Proceedings.* February 2003.