

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose and Use of This Draft EIR

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the incorporation of Arden Arcade (State Clearinghouse No. 2007102114). This document was prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.), Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act (CKH Act) of 2000, and Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) policies, standards, and procedures.

The purpose of this Draft EIR is to inform decision makers, representatives of affected and responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed project. This Draft EIR describes potential impacts relating to a wide variety of environmental issues and methods by which these impacts can be mitigated or avoided.

Project Summary

Project Setting

The proposed incorporation of the community of Arden Arcade (project or proposed incorporation) would result in the establishment of a new city and sphere of influence (SOI). The proposed Arden Arcade incorporation area (proposed incorporation area) would consist of the new city limits and SOI and would cover approximately 9,000 acres or about 14 square miles of land located in the northern-central portion of Sacramento County. The proposed incorporation area is generally surrounded by urban development on all sides and is bounded by Auburn Boulevard to the north, Mission Avenue on the east, Fair Oaks Boulevard on the south, and Ethan Avenue and the American River Parkway on the west.

The northern and western boundary of the project is contiguous with the City of Sacramento's city limits. The project area's eastern boundary is contiguous with the community plan boundary of the unincorporated community of Carmichael. The project is located within the unsectioned (S) portion of the Del Paso Land Grant, Townships 5 East and 6 East, Ranges 8 North and 9 North of the Mount Diablo Baseline. Portions of the proposed incorporation area can be seen in the following 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangles: Rio Linda Quadrangle, Citrus Heights Quadrangle, Sacramento East Quadrangle, and the Carmichael Quadrangle.

Project Description

The new city would be a General Law City with a city manager form of government. General government reflects management, administration, and support operations that would be provided by

the new City of Arden Arcade. Governing the new city, a six-member City Council would be elected by district according to boundaries drawn from an approximately equal division of the population of the community and elected by the registered voters of each district, and a mayor would be elected at large from throughout the incorporated area. The mayor and council members would have equal votes on the City Council. The city manager, city clerk, city treasurer, city attorney, and all other officers of the city would be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the City Council.

Section 57376 of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act requires that the new city council shall adopt, immediately following its organization and prior to performing any other official act, an ordinance providing that all Sacramento County ordinances previously applicable shall remain in full force and effect as city ordinances for a period of 120 days after incorporation. The Sacramento County General Plan would also be adopted by the city until the city prepares and adopts its own General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. In accordance with California Government Code Section 65360, the new city would have up to 30 months following incorporation to adopt a General Plan. At such time, the new city would also be required to conduct additional environmental review under CEQA to assess potential impacts of future land uses as proposed under the new General Plan.

The project will require the following discretionary approvals by LAFCo regarding changes to the organization of local governmental agencies and service providers:

- The incorporation of the proposed City of Arden Arcade, California
- Establish the City of Arden Arcade SOI
- The establishment of a general governmental entity responsible for providing a range of municipal services

There is no dissolution or reorganization of any other local governmental entity or service provider that will be required by the project.

Project Objectives

The incorporation petition sets forth the following reasons for the proposed project:

- To enhance the character and identity of Arden Arcade by establishing the community as a municipality;
- To increase local control over, and accountability for, decisions affecting Arden Arcade by having an elected City Council and mayor made of Arden Arcade residents who serve as the community's primary local governmental representatives;
- To ensure that the planning, zoning, and other regulatory land use decisions affecting Arden Arcade are made in Arden Arcade;
- To increase the accessibility of local government officials and staff members to the residents of Arden Arcade;

- To improve and enhance the level of local police protection by capturing revenues generated in Arden Arcade;
- To increase the allocation and acquisition of Federal and State revenues to Arden Arcade to support local services and programs;
- To increase local responsibility for determining services, service levels, and capital improvements in Arden Arcade;
- To promote more citizen participation and involvement in the local civic affairs of Arden Arcade; and
- To stimulate economic growth that will support the well-being of the city and its citizenry.

Impacts Not Considered in This EIR

Based on comments received during the two NOP circulation periods (see Appendix A and Appendix B) and the professional judgment of LAFCo staff and its consultants, a number of issues are not expected to have any significant impacts when compared with the baseline or with existing conditions and do not need to be analyzed further. These include:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Mineral Resources

These resources areas are briefly discussed below to explain why effects to these resources would not be significant with the incorporation of Arden Arcade.

Aesthetics

The proposed incorporation area is located within an urbanized section of the Sacramento Valley, with the Coast Range and Sierra Nevada mountains providing a topographic backdrop from a distance. The proposed incorporation area is dominated by urban land uses with prominent visual features consisting of commercial, retail, and office buildings ranging from single-story to multi-story construction. Three major transportation corridors along Howe Avenue, Arden Way, and Watt Avenue provide many opportunities to view the project area.

As described in Section 2, Project Description, immediately following its organization and prior to performing any other official act, the new city must adopt an ordinance providing that all county ordinances (including the County Zoning Ordinance and all other land use regulations and County General Plan land use designations) previously applicable to the former unincorporated area shall remain in full force and effect as ordinances of the City for a period of 120 days after incorporation,

or until the City Council has enacted ordinances superseding the county ordinances, whichever occurs first. As a result, the act of incorporating the city will not involve any change in land use or other development activities that might result in substantial adverse physical impacts on existing scenic vistas or the existing land use pattern within the area of the proposed incorporation.

U. S. Highway 50 and Interstate 80 in the vicinity of Arden Arcade are not designated by the State as scenic highways (Caltrans 2007); therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Because the project does not propose any physical development, and any future development proposal would be subject to further environmental and design reviews by the city in keeping with the current County Land Use Map and Zoning Ordinance, it is reasonable to conclude that the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Further, continued implementation of the Arden Arcade Community Plan and associated Design Guidelines will help ensure that visual character of new development is consistent with community's existing visual character even after approval of the project.

Nighttime lighting is extensively used within the proposed incorporation area, and the project involves no physical improvements that would result in any new sources of daytime glare or nighttime lighting. Any future development proposals would be subject to further environmental and design reviews by the city, in keeping with the current County Zoning Ordinance and all other land use regulations and County General Plan land use designations; therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the project would not adversely affect any day or nighttime views in the area.

Agriculture Resources

As discussed in Section 2, Project Description, the project would involve the incorporation of the community of Arden Arcade. A review of Important Farmland Maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation classifies the incorporation area as "Urban"; therefore, the act of incorporating the community of Arden Arcade would not directly or indirectly convert lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (FMMP 2004). The project would incorporate urbanized lands located within the County's adopted Urban Service Boundary (USB) and Urban Policy Area (UPA) and would not lead to any subsequent changes in the existing pattern of development within the County that could encourage the premature conversion of agricultural lands. Therefore, in the context of these findings, it is appropriate to conclude that the project would not adversely impact local agricultural resources.

Cultural Resources

In the context of the project, the act of incorporating the community of Arden Arcade would not in itself result in any physical impacts or ground disturbance; therefore, the establishment of an Area of Potential Effect (APE) is not necessary. For this reason and given the large area of the proposed

incorporation area, a site-specific records search was not deemed necessary; rather, this analysis assumes the presence of historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources within the incorporation area. This assumption is maintained even in the context of the extensive pre-existing disturbance within the proposed incorporation area.

As provided in Section 2, Project Description, the project would not involve any ground-disturbing activities, and existing state and county policies relating to the protection of historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources would be adopted by the new city in accordance with state law. Any future land use decisions would be required to undergo CEQA review and appropriate mitigation measures prescribed, based on the type of activity proposed. Likewise, new City General Plan policies regarding the protection of cultural resources would also require subsequent CEQA review. Based on these formalities, it is reasonable to conclude that it is unlikely that the project would disrupt undiscovered human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; directly or indirectly destroy unique resources or geologic features; or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical or archaeological resources. Therefore, a no impact determination is appropriate.

Geology and Soils

The topography of the proposed incorporation area is generally level to undulating; steeper slopes may be found close to local stream channels. Localized subsurface geology is characterized by Quaternary-age (less than 1.6 million years ago) stream channel deposits consisting of discontinuous sand, gravels, clays, and silts.

The proposed incorporation area is not located within 1 mile of a designated fault rupture zone; however, it is located within 50 miles of several active fault sources and is subject to the direct and indirect impacts of ground motion during an earthquake. The closest known Quaternary-age faults are those associated with the Foothills Fault System, of which the closest branch is located approximately 20 miles to the east, and the Coast Range-Sierran Block Boundary Zone, which is located approximately 30 miles to the west.

In response to these inherent risks, state and local building and grading codes regulate structural design. The Uniform Building Code (UBC), as amended, locates the proposed incorporation area within Seismic Risk Zone 3. The UBC requires use of seismic parameters that allow structural engineering analysis for structures to be based on soil profile types and the anticipated peak ground acceleration. However, since the project involves no structural improvements and since UBC requirements are integrated into Title 24, which is state law, the act of incorporation is expected to have no change on existing geologic or soil-related hazards; therefore, a no impact determination is appropriate.

Executive Summary

No new onsite wastewater treatment systems are proposed as part of the project; therefore, no impact is expected. Additional discussion of concerns related to water quality, groundwater, flooding, and soil erosion is provided in Section 3.4, Hydrology and Water Quality.

Mineral Resources

The proposed incorporation area is designated for a combination of urban uses, including varying densities of residential, commercial and office, and industrial development by the Sacramento County General Plan. In addition, it is not located in an area proposed for mineral resource extraction. In this context, it is appropriate to conclude that the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or affect a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan; therefore, no impact would occur.

Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts were identified for the project.

Summary of Project Alternatives

Below is a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project considered in Section 4, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed incorporation of Arden Arcade would not occur. The proposed incorporation area would remain under county jurisdiction.

Alternate Boundary Alternative

The Alternate Boundary Alternative would entail a larger incorporation area than is currently proposed. This boundary modification would include portions of the Arden Arcade Community Plan area to the south of Fair Oaks Boulevard and north of the American River. The area included is illustrated in Exhibit 4-1.

Alternate Provision of Services Alternative

An alternate service provider would be the City of Sacramento. Sacramento lies adjacent to the western boundary of the proposed incorporation area. Sacramento is a full-service city that provides fire, police, parks, water, wastewater, solid waste removal, planning, public works, animal control, street lighting, and street maintenance services.

Areas of Controversy

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b), a summary section must address areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and it must

also address issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project was issued on October 26, 2007. The NOP describing the original concept for the project and issues to be addressed in the EIR was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review period extending from October 26, 2007 through November 26, 2007. The NOP was recirculated on September 1, 2009, with a revised list of alternatives. Specifically, the Alternate Boundary Alternative was defined to include areas south of Fair Oaks Boulevard, islands located along the American River. The comment period for the 2009 Recirculated NOP ended September 30, 2009. The NOP identified the potential for significant impacts on the environment related to the following topical areas:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Recreation
- Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems

Disagreement Among Experts

This Draft EIR contains substantial evidence to support all the conclusions presented herein. It is possible that there will be disagreement among various parties regarding these conclusions, although Sacramento LAFCo is not aware of any disputed conclusions at the time of this writing. Both the CEQA Guidelines and case law clearly provide the standards for treating disagreement among experts. Where evidence and opinions conflict on an issue concerning the environment, and the lead agency knows of these controversies in advance, the EIR must acknowledge the controversies, summarize the conflicting opinions of the experts, and include sufficient information to allow the public and decision makers to make an informed judgment about the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

Potentially Controversial Issues

Below is a list of potentially controversial issues that may be raised during the public review and hearing process of this Draft EIR:

- Land Use
- Transportation
- Public Services/Utility Systems
- Alternative Boundary Area

It is also possible that evidence will be presented during the 45-day, statutory Draft EIR public review period that may create disagreement. Decision makers would consider this evidence during the public hearing process.

Executive Summary

In rendering a decision on a project where there is disagreement among experts, the decision makers are not obligated to select the most environmentally preferable viewpoint. Decision makers are vested with the ability to choose whatever viewpoint is preferable and need not resolve a dispute among experts. In their proceedings, decision makers must consider comments received concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR and address any objections raised in these comments. However, decision makers are not obligated to follow any directives, recommendations, or suggestions presented in comments on the Draft EIR, and can certify the Final EIR without needing to resolve disagreements among experts.

Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table ES-1 summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and resulting level of significance after mitigation for the relevant environmental issue areas evaluated for the proposed project. The table is intended to provide an overview; narrative discussions for the issue areas are included in the corresponding section of this EIR. Table ES-1 is included in the EIR as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1).

Table ES-1: Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.1 - Air Quality		
Impact 3.1-1: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 3.5-2.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.1-2: The project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.1-3: The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.1-4: The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.1-5: The project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Impact 3.1-6: The project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Impact 3.1-7: The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.	MM 3.1-7: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the new city to develop a community-wide and municipal greenhouse gas emissions inventory and a Climate Action Plan concurrent with the development of the city’s first General Plan. At a minimum, the Climate Action Plan shall include the following components:	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline and future year emission inventories for the community and local government operations • Emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2030 • Descriptions of strategies selected to achieve targets • Emission reduction estimates from potential reduction measures and strategies • Implementation plan with mechanisms for monitoring and course corrections 	
Section 3.2 - Biological Resources		
<p>Impact 3.2-1: The project would not 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
<p>Impact 3.2-2: The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
<p>Impact 3.2-3: The project would not 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, and coastal) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.</p>	No mitigation is required.	No impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.2-4: The project would not 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 wildlife nursery sites.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.2-5: The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.2-6: The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan; natural community conservation plan; or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>		
<p>Impact 3.3-1: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.3-2: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.3-3: The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.3-4: The project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.3-5: The project would be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Additionally, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area.</p>	<p>MM 3.3-5: Prior to the approval of specific land uses that affects an area within an airport planning boundary established by the ALUC, the new city shall refer the proposed action to the ALUC for consistency determination. Future development and/or proposed new land uses must comply with the 1992 McClellan Air Force Base CLUP, development restrictions.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.3-6: The project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.3-7: The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.3-8: The project would not 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.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 - Hydrology and Water Quality</p>		
<p>Impact 3.4-1: The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requests.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.4-2: The project would not 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.4-3: The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.4-4: The project would not 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 offsite.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.4-5: The project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.4-6: The project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 3.4-7: The project would not place new 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.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Impact 3.4-8: The project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Impact 3.4-9: The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.4-10: The project would not be inundated by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Section 3.5 - Land Use and Planning		
Impact 3.5-1: The proposed incorporation of Arden Arcade would not physically divide an established community.	MM 3.5-1: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the new city (Arden Arcade) to include the Mission Oaks Neighborhood Preservation Area in the city's new General Plan.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.5-2: The project would not 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.	MM 3.5-2: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the City(Arden Arcade) to prohibit development of vacant land parcels within the incorporation area to uses that are inconsistent with the 1993 Sacramento County General Plan and/or the most recent and binding land use guidance document until such time the City adopts its own General Plan.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.6 - Noise		
Impact 3.6-1: The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.6-2: The project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.6-3: The project would not create substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Impact 3.6-4: The project would not create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Impact 3.6-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, the project may not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.	MM 3.6-5: As a contingency for incorporation approval, LAFCo shall require the new city to adopt criteria similar to those listed in the Sacramento County General Plan regarding infill development within the airport's 65-dB CNEL noise contour.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.6-6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 3.7 - Population and Housing		
Impact 3.7-1: The project would not 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).	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.7-2: The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Impact 3.7-3: The project would not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
Section 3.8 - Public Services		
Impact 3.8-1: The project would not adversely impact fire protection services.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.8-2: The project could potentially adversely impact law enforcement services.	MM 3.8-2: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require that the city provide adequate law and traffic enforcement services through the creation of a local department or on a contractual basis with the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, any CHP, or another law enforcement agency and other entities if legally permissible. .	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.8-3: The project would not adversely impact public school services.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.8-4: The project would not adversely impact parks and recreation services.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.
Impact 3.8-5: The project would not adversely impact library services.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.8-6: The project could potentially adversely impact animal control services.</p>	<p>MM 3.8-6: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require that the city provide animal control services through the creation of a local department or on a contractual basis with other entities if legally permissible. At a minimum, animal control services shall be maintained at levels existing at the time of approval of the project EIR.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-7: The project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, but it may adversely affect the provision of water supply.</p>	<p>MM 3.8-7a: LAFCo shall condition the approval of the incorporation to identify the current public agencies that provide water as primary service providers such that if it is determined that one of the primary provider districts were no longer able to render services, the city would become the primary service provider for that district.</p> <p>MM 3.8-7b: LAFCo shall condition the approval of the incorporation such that the city becomes a signatory to the Water Forum Agreement.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-8: The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements and would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-9: The project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</p>	<p>MM 3.8-9a: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the new city to develop standards for construction, operation, and maintenance regarding the maintenance of Zone 11B and 13 that are compatible with SCWA therefore continuing services from the Sacramento County Stormwater Utility.</p> <p>MM 3.8-9b: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the new city to adopt a flood plain management ordinance.</p> <p>MM 3.8-9c: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the new city to participate and eventually become a co-permittee under the existing countywide NPDES permit.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.8-10: The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-11: The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</p>	<p>MM 3.8-11: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the new city to contract waste collection services through the County of Sacramento’s Department of Waste Management and Recycling Services.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-12: The project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy, gas, and or communication facilities.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-13: The project would result in the new city assuming responsibility for building inspection, engineering, permitting, and planning services, potentially altering current service provisions.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-14: The project would result in road, street, and landscape construction and maintenance services becoming a city responsibility, potentially altering current service standards.</p>	<p>MM 3.8-14a: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require that existing transportation fee impact programs be continued at level necessary to adequately fund approved road construction projects. MM 3.8-14b: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require the transfer of ownership, maintenance, and financial responsibility for Watt Avenue (Auburn Boulevard to Longview Drive), Auburn Boulevard (Park Road to Howe Avenue), Winding Way (Auburn Boulevard to 1000 feet east), and Bell Street (between the easterly and westerly legs of Auburn Boulevard) to the new city.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.8-15: The project would result in street lighting services becoming a city responsibility, potentially altering current service standards.</p>	<p>MM 3.8-15 LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require that the new city shall provide street lighting maintenance by (1) contract with the County or contract with a private company, (2) waive detachment from CSA 1 and agree to be financially responsible for any difference in revenues collected by CSA 1 and the cost of services, or (3) directly perform the maintenance. At a minimum, street lighting and roadway conditions shall be maintained at existing levels, and close coordination between city and county staff will be required.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-16: The project would potentially fragment or disrupt current regional planning activities.</p>	<p>MM 3.8-16a: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require that the new city shall petition SACOG for inclusion in its Joint Powers Agreement as a member city. MM 3.8-16b: LAFCo shall condition the incorporation approval to require that the new city shall petition Sac RT for inclusion in its Board of Directors as a member city, or to enter into an agreement to provide transit services within the new city's incorporated boundary.</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Section 3.9 - Traffic and Transportation</p>		
<p>Impact 3.9-1: The project would not cause an increase in traffic, which 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).</p>	<p>Implement Land Use Mitigation Measure MM- 3.5-2</p>	<p>Less than significant impact.</p>
<p>Impact 3.9-2: The project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No Impact.</p>

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 3.9-3: The project would not 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.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Impact 3.9-4: The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Impact 3.9-5: The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Impact 3.9-6: The project would not result in inadequate parking capacity.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Impact 3.9-7: The Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	Implement Public Services Mitigation Measure: MM- 3.8-16b	No Impact.
Impact 3.9-8: The project would provide safe access and would not obstruct access to nearby uses or fail to provide for future street right of way.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Section 3.10 - Environmental Justice		
Impact 3.10-1: The project would not result in an adverse effect or impact that is appreciably more severe in magnitude or predominately borne by low-income populations.	No mitigation is necessary.	No impact.

Table ES-1 (cont.): Executive Summary Matrix

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 3.10-2: The project would not result in an adverse effect or impact that is appreciably more severe in magnitude or predominately borne by minority populations.	No mitigation is necessary.	No impact.

