DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

2101 ARENA BOULEVARD, SECOND FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95834

PLANNING DIVISION

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING SERVICES
916-808-7931
FAX 916-264-5328

REVISED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, make declare, and publish this Revised Mitigated Negative Declaration for the following described project.

P05-060 Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station Project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing waste transfer station from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to the design capacity of 2,500 TPD. The increase in allowable daily tonnage would result in an increase in the number of vehicle trips entering and exiting the facility. Daily vehicles at the facility would increase from 551 vehicles per day (1,347 one-way passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips per day) to 980 vehicles per day (2,099 PCE trips per day), resulting in a net increase of 429 vehicles per day, and 752 one-way PCE trips per day, at the facility.

The Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station is located on a 19.5-acre parcel near the intersection of Fruitridge Boulevard and Florin Perkins Road in the southeast portion of the City of Sacramento. (APN: 061-0173-028). The physical address is 8491 Fruitridge Road, Sacramento.

The City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, has reviewed the proposed project and on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project, with mitigation measures as identified in the attached Initial Study, will have a significant effect on the environment. This Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis. An Environmental Impact Report is not required pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Sections 21000, et seq., Public Resources Code of the State of California).

This Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to Title 14, Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento; and the Sacramento City Code.

The public review period for the Mitigated Negative Declaration document was January 18, 2006 to February 17, 2006. This Revised Mitigated Negative Declaration includes clarifying revisions to the document made as a result of written comments received by the City of Sacramento during the public review period. No new information has been presented that identified any new project impacts or mitigation measures. A copy of this document and all

supportive documentation may be reviewed or obtained at the City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, Planning Division, 2101 Arena Blvd., Second Floor, Sacramento, California 95834, between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m.

Environmental Services Manager, City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation

By: _____

SACRAMENTO RECYCLING AND TRANSFER STATION (P05-060)
REVISED INITIAL STUDY/REVISED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This Initial Study has been prepared by the Development Services Department, Environmental Planning Services, 2101 Arena Blvd., Second Floor, Sacramento, CA 95834, pursuant to Title 14, Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations; the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892) adopted by the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento City Code. Additions to text in the circulated documents are noted in underline.

This Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

SECTION I. - BACKGROUND: Page 3 - Provides summary background information about the project name, location, sponsor, when the Initial Study was completed, and a project introduction.

SECTION II. - PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Page 5 - Includes a detailed description of the Proposed Project.

SECTION III. - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION: Page 9 - Contains the Environmental Checklist form together with a discussion of the checklist questions. The Checklist Form is used to determine the following for the proposed project: 1) "Potentially Significant Impacts" that may not be mitigated with the inclusion of mitigation measures, 2) "Potentially Significant Impacts Unless Mitigated" which could be mitigated with incorporation of mitigation measures, and 3) "Less-than-significant Impacts" which would be less-than-significant and do not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

SECTION IV. - ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: Page 50- Identifies which environmental factors were determined to have either a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Impacts Unless Mitigated," as indicated in the Environmental Checklist.

SECTION V. - DETERMINATION: Page 51 - Identifies the determination of whether impacts associated with development of the Proposed Project are significant, and what, if any, additional environmental documentation may be required.

ATTACHMENTS	**A**	Vicinity Map
	B	Site Plan
	C	Land Use and Zoning
	D	Traffic Study

SECTION I. BACKGROUND

File Number, Project Name:

P05-060, Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station

Project Location:

The Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station is located on a 19.5-acre parcel near the intersection of Fruitridge Boulevard and Florin Perkins Road in the southeast portion of the City of Sacramento. (APN: 061-0173-028). The physical address is 8491 Fruitridge Road, Sacramento. See Attachment A.

Project Applicant, Project Planner, and Environmental Planner Contact Information:

Project Applicant
BLT Enterprises
Shawn Guttersen
8491 Fruitridge Road
Sacramento, CA 95826
(916) 379-0500
FAX (916) 379-0501

Project Planner
Kimberly Kaufmann-Brisby, Associate Planner
City of Sacramento, Development Services Department
915 I Street, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 808-5590

Environmental Planner
Tom Buford, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento, Development Services Department
2101 Arena Blvd., Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 808-7931

Date Initial Study Completed: January 13, 2006

Date Revised Initial Study Completed: March 28, 2006

Introduction

The Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station (Transfer Station) is a materials recovery facility and transfer station. The Transfer Station was constructed in 1998, and operates pursuant to a Special Permit from the City of Sacramento, and permit issued by the California

Integrated Waste Management Board.

The Special Permit establishes a limit on the total daily tonnage of waste that can be received and processed at the Transfer Station. At the time of initial approval, the Transfer Station was permitted to receive and process 1,500 tons per day (TPD). In 2000 the Special Permit was increased to allow up to 2,000 TPD for processing. The Transfer Station has a design capacity of 2,500 TPD, and the proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage to the design capacity.

The City of Sacramento, as lead agency, has determined that the appropriate environmental document for the proposed project is a Mitigated Negative Declaration. This environmental document examines project effects which are identified as potentially significant effects on the environment or which may be substantially reduced or avoided by the adoption of revisions or conditions to the design of project specific features. The City has determined that, as modified by mitigation identified in the Initial Study, the project would not result in potentially significant impacts. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the proposed environmental document for this project.

The City is soliciting views of interested persons and agencies on the content of the environmental information presented in this document. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than the 30-day review period ending February 17, 2006.

Please send written responses to:

Tom Buford, Environmental Project Manager
Planning and Building Department
Environmental Planning Services
2101 Arena Blvd., Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95834
Telephone: (916) 808-7931
Fax (916) 566-3968

SECTION II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Background and Previous Environmental Review

BLT of Sacramento has operated the Transfer Station since it was first constructed. The project has been identified in some documents as "BLT of Sacramento's Recycling and Transfer Station." This document refers to the project as the Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station, or Transfer Station.

The Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station (Transfer Station) was approved and constructed in 1998. The City approved a Special Permit for the facility in 1998 (Special Permit Resolution 98-461). The facility was designed and constructed to receive and process a maximum of 2,500 tons of garbage and recyclables per day. The facility was approved and permitted to process a maximum of 1,500 tons per day (TPD) of municipal waste and recyclables. The facility operates under a Special Permit issued by the City of Sacramento and a Solid Waste Facility Permit issued by the County of Sacramento Environmental Management department and concurred with by the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

The current Solid Waste Facility Permit allows the facility to operate under the following limitations:

- Permitted Tons per Operating Day: 2,000 maximum tons per day
- Permitted Traffic Volume: 544 Vehicles per Day
- Operating Hours:
  - Waste Acceptance: 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., seven days per week
  - Processing: 24 hours per day, seven days per week

The City of Sacramento prepared an environmental impact report for the original project, which was certified in September 1998 by the City Council.

In March 2000 the operator of the Transfer Station sought to increase the tonnage that could be received and processed at the facility from 1,500 TPD to 2,000 TPD, and to extend the hours of operation for receiving waste to 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. The extended hours were necessary to accommodate peak loading in the waste market and were for receiving only; other operational aspects of the Transfer Station remained unchanged.

The City prepared an Addendum to the previously certified EIR in connection with the March 2000 application, and approved the project.

The proposed project would increase the allowable tons per day to be received and processed at the site from 2,000 TPD to 2,500 TPD, the design capacity for the facility. The hours of operation of the facility would remain unchanged. No new construction is proposed. The increase in allowable daily tonnage would result in an increase in the number of vehicle trips entering and exiting the facility. Daily vehicles at the facility would increase from 551 vehicles per day (1,347 one-way passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips per day) to 980 vehicles per day

(2,099 PCE trips per day), resulting in a net increase of 429 vehicles per day, and 752 one-way PCE trips per day, at the facility.

The operator and the Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station employees shall use the following factor units for calculating permitted traffic volume to PCEs to assure that the maximum daily vehicles do not exceed daily passenger car equivalent limits evaluated in the Initial Study, and that are considered as part of the Solid Waste Facility Permit issued by the California Integrated Waste Management Board:

- Transfer Trucks = 3.7 PCE
- Self Haul = 1.5 PCE
- Garbage (Collection) Trucks = 2.7 PCE
- Visitors/Employee Passenger Cars = 1.0 PCE

The applicant is proposing only minor changes to the physical layout of the site. Incoming traffic will continue to enter the facility from 84th Street. Garbage trucks, recycling trucks and self-haul vehicles are weighed on one of the two 70-foot electronic scales. Trucks carrying waste with low recyclable content are directed to the appropriate dump area and tip loads onto a concrete floor. Floor sorters separate recyclable materials, and transfer them to the materials recovery facility (MRF) or to a reclyclable processor. Remaining materials are pushed by a loader through openings in the tipping floor into transfer trailers for transport to a landfill facility.

Approximately 67,600 square feet of the main building is used as a materials recycling facility (MRF). Incoming commercial and self-haul loads that contain recyclable materials are directed to the MRF tipping area. After unloading, bulky items are salvaged and the remaining material pushed by loader into conveyors to elevated sorting platforms. The recovered materials (e.g., plastics, newspapers, metals) are sorted, baled and stored for final shipment. Non-recoverable materials are conveyed back to the main tipping floor.

No additional equipment would be added or used as part of the project. Equipment used within the transfer station will be replaced from time to time as part of normal equipment maintenance and replacement, and may be upgraded over time with newer and more efficient equipment with similar capabilities.

Storage of loose waste and recyclables occurs inside the building. Bins containing scrap metal and glass are stored outside of the building. Wood and green materials are stockpiled on the perimeter of the tipping floor. Other recyclables may be baled, palletized, or otherwise containerized outside. Pallets are stacked outside. The initial storage area for baled recyclables is in the Bale Storage Area located in the Material Recovery Facility. Typically, the following materials are baled and stored at the facility: all grades of paper, plastics, scrap metals, and textiles. Additional bale storage areas are located outside of the facility, as shown on the Site Plan.

Tractor trailers, wood storage boxes, vehicles and equipment are parked and stored on and about the exterior grounds of the facility, including on the dirt and grass area located at the southeast corner of the project site.

Additional new employment is expected. Total employment at the facility would increase to approximately 100 employees from the current level of 84 employees. The City of Sacramento prepared an environmental impact report for the original project, which included analysis of potential impacts associated with approximately 100 employees, and which was certified in September 1998 by the City Council. Employees currently work on a one shift basis, with some weekend operations, and the schedule of work would continue without change.

All waste hauling traffic enters and exits the facility via 84th Street from Fruitridge Avenue. All waste and recycling operations at the facility are conducted within building interiors. The project includes a request to modify conditions of the Special Permit to allow outdoor storage.

The solid waste and recycling processing operations are conducted within a single building of approximately 127,930 square feet. The site also includes an area designated to receive household hazardous waste. The total design capacity of the facility is 2,500 tons per day (TPD); the facility is currently permitted to process 2,000 TPD.

The existing facility is permitted to receive incoming municipal solid waste and recyclables from Monday through Saturday between 5:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.

The Transfer Station processes municipal solid waste for transfer to landfills, and separates recyclables for processing. The process is part of the City's efforts to comply with the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, which requires local agencies to take affirmative steps to recycle specific percentages of the waste stream generated in the community.

BLT contracts with the City of Sacramento to receive residential solid waste and recyclables that are collected by the City at the curbside. Curbside waste and recyclables arrive at the Transfer Station in garbage and recycling collection trucks. Trucks hauling solid waste typically have a total weight of approximately 7-8 tons per load; recycling trucks typically have a total weight of 4-5 tons. All traffic enters the facility via 84th Street from Fruitridge Avenue. All waste and recycling operations at the facility are conducted in building interiors. See Attachment B, Site Plan.

Solid waste is emptied from the trucks in the interior sorting area, and transferred to trucks that have a larger capacity. These trucks, with a total weight of approximately 22 tons, convey the solid waste to a landfill.

The applicant selects the landfill to which waste is transported based on market and cost factors. Factors considered by the applicant are distance for transport and tipping charges at the receiving landfill. Landfills that could receive waste from the facility include:

- *Kiefer Landfill, Sacramento County.* Kiefer is the primary municipal solid waste disposal facility in Sacramento County. Categorized as a Class III facility, it accepts waste from the general public, businesses, and private waste haulers. Wastes

accepted include construction/demolition debris, mixed municipal and sludge (biosolids). The facility is located on a 1,084-acre site near the intersection of Kiefer Boulevard and Grant Line Road. The permitted capacity of the landfill is 117,400,000 cubic yards, and 10,815 tons per day. As of 20,000, the Kiefer Landfill had a remaining capacity of 86,163,462 yards (73 percent of capacity), with a landfill closure date of 2064.

- *Lockwood Regional Landfill, Sparks, Nevada.* Lockwood is a Class I landfill that currently accepts an average of 7,700 tons per day, 800 tons of which come from the City of Sacramento. Lockwood does not have maximum daily disposal limits, and it has a remaining capacity of 32.5 million tons. The landfill operates on a 550-acre site, with expansion to 1,100 acres under way. (City of Sacramento, ParkeBridge Draft Environmental Impact Report, SCH # 2005012119, 2005.)

Recyclables are emptied in a separate interior space. Recyclables collected by the City are "single-stream," with various recyclable materials co-mingled. The materials are separated in the Transfer Station via a "pick line," and processed for transfer. The typical truck exiting the Transfer Station with recyclables for market has a total weight of approximately 20 to 22 tons.

The Transfer Station also receives solid waste and recyclables through self-haul vehicles. Private self-haul vehicles consist primarily of a loaded pickup truck or car or truck with loaded trailer. Self-haul vehicles typically weigh in at 250 pounds to 1,000 pounds per load, with an average weight of approximately 700 pounds. Solid waste and recyclables from self-haul vehicles are processed in the same manner as other materials, with all processing and sorting completed in the interior of the facility.

The City of Sacramento delivers all solid waste and recyclables from curbside collections to the Transfer Station. The Transfer Station is the only facility operated by the applicant within the City of Sacramento at this time. The City has continued its efforts to locate a second facility in the northern portion of the City. See discussion below regarding the North Area Recovery Facility.

Universal wastes would be received and processed at the facility, but this is due to a regulatory change, and would occur with or without the project. See discussion of universal wastes under Hazards, below.

Most of the properties adjacent to the Transfer Station have been developed with industrial, manufacturing and warehousing uses. Fruitridge Boulevard abuts the parcel to the south, and provides access to the site for vehicular traffic. The Packard Bell/NEC complex, formerly the Sacramento Army Depot, is located south of Fruitridge Boulevard directly across from the site.

The General Plan designation for the site is Heavy Commercial or Warehouse; zoning for the site is M-2 (Heavy Industrial). Properties surrounding the site are zoned for industrial or heavy industrial uses. See Attachment C.

Other Agencies

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) regulates the operation of the

Transfer Station by enforcement of the regulations set forth in California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 7. The Sacramento County Environmental Management Department serves as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA). The LEA has full authority to enforce the California regulations, including permitting, inspection and enforcement. The Board and LEA are responsible agencies as defined in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21069; CEQA Guidelines Section 15381.

As a "solid waste facility," the Transfer Station is required to obtain a permit pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 44014. This permit is issued by the LEA, with concurrence by the Board. The statute provides that no changes in the design or operation of the facility can be made without approval of the LEA and Board. In this case the Board concurred with the Solid Waste Facility Permit 34-AA-0195 in January 2001 to permit the daily tonnage limit increase to 2,000 TPD. LEA approval of a revised solid waste facility permit, and the Board's concurrence with the issuance of the revised permit, would be required prior to the change in operations now proposed.

The regulations set forth in Title 14 were enacted to promote the health, safety and welfare of the people of the State of California, and to protect the environment by establishing minimum standards for the handling of solid wastes. The regulations establish performance standards for solid waste facilities, and impose reporting requirements on operators of such facilities. The regulations generally establish general standards of performance, rather than detailed requirements, thus providing the LEA with flexibility in dealing with individual solid waste operations. CCR Title 14, Sections 17400 et seq. establish performance standards for the operators of transfer/processing operations such as the facility operated by the applicant.

The Solid Waste Facility Permit regulates the design and operation of the Transfer Station, including the physical layout of the facility, total throughput of waste, vehicular traffic flow and patterns, and procedures used to handle and dispose of solid waste.

Documents Available for Review

The following documents are available for review at City of Sacramento, Development Services Department, Planning Division, 1231 I Street, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, California 95814.

1. Project Application

2. Draft Environmental Impact Report (June 1998) and Final Environmental Impact Report (August 1998) for BLT Enterprises of Sacramento, Inc.'s Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station, State Clearinghouse No. 98012046

3. Addendum to the BLT Enterprises of Sacramento, Inc.'s Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station EIR, March 2000

SECTION III. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
1. LAND USE *Would the proposal:* A) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned use of an area?			✓
B) Affect agricultural resources or operation (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impact from incompatible land uses?)			✓

Environmental Setting

The General Plan designation for the site is Heavy Commercial or Warehouse; zoning for the site is M-2 (S) (Heavy Industrial). This zone permits the manufacture or treatment of goods from raw materials. The M-2(S) zone includes regulations designed to encourage industrial park developments that are in keeping with the modern concept of attractive, landscaped industrial plants.

The project site is located in a Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ). The RMDZ program combines recycling with economic development to encourage new businesses, expand existing ones, create jobs, and divert waste from landfills. This program provides loans, technical assistance and free product marketing to businesses that use materials from the waste stream to manufacture their products and are located in such a zone.

The project site is located within the Florin Perkins Enterprise Zone. The Zone was established by the City, and provides tax credits, deductions and other state and local incentives to businesses within the boundaries of the zone.

The project site is occupied by the recycling and transfer facility that is the subject of this application, which is in active operation. The project site is surrounded by warehouse, manufacturing and industrial uses. Surrounding properties are also zoned M-2 (S). The closest residence located approximately 2,000 feet southeast of the project site on Unsworth Avenue, a single-family residence located on land zoned M-2. The nearest residential neighborhood is located approximately 3,000 feet west of the project on either side of Fruitridge Road.

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact is considered significant if the project would:

- Substantially change land use of the site;
- Be incompatible with long-term uses on adjacent properties; or
- Conflict with applicable land use plans.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage for the existing recycling and transfer facility from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. The land use at the site would remain the same. No change in operating hours or other operating procedures of the project would be changed.

The M-2 (S) zone allows heavy industrial uses, including a "solid waste transfer station," "recycling facilities," and "solid waste landfill." The existing use is consistent with these identified uses that are allowed in the M-2 (S) zone. The Zoning Code imposes several requirements, depending on the specific use involved:

- Solid waste transfer stations must obtain a special permit for operation in the M-2 (S) zone. The existing facility operates pursuant to a special permit, and the proposed project is requesting a special permit for the proposed increase in allowable daily tonnage.

- Recycling facilities are subject to landscaping and setback requirements.

- Recycling facilities are subject to a variety of development and operational standards, including regulations that require litter control and fencing.

The proposed project would not change the nature of operations at the project site, and no physical changes are proposed to the site. No physical change to the facility structure or addition of outdoor processing equipment is proposed. The project would increase the allowable daily tonnage that could be processed at the site, and the operation would remain subject to the other requirements of the special permit process, and the applicable sections of the City Zoning Ordinance.

The project does not include significant changes to equipment located on the project site. Such changes would occur from time to time in the future as part of normal operations as existing equipment is replaced with state-of-the-art equipment that is more efficient, or as existing equipment wears out and is replaced.

The proposed project would not affect the land use at the project site, and would be consistent with the surrounding land uses. Any impact to land use would be **less than significant.**

Question B

The proposed project would allow an increase in the daily tonnage processed at the existing facility. No physical changes in the project site are proposed, and no new construction would occur. There would be no increase in impervious surfaces. There are no agricultural operations on or in the vicinity of the project site, and any impact on agricultural resources would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts to land uses.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING *Would the proposal:* A) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?			✓
B) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?			✓

Environmental Setting

The project site is occupied by the existing recycling and transfer facility. No housing is present on the site.

Standards of Significance

Section 15131 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that the economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as a significant effect on the environment. CEQA indicates that social and economic effects should be considered in an EIR only to the extent that they would result in secondary or indirect adverse impacts on the physical

environment.

This environmental document does not treat population/housing as an environmental impact, but rather as a social-economic impact. If there are clear secondary impacts created by a population/housing increase generated by the project, those secondary impacts will be addressed in each affected area (e.g., transportation, air quality).

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact is considered significant if the project would induce substantial growth that is inconsistent with the approved land use plan for the area or displace existing affordable housing.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A & B

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing recycling and transfer facility. The increase in allowable daily tonnage would result in an increase in employment at the facility from 84 to 100 employees. The City of Sacramento prepared an environmental impact report for the original project, which included analysis of project impacts associated with approximately 100 employees, and which was certified in September 1998 by the City Council. An additional 16 employees at the facility would not have a significant impact on population given the existing population of the City.

The proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on population and housing.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Finding

The proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact to population and housing.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
3. SEISMICITY, SOILS, AND GEOLOGY *Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:* A) Seismic hazards?			✓
B) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions?			✓
C) Subsidence of land (groundwater pumping or dewatering)?			✓
D) Unique geologic or physical features?			✓

Environmental Setting

Seismicity. The Sacramento General Plan Update (SGPU) Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) identifies all of the City of Sacramento as being subject to potential damage from earthquake groundshaking at a maximum intensity of VIII of the Modified Mercalli scale (SGPU DEIR, 1987, T-16). No active or potentially active faults are known to cross within close proximity to the project site.

Topography. Terrain in the City of Sacramento features very little relief (SGPU, DEIR, 1987, T-3). The potential for slope instability within the City of Sacramento is minor due to the relatively flat topography of the area.

Regional Geology. The surface geology of the project site consists of Pleistocene Alluvium (Victor Formation). The Victor Formation forms a broad plain between the Sacramento River and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountains (SGPU DEIR, T-1). It is a complex mixture of consolidated, ancient river-borne sediments of all textures (SGPU DEIR, T-1). Weathering subsequent to formation during the Ice Ages has typically caused a hardpan layer to develop near the surface, generally allowing only a moderate-to-low rate of rainwater infiltration (SGPU DEIR, T-1).

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact is considered significant if it allows a project to be built that will either introduce geologic or seismic hazards by allowing the construction of the project on such a site without protection against those hazards.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

Cities in California are required to consider seismic safety as part of the General Plan safety elements. The City of Sacramento recognizes that it is prudent for the City to prepare for seismic related hazards and has, therefore, adopted policies as a part of the General Plan, Health and Safety Element. These policies require that the City protect lives and property from unacceptable risk due to seismic and geologic activity or unstable soil conditions to the maximum extent feasible, that the City prohibit the construction of structures for permanent occupancy across faults, that soils reports and geologic investigations be required for multiple story buildings, and that construction adhere to the requirements of the Uniform Building Code that recognize State and Federal earthquake protection standards in construction.

The policies listed above are implemented through the building permit for new construction projects and reduce the potential significant health and safety impacts. The proposed project would not construct any new buildings or facilities. The buildings and structures on-site were constructed within the past ten years, and comply with the applicable building codes. No substantial new exposure to seismic hazards would result from the project. The impact of exposure to seismic hazards would be **less than significant.**

Question B

The proposed project would not change the physical facilities at the project site, and no grading or ground disturbance would occur. This impact is **less than significant.**

Question C

According to the SGPU DEIR, no significant subsidence of land had occurred within the City of Sacramento (T-13). State regulations and standards related to geotechnical considerations are reflected in the Sacramento City Code. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

Question D

The project site is generally level, and contains no unique geologic or physical features. The project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts from or to unique geologic or natural features.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on seismicity, soils, and geology.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
4. WATER *Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:* A) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface/stormwater runoff (e.g. during or after construction; or from material storage areas, vehicle fueling/maintenance areas, waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, etc.)?			✓
B) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?			✓
C) Discharge into surface waters or other alterations to surface water quality that substantially impact the temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefits, or cause harm to the biological integrity of the waters?			✓
D) Changes in flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff that cause environmental harm or significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?			✓
E) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?			✓

F)	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawal, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of recharge capability?			✓
G)	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?			✓
H)	Impacts to groundwater quality?			✓

Environmental Setting

Drainage/Surface Water. The project site is occupied by the existing recycling and transfer station, including impervious surfaces, buildings, and infrastructure. There is no surface water on the project site.

The existing facility currently complies with requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), which has primary responsibility for protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters within the City. The RWQCB's efforts are generally focused on preventing either the introduction of new pollutants or an increase in the discharge of existing pollutants into bodies of water that fall under its jurisdiction. RWQCB implements water quality standards and objectives that are in keeping with the State of California Standards.

The City of Sacramento has obtained a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board under the requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency and Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The goal of the permit is to reduce pollutants found in storm runoff. The general permit requires the permittee to employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) before, during, and after construction. The BMP document is available for review at the Department of Utilities, Engineering Services Division, 1395 35th Avenue, Sacramento, CA. Components of BMPs include:

- Maintenance of structures and roads;
- Flood control management;
- Comprehensive development plans;
- Grading, erosion and sediment control ordinances;
- Inspection and enforcement procedures;
- Educational programs for toxic material management;
- Reduction of pesticide use; and
- Site-specific structural and non-structural control measures.

The existing facility is subject to such requirements.

Flooding. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map

(FIRM) that the project site is within the Flood Zone XS. Flood Zone X is defined as: Areas of 500-year flood; areas of 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood.

Standards of Significance

Surface/Ground Water. For purposes of this environmental document, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increased sediments and other contaminants generated by consumption and/or operation activities.

Flooding. Substantially increase exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A, C, D, E, F and G

The proposed project would increase the allowable tonnage at the existing facility from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. The proposed project would not result in construction of new facilities or the addition of impervious surfaces to the project site. The proposed project would not change absorption rate or quality of discharge of stormwater to the drainage system, course or direction of water movements and would, therefore, have a **less-than-significant** impact on drainage and water quality.

Question B

The project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing facility. The project site is within the Flood Zone XS. Flood Zone X is defined as: Areas of 500-year flood; areas of 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood. The proposed project would not expose people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding, and would have a **less-than-significant** impact for such exposure.

Questions H

The proposed project would increase the allowable tonnage at the existing facility from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. The increase would not result in a substantial increase in water use, and no discharge to groundwater would result from the project. Dewatering or groundwater pumping is not proposed as a part of the project. Therefore, impacts to groundwater are anticipated to be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

This project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts to water resources.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
5. AIR QUALITY *Would the proposal:* A) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓
B) Exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants?			✓
C) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?			✓
D) Create objectionable odors?		✓	

Environmental Setting

The project area lies within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB). The climate of the SVAB is Mediterranean in character, with mild, rainy winter weather from November through March, and warm to hot, dry weather from May through September. The SVAB is subject to eight unique wind patterns. The predominant annual and summer wind pattern is the full sea breeze, commonly referred to as Delta breezes. Wind direction in the SVAB is influenced by the predominant wind flow pattern associated with the season.

The SVAB is subject to federal, state, and local regulations. Both the federal Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board classifies the SVAB as non-attainment for ozone and PM_{10} (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter). Carbon monoxide (CO) is designated as unclassified/attainment (California Air Resources Board, 1998). The project site is in Sacramento County, under the jurisdiction of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). The SMAQMD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws.

Air quality within the project area and surrounding region is largely influenced by urban emission sources. As there are minimal industrial emissions, and urban emission sources originate primarily from automobiles. Home fireplaces also contribute a significant portion of the air pollutants, particularly during the winter months. Air quality hazards are caused primarily by CO, PM_{10} and ozone, primarily as a result of motor vehicles. In 1998, the Sacramento area was within California Environmental Protection Agency attainment standards for all pollutants except ozone, which exceeded state standards on 42 days of the year. Although the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) is a non-attainment area for PM_{10}, it has not exceeded state or federal standards since 1991 (California Air Resources Board, 1999).

Standards of Significance

On March 28, 2002 the SMAQMD Board adopted revisions to the thresholds used in Sacramento County. Project-related air emissions are considered to have a significant effect if they result in concentrations that create either a violation of an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation.

Ozone and Particulate Matter. An increase of nitrogen oxides (NOx) above 85 pounds per day for short-term effects (construction) would result in a significant impact. An increase of either ozone precursor, nitrogen oxides (NOx) or reactive organic gases (ROG), above 65 pounds per day for long-term effects (operation) would result in a significant impact (as revised by SMAQMD, March 2002). The threshold of significance for PM_{10} is a concentration based threshold equivalent to the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS). For PM_{10}, a project would have a significant impact if it would emit pollutants at a level equal to or greater than five percent of the CAAQS (50 micrograms/cubic meter for 24 hours) if there were an existing or projected violation; however, if a project is below the ROG and NOx thresholds, it can be assumed that the project is below the PM_{10} threshold as well (SMAQMD, 2004).

Carbon Monoxide. The pollutant of concern for sensitive receptors is carbon monoxide (CO). Motor vehicle emissions are the dominant source of CO in Sacramento County (SMAQMD, 2004). For purposes of environmental analysis, sensitive receptor locations generally include parks, sidewalks, transit stops, hospitals, rest homes, schools, playgrounds and residences. Industrial or manufacturing buildings are generally not considered sensitive receptors. Carbon monoxide concentrations are considered significant if they exceed the 1-hour state ambient air quality standard of 20.0 parts per million (ppm) or the 8-hour state ambient standard of 9.0 ppm (state ambient air quality standards are more stringent than their federal counterparts).

Toxic Air Contaminants. The project would create a significant impact if it created a risk of 10 in 1 million for cancer.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at an existing recycling and transfer station. The existing facility is designed to process up to 2,500 tons per day of garbage and recycling materials, and the proposed project would not require new construction or expansion of the existing facilities. No additional equipment would be required for the operation. Existing equipment and personnel working on existing work shifts would be sufficient to handle the increased material loads. (Pers. comm. applicant, E. Edgar, 12/12/2005). Because no additional equipment would be used, and existing work shifts would be adequate to receive and process the increased garbage and recyclables, any additional emissions from the use of equipment for these purposes would be negligible.

Because there would be no new facilities constructed, the project would not result in any construction impacts.

It is expected that the increase in daily tonnage would result in an increase in the truck and self-haul vehicle traffic to and from the site. Air quality impacts from the proposed project would be caused by additional vehicle traffic generated by the increased daily tonnage.

The City conducted a traffic study for the proposed project, and identified the increase in vehicle traffic that would be generated if the project were approved. The traffic study used traffic generation estimates that provided the basis for analysis of impacts in the 1998 EIR for the original project, and estimates provided by the applicant for 2,500 TPD based on actual traffic at the facility. Table 1 identifies the increase in traffic from the original estimate if the project is approved (Traffic Study, page 5). Table 1 reflects an anticipated increase in self-haul vehicles, and a decrease in the number of transfer trailer trips, even though the daily tonnage would increase. See Table 1, below:

Table 1
Daily Trip Generation of Transfer Station Increase to 2,500 tons per day (tpd)
Including Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs)

	1,500 tpd		**2,500 tpd**		**Change Due to Project**	
Vehicle Types	**Vehicles**	**PCE Trips**	**Vehicles**	**PCE trips**	**Vehicles**	**PCEs**
Garbage/Recycling Collection Trucks	257	1,388	377	2,036	120	648
Self-Haul Vehicles	95	285	400	1,200	305	915
Transfer Trailer Trucks	115	851	103	762	(12)	(89)
Passenger vehicles	84	168	100	200	16	32
Total	**551**	**2,692**	**980**	**4,198**	**429**	**1,506**

Passenger car equivalents (PCEs) are used for traffic planning because larger vehicles have a greater impact on traffic conditions than passenger cars. These larger vehicles are assigned additional PCEs to take this into account. In the case of air quality, the more relevant reference is trips, which is twice the number of vehicles shown (i.e., one trip in, and one trip out for each

vehicle). The proposed project is estimated to result in 1,506 new PCEs. The proposed project would also result in 858 daily trips (429 trips to enter, 429 trips to exit), including 216 diesel truck trips (108 net trips X 2 = 216) and 642 light-duty truck trips (321 net trips X 2 = 642).

The proposed project would not change the land use for the project site. The typical method of estimating emissions is the URBEMIS software program, but this method is not useful here. The URBEMIS program provides estimates based on square footage for identified land uses, and the project would not change the square footage for any land use at the site.

An alternative method for estimating project emissions is available. The California Air Resources Board has developed the on-road motor vehicle emissions model (EMFAC, short for EMission FACtor). The primary function of EMFAC is to generate emission factor information for various vehicle classes, such as heavy-duty trucks and passenger cars. The EMFAC model provides data for each California air basin, including the Sacramento area. Emission factors, in terms of emissions per trip, are provided based on analysis of ten broad vehicle classes (e.g., light-duty passenger cars, light-duty trucks, diesel trucks).

Reactive organic gas (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions for the proposed project were estimated using the EMFAC model. The EMFAC model provides emissions for light duty passenger cars, light duty trucks, and heavy-duty diesel trucks in the form of tons of emissions per day, which can be translated to pounds per trip. This is then applied to the proposed project to calculate total emissions. Table 2 identifies the data used to compute the pounds per day (lbs/day) generation factor for ROG and NOx for each type of vehicle.

Table 2
EMFAC Calculations for Vehicles

	ROG		**NOx**	
Vehicle	**Tons/Day**	**Lbs/Trip**	**Tons/Day**	**Lbs/Trip**
Light Duty Passenger Car	11.41	.0071236	8.48	.0052943
Light Duty Truck	8.42	.0092988	8.26	.0091221
Diesel Truck	0.094	.006703	23.93	.170642

Source: Air Resources Board EMFAC Model (EMFAC2002); Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

In the case of both ROG and NOx emissions, light-duty trucks have a higher emissions generation factor than passenger vehicles. Because employees may drive such trucks to and from work, and because self-haul vehicles may include such trucks, the project emissions were calculated using the light-duty truck emission factors as shown in Table 3.

The project emissions for ROG and NOx, based on the EMFAC model and emission generation factors shown in Table 2, are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 ROG and NOx Emissions for Proposed Project					
Vehicles	**Trips/Day**	**ROG Rate per Trip**	**ROG Total**	**NOx Rate per Trip**	**NOx Total**
Light-duty trucks	642	.0092988	5.97	.0091221	5.86
Diesel Trucks	216	.0006703	.145	.170642	36.86
Total	**858**		**6.11 lbs/day**		**42.72 lbs/day**

The threshold for determining significance for both ROG and Nox is 65 pounds per day. The proposed project would increase ROG emissions by 6.11 pounds per day, and NOx emissions by 42.72 pounds per day. In each case, the emissions fall below the applicable threshold, and the impact is therefore considered **less than significant.**

The SMAQMD has identified screening techniques to identify projects that can be conservatively assumed not to be associated with significant emissions of CO, PM_{10} or other pollutants. In the case of CO, SMAQMD considers projects of the size and type that fall below the significance cut-points for ROG and NOx also to be insignificant for CO. (SMAQMD, Guide to Air Quality Assessment, 2004, page 5-2). The screening process is appropriate for projects where operational emissions come from increased vehicular traffic. (page 4-2)

The SMAQMD identifies various land use types as part of the screening process, and provides size cut-points for determining significance. The assumptions are based on average, default assumptions for modeling inputs using the URBEMIS 2002 model, and the size cut-points represent approximate sizes of projects for which total emissions may exceed the applicable threshold. As noted by SMAQMD, projects approaching or exceeding the levels set forth should undergo a more detailed analysis.

The screening levels identified by SMAQMD that would be relevant for the proposed project are set forth in Table 4, below.

Table 4 SMAQMD Screening Levels for Nox and ROG	
Land Use Development Type	**Screening Level**
Warehouse	2,100,000 square feet
Manufacturing	1,600,000 square feet
Industrial Park	1,215,000 square feet
Source: SMAQMD Guide to Air Quality Assessment, Table 4.2, page 4-3. Note that Table 4-2 identifies NOx screening level only. Text in introduction to Table 4.2 clearly indicates screening levels are based on 65 pounds per day operational threshold for both NOx and ROG.	

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage that could be processed at the existing facility, but would not increase the square footage of the Transfer Station. For air emissions screening, the total square footage of the existing facility was considered, thus treating it as a proposed facility for this purpose. The total square footage of the Transfer Station is 127,930 square feet, which falls well below any of the relevant screening cut-points.

As shown in Table 3, above, the proposed project's ROG and NOx emissions fall below the identified thresholds. The proposed project also falls well below the screening levels identified by SMAQMD for projects that could cause significant impacts. Based on SMAQMD guidance, impacts from PM10 and CO emissions are considered less than significant if the project falls below the significance levels established for ROG and NOx, which is the case here.

Based on the review of the project emissions and the applicable levels of significance, the impact for air emissions is **less than significant.**

Question B

The proposed project would increase vehicle traffic at the existing facility. The Traffic Study estimated that the facility would generate 240 daily trips (one in, one out) of garbage and recycling collection trucks (see Table 5, below, in Transportation discussion). It is reasonable to assume that many of these trucks would be powered by diesel engines.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified diesel PM as a toxic air contaminant in August 1998. This led to development of the Diesel Risk Reduction Plan to reduce diesel emissions from both new and existing diesel engines and vehicles, which was approved in September 2000. One of the key elements of the plan is to retrofit existing diesel engines in California to reduce diesel particulate emissions to near zero, in the shortest time possible. The program focuses on several control options (identified and discussed in the plan) such as the catalyst based diesel particulate filters or traps and other viable alternative technologies and fuels.

In 2003, the CARB passed the Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Regulation, which ensures that all refuse collection and recycling trucks using the project site must be retrofitted for PM reduction between 2004-2010. Title 13, California Code of Regulations, Sections 2020 et seq. The CARB has estimated that this regulation will result in an 85% PM reduction and a substantial NOx reduction. Trucks that cannot be retrofitted with CARB-approved best available control technology must be replaced by December 31, 2009.

The federal Environmental Protection Agency conducted an assessment that examined information regarding the possible health hazards associated with exposure to diesel engine exhaust (DE), which is a mixture of gases and particles. The assessment concluded that long-term (i.e., chronic) inhalation exposure is likely to pose a lung cancer hazard to humans, as well as damage the lung in other ways depending on exposure. (EPA, Health Assessment Document for Diesel Fuel Exhaust, 2002) Exposure to TACs from the proposed project could occur due to stationary source emissions (e.g., on-site generators), area sources (e.g., piles of materials at the facility) or mobile sources (e.g., diesel trucks).

The SMAQMD has jurisdiction over the permitting of stationary sources, and would regulate area sources at the facility. The Transfer Station does not grind, crush or otherwise physically process the garbage and recyclables at the facility. Garbage is transferred on the floor from collection trucks to transfer trucks; recyclables are separated and transferred to trucks that carry materials to market. While there is some risk of exposure to materials that would pose a hazard to human health, the risk is on a small scale and is handled by the emergency programs the facility is required to maintain. See, in this regard, the discussion on this document under Hazards. For these reasons, the risk of TACs from stationary or mobile sources is less than significant.

While an increase in the allowable daily tonnage at the Transfer Station would result in increased traffic at the facility, not all of the resulting traffic would be generated by the facility itself, but instead would be redirected to the facility from other locations. This could result because of customer convenience (e.g., proximity of residence to the facility), cost or other factors.

The presence of landfills and transfer stations is a response to solid waste generated by residences and businesses; increasing the capacity of a particular transfer station, as proposed here, would not result in the generation of additional solid waste, but would result in re-directing some of the solid waste already produced in the community to the Transfer Station. Many, if not most, of the collection trucks, therefore, are already in operation and collecting waste, but they are delivering it to other transfer stations or landfills. It is also likely that many, if not most, of the self-haul vehicle trips would be made with or without the facility.

All of the vehicles that visit the Transfer Station utilize the local roadway system. The proposed project would generate additional trips by garbage and collection trucks, and, as recognized in the Traffic Study, these trips would affect vicinity intersections. The most likely impact from TACs, therefore, would be focused on the site itself, and would decrease as the distance from the facility increases, as the various route alternatives come into play. There are no sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, residences, hospitals) in close proximity to the project site. The closest residences to the project site are located approximately 3,000 feet east on Fruitridge Road.

Concern regarding exposure to diesel exhaust has recently been addressed in the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*, issued by the California Air Resources Board, 2005. The Handbook recommends that local communities include exposure to freeways and high-traffic roadways as a factor in siting residential development. While the Handbook does not propose specific thresholds, it recommends that local agencies avoid siting sensitive land uses within 500 feet of freeways with 100,000 trips per day, or rural roadways with 50,000 trips per day. As noted in the discussion above, the additional trips by diesel trucks that would occur due to the proposed project would most likely be redirected, and would not approach the order of magnitude identified by the CARB as a concern for exposure.

The number of additional trips generated by the facility would be limited, and the exposure of any specific resident would be reduced by the various routes available to each truck in question. The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at an existing recycling and

transfer station. The facility is located in an urbanized portion of the City of Sacramento, with adjacent industrial and commercial uses. No sensitive receptors are located near the project site. The proposed project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs or other pollutants, and the impact would be **less than significant.**

Question C

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at an existing recycling and transfer facility, and would generate additional truck and self-haul vehicle traffic. The increase in such traffic would not be sufficient to alter air movement, moisture, temperature, or create any change in climate, either locally or regionally, and any impact would be **less than significant.**

Question D

The proposed project would increase the daily allowable tonnage for processing at the facility. The proposed project would not generate any new sources of odor, because the types of materials received for processing at the facility would remain unchanged. The project site is located in an area committed to industrial activities. The closest residence located approximately 2,000 feet southeast of the project site on Unsworth Avenue, a single-family residence located on land zoned M-2. The nearest residential neighborhood is located approximately 3,000 feet west of the project on either side of Fruitridge Road.

The increase in allowable tonnage could, however, increase the risk that potentially offensive odors could be generated by the facility, and this is a **potentially significant** impact.

All types of municipal solid waste can emit odors, but wet waste is particularly odorous, and can be malodorous.[1] The presence of waste materials that emit strong odors could affect neighboring properties, and materials that are malodorous would be of greater concern. Reducing the potential impact can be achieved by ensuring that <u>malodorous</u> materials are removed from the tipping floor at the end of each work day, and ensuring that <u>any waste materials</u> do not remain on the tipping floor nor on the site for more than 48 hours, thus reducing the time any such materials spend on the project site. The mitigation measure set forth below would implement such requirements.

The mitigation measure set forth below would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level.

[1] "Odorous" and "odiferous" are each defined as having a distinctive odor; "odoriferous" is defined as having or giving off an odor. "Malodorous" is defined as having a bad odor; stinking. Webster's New World Dictionary, 1996.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1 The operators of the facility shall prioritize the processing and transport of all materials, such as the City municipal solid waste, to ensure that these materials do not remain on tipping floor or project site for more than 48 hours. The operators of the facility shall remove all malodorous waste from the tipping floor at the end of each working day.

AQ-2 A ventilation system shall continue to be utilized to maintain pressure within the enclosed building where waste is tipped and processed.

AQ-3 A light misting system shall be utilized in the area of the municipal solid waste tipping areas to minimize dust and odors.

Findings

With implementation of the mitigation measures set forth above, the project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact to air quality.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION *Would the proposal result in:* A) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?			✓
B) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			✓
C) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?			✓
D) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?			✓
E) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?			✓
F) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			✓
G) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?			

			✓

Environmental Setting

Roadway System

Regional access to the project site is provided via U.S. Highway 50, State Route 99 and Interstate 80. Local access is provided by the following roadways:

Power Inn Road is a four-lane, north/south arterial extending from Folsom Boulevard to Calvine Road. The roadway becomes Howe Avenue to the north of Folsom Boulevard.

State Route 16 (Jackson Highway) is an east/west highway that passes north of the project site and provides access from downtown Sacramento.

Florin Perkins Road is a north/south arterial from Folsom Boulevard to Gerber Road and provides primary access to the project site. The facility is four-lanes through the project area with a left-turn lane at most cross streets.

Folsom Boulevard is an east/west arterial that parallels U.S. Highway 50. The roadway is four lanes in the project area with a center turn lane throughout.

Fruitridge Road is an east/west collector road, consisting of four lanes with a center turn lane in the project area.

Howe Avenue is an extension of Power Inn Road north of Folsom Boulevard. The roadway functions as a four-lane expressway near the American River and becomes a six-lane arterial near Fair Oaks Boulevard.

65th Street Expressway is a four-lane expressway in the project area.

84th Street is a north/south collector road from Fruitridge Road to 24th Avenue. It has one lane in each direction and serves the project site and adjacent industrial uses.

Florin Road is an east/west two-lane roadway that extends from Sunrise Boulevard to Interstate 5.

Watt Avenue is a north/south arterial extending from northern Sacramento County to the Elk grove area. South of Jackson Highway the roadway becomes South Watt Avenue and then Elk grove-Florin Road south of the project area. Watt Avenue is six lanes in the project area and connects directly to U.S. Highway 50.

Elder Creek Road is an east/west two-lane roadway connecting much of the southeast area of Sacramento.

Other Transportation

Regional Transit provides bus service to the project area.

Class II (on-street) bikeways exist on portions of Jackson Road, Florin Perkins Road, Power Inn

Road, South Watt Avenue, Fruitridge Road and Folsom Boulevard that provide bicyclists with connections to the regional bikeway system. There are no existing or planned bikeway facilities adjacent to the project site.

Standard of Significance

The City of Sacramento has established a level of service standard for intersections of LOS C.

The level of service is based on the average control delay at signalized and unsignalized intersections. As stated in the City's *Traffic Impact Guidelines* (February 1996), a significant traffic impact occurs under the following conditions:

- The addition of project-generated traffic causes a facility to change from LOS A, B, or C to LOS D, E, or F, or
- The addition of project-generated traffic increases the average stopped delay by five seconds or more at an intersection already operating worse than LOS C.

Regional Transit. An impact is considered significant if the project will cause the transit boardings to increase beyond the crush load of a transit vehicle or if the project will cause a 10% or greater increase in travel time along any route.

Bikeways. An impact is considered significant if implementation of the project will disrupt or interfere with existing or planned (BMP) bicycle or pedestrian facilities or if the project is to result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists, including unsafe bicycle/pedestrian or bicycle/motor vehicle conflicts.

Parking. A significant impact to parking would occur if the anticipated parking demand of the project exceeds the available or planned parking supply.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A

The proposed project would increase the maximum daily tonnage of solid waste and recyclables that could be received at the existing facility from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. The increase in allowable daily tonnage would result in an increase in truck and self-haul personal vehicle traffic to the project site.

The City of Sacramento prepared a traffic study for the proposed project. Technical Memorandum, December 7, 2005, Fehr & Peers (Traffic Study). See Attachment D.

Four types of vehicles constitute the traffic generated at the Transfer Station:

- Garbage/recycling collection trucks: These collect garbage and recycling materials at curbside and deposit materials at the Transfer Station. Collection trucks for garbage enter with approximate total weight of 7-8 tons; recycling collection trucks enter with an approximate total weight of 4-5 tons.
- Self-haul vehicles: The typical self-haul vehicle is a pickup truck or car/truck with trailer. Self-haul vehicles typically weigh in at 250 to 1,000 pounds per load.

- Transfer trailer truck: These trucks carry garbage to a landfill destination, or recyclables to market, and usually weigh approximately 20 tons.
- Employee vehicles: These are automobiles and light trucks.

The increase in daily tonnage would generate additional traffic at the Transfer Station. The additional traffic would consist of additional garbage and recycling collection trucks, transfer trucks, and self-haul vehicles. While there would an increase in employment, from 84 up to 100 employees, associated with the project, the City of Sacramento previously prepared an environmental impact report for the original project, which analyzed project impacts associated with approximately 100 employees, and which was certified in September 1998 by the City Council. The traffic study prepared in connection with this proposed expansion in daily tonnage determined that the increase in employee vehicles would not be significant.

The Transportation Research Board (TRB), National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) and the American Association of State Highway Transportation officials (AASHTO) have determined that truck traffic reduces intersection capacity during peak periods, particularly at congested intersections. In order to quantify this effect, trucks are converted to passenger car equivalents (PCE) for analysis. The following factors are considered in the conversion:

- Truck size;
- Roadway type (e.g., width, grade);
- Total traffic volume; and
- Vehicle fleet mix (i.e., types of vehicles on the road).[2]

The project's impact was identified based on the increase in traffic that would result with approval of the project. The following table shows the trip generation of the site approved in the EIR for 1,500 tons per day, and the anticipated traffic generated if the Transfer Station is approved for 2,500 daily tons.[3] Table 1 identifies additional vehicles and PCEs that would be generated by the proposed project, based on estimates analyzed in the EIR for the original project.

Table 5
Daily Trip Generation of Transfer Station Increase to 2,500 tons per day (tpd)
Including Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs)

	1,500 tpd		2,500 tpd		Change Due to Project	
Vehicle Types	**Vehicles**	**PCE**	**Vehicles**	**PCE**	**Vehicles**	**PCEs**

[2] Draft Environmental Impact Report, BLT Enterprises of Sacramento, Inc.'s Sacramento Recycling and Transfer Station, SCH 98012046, June 1998, p. 6.3-21

[3] The EIR analyzed the impacts of 551 total trips (one-way); the Addendum identified 544 total trips with an increase to 2,000 TPD, based on experience at the facility; and the proposed project is estimated to generate a total of 980 trips. The analysis here compares the proposed project with trips estimated in the original EIR.

		Trips		trips		
Garbage/Recycling Collection Trucks	257	1,388	377	2,036	120	648
Self-Haul Vehicles	95	285	400	1,200	305	915
Transfer Trailer Trucks	115	851	103	762	(12)	(89)
Passenger vehicles	84	168	100	200	16	32
Total	**551**	**2,692**	**980**	**4,198**	**429**	**1,506**

The Traffic Study analyzed the potential impact of the proposed project on four intersections in the project vicinity (see Attachment D, Figure 1):

- Frutiridge Road/Florin Perkins Road
- Fruitridge Road/84th Street
- Fruitridge Road/Power Inn Road
- Jackson Highway (SR 16)/Florin Perkins Road

The existing traffic levels during the a.m. (7:00 – 9:00 a.m.) and p.m. (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) peak hours, which include traffic generated by the existing facility, were identified through traffic counts collected in October 2005. The study intersections were analyzed using methodology presented in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (2000 HCM), Transportation Research Board 2000. In addition to estimating the number of trips that would be generated by the proposed project, the Traffic Study estimated the trip distribution on local roadways (page 7), and cumulative impacts when combined with other projects in the vicinity (page 5).

New trips generated by the proposed project during the AM and PM peak hours were added to existing traffic volumes based on trip generation and distribution assumptions, as set forth in the Traffic Study. Table 2 identifies the level of service (LOS) at each of the study intersections under existing conditions, and with the proposed project.

Table 2
Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Conditions LOS		Existing Plus Project LOS	
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM peak	PM peak
Fruitridge Rd/Florin Perkins Rd	Signal	D	D	D	D
Fruitridge Rd/84th St	Signal	C	C	C	C
Fruitridge Rd/Power Inn Rd	Signal	C	D	C	D
Jackson Rd (SR16)/Florin Perkins Road	Signal	C	D	C	D

As shown, the following study intersections operate below City (LOS C) standards under existing plus conditions:

-- Fruitridge Road/Florin Perkins Road continues to operate at LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours with the proposed SRTS expansion (less than a 5 second increase in delay)

-- Fruitridge Road/Power Inn Road continues to operate at LOS D during the PM peak hour with the proposed SRTS expansion (less than a 5 second increase in delay)

-- Jackson Road/Florin Perkins Road continues to operate at LOS D during the PM peak hour with the proposed SRTS expansion (less than a 5 second increase in delay)

Because the additional traffic generated by the proposed project would not result in a reduction of existing level of service, or a greater than 5-second stopped delay, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact to the transportation system within the study area.

Questions B & E

The proposed project would increase the daily allowable tonnage at the existing site, but would not include construction of any new physical improvements, and no new hazards due to design features or conflicts with incompatible uses would be created. The proposed project would not construct any physical features that would create barriers or hazards to pedestrians or bicyclists.

Potential impacts arising from hazards due to design features or bicycle/pedestrian conflicts with motor vehicles are therefore considered **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

Question C

Existing road infrastructure provides adequate emergency access to the existing facility on the project site. The proposed project would utilize the existing access to the site. The project site has been designed to appropriate standards, to the satisfaction of the City of Sacramento's Development Services Department, Development Engineering and Finance Division and Fire Department. Potential emergency access impacts are **less than significant**.

Question D

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage that could be received at the existing facility. <u>The increase in allowable daily tonnage would result in an increase in employment at the facility from 84 to 100 employees.</u> No increase in parking capacity would be required. The project site is improved with 179 parking spaces. These spaces are adequate for employees and occasional visitors to the project site. The project would have a **less-than-**

significant parking impact on parking.

Question F

The proposed project would not generate a new demand for public transit services. While additional employment would result from the proposed project, this would not be substantial in relation to existing employment in the project area. Motorized vehicles are the sole means of transporting materials to and from the facility. The impact on public transit services would be **less than significant.**

Question G

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing recycling and transfer station. Recycling and solid waste would continue to be delivered via private automobile and trailers, and trucks, and there would be a **less-than-significant** impact on rail, waterborne or air traffic.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts to transportation or circulation.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES *Would the proposal result in impacts to:* A) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals and birds)?			✓
B) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage or City street trees)?			✓
C) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?			✓

Environmental Setting

The project site is occupied by the existing recycling and transfer facility in an urbanized portion of the City of Sacramento. The project site is substantially developed with a building and impervious surfaces.

Standards of Significance

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact would be significant if any of the following conditions or potential thereof, would result with implementation of the proposed project:

- Creation of a potential health hazard, or use, production or disposal of materials that would pose a hazard to plant or animal populations in the area affected;
- Substantial degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of the habitat, reduction of population below self-sustaining levels of threatened or endangered species of plant or animal;
- Affect other species of special concern to agencies or natural resource organizations (such as regulatory waters and wetlands); or
- Violate the Heritage Tree Ordinance (City Code 12:64.040).

For the purposes of this report, “special-status” has been defined to include those species, which are:

- Listed as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species act (or formally proposed for, or candidates for, listing);
- Listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (or proposed for listing);
- Designated as endangered or rare, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (Section 1901);
- Designated as fully protected, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code (Section 3511, 4700, or 5050);
- Designated as species of concern by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), or as species of special concern to California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG);
- Plants or animals that meet the definitions of rare or endangered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A-C

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing recycling and transfer station. No construction is proposed as part of the project, and no trees would be affected. The project would not increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the project site. The project is zoned for industrial uses, and is located in an urbanized area zoned for such uses. Due to the previous site disturbance, no wetland habitat exists on the site, and there are no endangered, threatened or rare species on the project site. The project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on biological resources.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact to biological resources.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
8. ENERGY *Would the proposal result in impacts to*: A) Power or natural gas?			✓
B) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?			✓
C) Substantial increase in demand of existing sources of energy or require the development of new sources of energy?			✓

Environmental Setting

The project site is developed with an existing recycling and transfer facility, and is served with natural gas, electricity, and other urban infrastructure. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) is the

natural gas utility for the City of Sacramento. The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) supplies electricity to the City of Sacramento. SMUD operates a variety of hydroelectric, photovoltaic, geothermal and co-generation powerplants. Major electrical transmission lines are located in the northeastern portion of the City of Sacramento.

Standards of Significance

Gas Service. A significant environmental impact would result if a project would require PG&E to secure a new gas source beyond their current supplies.

Electrical Services. A significant environmental impact would occur if a project resulted in the need for a new electrical source (e.g., hydroelectric and geothermal plants).

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A - C

The proposed project is developed with an existing recycling and transfer station, and is served with urban services and utilities. The project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the site from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. Operating hours at the facility would remain the same, and no new equipment would be required to process the additional tonnage. Operating hours would not be changed, and existing equipment would be utilized in processing the increase in daily tonnage. The increase in allowable daily tonnage would not substantially increase energy needs at the facility. Therefore a **less-than-significant** impact to energy resources is expected.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Findings

The project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on energy resources.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
9. HAZARDS *Would the proposal involve:*			

A)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?		✓	
B)	Possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?			✓
C)	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?		✓	
D)	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?		✓	
E)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?			✓

Environmental Setting

The project site is improved with an existing recycling and transfer facility. The existing facility is permitted to process a maximum of 2,000 tons per day (TPD) of municipal solid waste.

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this document, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would:

- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated soil during construction activities;
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to asbestos-containing materials; or
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to existing contaminated groundwater during de-watering activities; or
- expose people (e.g., residents, pedestrians, construction workers) to increase fire hazards.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A, C & D

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage of the existing recycling and transfer station from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. No construction or physical change to the facility is proposed, and the operating hours would remain unchanged. It is anticipated that

the increase in allowable daily tonnage would result in an increase in truck and self-haul vehicle traffic, but no other operational impacts are expected.

The proposed project would not result in new types of hazards at the existing facility. The types of vehicles that would travel to and from the facility would not change. Universal wastes would be received and processed at the facility, but this is due to a regulatory change, and would occur with or without the project.

Universal wastes and electronic wastes will be managed at the facility. Changing state regulations has created this new class of wastes (computer screens, televisions, thermostats, fluorescent lighting tubes, and batteries) whose content of certain hazardous components (e.g., mercury and cadmium) requires special handling but not a hazardous waste permit should certain requirements be met for the handling of the materials prior to transport to a recycling facility. The goal of the Universal Waste Rule is to prevent landfilling and encourage recycling by allowing the proper storage of this waste stream to occur at Solid Waste Facility. The Transfer Station will provide temporary storage adjacent to the tipping pad of universal waste adjacent to the tipping pad, with transport to the on-site HHW Collection Facility at the end of the day. The storage of the universal waste complying with the state minimum standards:

- Storage less than 90 days,
- Marking or labeling receipt date,
- Inventory control system, and
- Maintaining a specific accumulation area.

Hazardous and universal wastes encountered as part of the site's Load Checking Program are temporarily stored for up to 90 days in appropriate containers within the HHW Collection Facility the pending transferring to a certified recycling facility.

Municipal and commercial wastes received at the recycling and transfer station consist primarily of non-hazardous materials

Operation of the facility includes the transfer of municipal solid waste and the acceptance of household hazardous waste. Other than household hazardous waste, hazardous chemicals and chemical feed stocks are unlikely to be used by the general public or be present in the waste streams hauled to the facility, and such hazards are not likely to be present in the waste stream. While this risk is minimal, such materials could occasionally be received, and released at the facility, and could pose a hazard to workers, off-site receptors or the general public through exposure to such substances, fire or explosion.

The facility would remain subject to federal, State and local regulatory requirements and standards related to the identification and handling of such substances. Although the proposed project would increase the total daily permitted capacity of the facility, potentially hazardous materials would still be expected to arrive in only small quantities.

The municipal and commercial waste stream handled at the facility could contain infectious waste,

or biohazards, including medical waste. Contact with potentially infectious materials could expose individuals to disease-carrying organisms or infection. This is a **potentially significant** impact.

The following mitigation measure addresses activities of the applicant/operator, and would reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant** level:

Mitigation Measure for Hazards

Hazard 1 All employees, particularly sorters and other personnel on the tipping floor, shall be advised of the potential hazards and types of personal protective equipment (PPE) and respiratory protection necessary to control any exposures, and trained in identification, proper handling, and reporting. The Respiratory Protection Program shall include a provision that all sorters and workers on the tipping floor be provided with appropriate air-purifying particulate respirators that protect against penetration by bloodborne pathogens, or other harmful solid and liquid particles as certified under the provisions of 42 CFRR Part 84. Individuals potentially exposed shall be immediately tested by an occupational physician or other trained medical personnel. All sorters shall be included in a medical surveillance program and examined as necessary.

Questions B & E

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing facility. No construction or change in operations is proposed as part of the project. The project site is substantially developed with buildings and impervious surfaces.

The project is served by area roadways and has adequate access to emergency services and evacuation routes. The proposed project would not affect such access, and, and would not interfere with any emergency evacuation plan.

The proposed project would not change the hours of operation or increase the fire hazard at the project site. The facility would remain subject to the Uniform Fire Code standards.

The proposed project would affect emergency evacuation routes or increase fire hazards, and any impacts would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

With implementation of the identified mitigation measure, the proposed project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts regarding hazards.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
10. NOISE *Would the proposal result in:* A) Increases in existing noise levels? Short-term Long Term			 ✓ ✓
B) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? Short-term Long Term			 ✓ ✓

Environmental Setting

The project site is occupied by an existing recycling and transfer station. The facility conducts operations within a single building of approximately 127,930 -square feet. Most of the properties adjacent to the Transfer Station have been developed with industrial, manufacturing and warehousing uses. Fruitridge Boulevard abuts the parcel to the south, and provides access to the site for vehicular traffic. The Packard Bell/NEC complex, formerly the Sacramento Army depot, is located south of Fruitridge Boulevard directly across from the site.

The General Plan designation for the site is Heavy Commercial or Warehouse; zoning for the site is M-2 (S) (Heavy Industrial).

Standards of Significance

Thresholds of significance are those established by the Title 24 standards and by the City's General Plan Noise Element and the City Noise Ordinance. Noise and vibration impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would be considered significant if they cause any of the following results:

- Exterior noise levels at the proposed project, which are above the upper value of the normally acceptable category for various land uses (SGPU DEIR AA-27) caused by noise level increases due to the project.

- Occupied existing and project residential and commercial areas are exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to project construction;

- Project residential and commercial areas are exposed to vibration peak particle velocities greater than 0.5 inches per second due to highway traffic and rail operations; and

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A and B

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing recycling and transfer station from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. No construction or physical improvements are proposed as part of the project, and the operating hours of the facility would remain unchanged.

The increase in allowable tonnage would result in increased truck and self-haul vehicle traffic, but the additional traffic would be of the same character and type generated by the existing use. The additional traffic would generate additional noise, but surrounding properties are committed to industrial use, and no sensitive receptors would be affected by noise from the project site. Additional traffic generated by the proposed project would utilize surface streets, but increases in traffic would not be substantial, and the additional noise generated by such traffic would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not result in substantial increases in noise generated at the project site or elsewhere, and the impacts of noise would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts regarding noise.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
11. PUBLIC SERVICES *Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:* A) Fire protection?			✓
B) Police protection?			✓
C) Schools?			✓
D) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?			✓

E) Other governmental services?			✓

Environmental Setting

The project site is occupied by an existing recycling and transfer station, and is served by the City of Sacramento Fire Department and Police Department.

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this report, an impact would be considered significant if the project resulted in the need for new or altered services related to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, roadway maintenance, or other governmental services.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A - E

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing recycling and transfer station from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. No change in the hours of operation would result. The proposed project would not result in the need for an alteration to existing services nor would it result in the need to construct any new facilities to provide additional services. The proposed project is consistent with the existing land use, and the General Plan and zoning designations for the project site. Therefore, a **less-than-significant** impact on public services is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts to public services.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
12. UTILITIES *Would the proposal result in the need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following*			

utilities: A) Communication systems?			✓
B) Local or regional water supplies?			✓
C) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?			✓
D) Sewer or septic tanks?			✓
E) Storm water drainage?			✓
F) Solid waste disposal?			✓

Environmental Setting

Telephone. SBC provides telephone service to the project site and throughout the surrounding area. Telephone service to the project area is provided primarily with aboveground transmission lines.

Water. The City has the rights to enough water to supply growth within the City limits until buildout and beyond

Stormwater and Sewage Drainage. The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) provides sewage treatment for the cities of Folsom and Sacramento and County Sanitation District (CSD)-1, which serve the unincorporated urban portions of the County and portions of Sacramento. The SRCSD is responsible for the operation of all regional interceptors and wastewater treatment plants, while local collection districts operate the systems that transport less than 10 million gallons of waste flow daily.

Solid Waste. The project is required to meet the City's Recycling and Solid Waste Disposal Regulations (Chapter 17.72 of the Zoning Ordinance). The proposed project involves an increase in the allowable daily tonnage for the existing recycling and transfer station.

Standards of Significance

For purposes of this environmental document, an impact is considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Result in a detriment to microwave, radar, or radio transmissions;
- Create an increase in water demand of more than 10 million gallons per day;
- Substantially degrade water quality;
- Generate more than 500 tons of solid waste per year; or
- Generate storm water that would exceed the capacity of the storm water system.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Question A-F

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage for the existing recycling and transfer station from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. No physical changes or construction at the site are proposed, and the operating hours of the facility would remain the same. The project site is served by a full range of urban services, and no substantial change in demand for such services would occur as a result of the project.

The impact on utilities would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts to utility systems.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
13. AESTHETICS, LIGHT AND GLARE *Would the proposal:* A) Affect a scenic vista or adopted view corridor?			✓
B) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?			✓
C) Create light or glare?			✓
D) Create shadows on adjacent property?			✓

Environmental Setting

The project site has been developed with a single structure with approximately 127,930 square feet of enclosed space, and other facilities for the operation of a recycling and transfer station. The project site is located in an area developed with warehouse, manufacturing and industrial uses.

Standards of Significance

Visual impacts would include obstruction of a significant view or viewshed or the introduction of a façade which lacks visual interest and compatibility which would be visible from a public gathering or viewing area.

Shadows. New shadows from developments are generally considered to be significant if they would shade a recognized public gathering place (e.g., park) or place residences/child care centers in complete shade.

Glare. Glare is considered to be significant if it would be cast in such a way as to cause public hazard or annoyance for a sustained period of time.

Light. Light is considered significant if it would be cast onto oncoming traffic or residential uses.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A-D

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing facility from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. No physical change would be made in the existing facility or lighting, and the operating hours of the facility would remain unchanged. The project site is not in an adopted view corridor or a scenic vista. For these reasons, impacts for aesthetics, light and glare would be **less-than-significant.**

The proposed project would not result in an alteration of the project site or lighting at the site.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The project is expected to have a **less-than-significant** impact to aesthetics, light, or glare.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
14. CULTURAL RESOURCES *Would the proposal:*			✓

A)	Disturb paleontological resources?			
B)	Disturb archaeological resources?			✓
C)	Affect historical resources?			✓
D)	Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?			✓
E)	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?			✓

Environmental Setting

The project site is occupied by a recycling and transfer station.

Standards of Significance

Cultural resource impacts may be considered significant if the proposed project would result in one or more of the following:

1. Cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or

2. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A - E

The proposed project would increase the allowable daily tonnage at the existing recycling and transfer station from 2,000 tons per day (TPD) to 2,500 TPD. No physical change would be made in the existing facility, and no ground disturbance would occur. There are no historic structures on the project site, and the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on cultural or historic resources.

Findings

The project would have **less-than-significant** impacts on cultural resources.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Impact Unless	Less-than-significant

Issues:	Impact	Mitigated	Impact
15. RECREATION *Would the proposal:* A) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?			✓
B) Affect existing recreational opportunities?			✓

Environmental Setting

There are no existing recreational amenities within the project site. The project site is occupied an existing recycling and transfer station.

Standards of Significance

Recreation impacts would be considered significant if the project created a new demand for additional recreational facilities or affected existing recreational opportunities.

Answers to Checklist Questions

Questions A and B

There are no existing recreational amenities within the project site. The proposed project would not result in new construction on the site. The increase in allowable daily tonnage would result in an increase in employment at the facility from 84 to 100 employees. The increase in employment, and the potential for attracting new residents to the community with resulting increases in the demand for recreational facilities, would not be substantial in relation to the population of the community. Therefore, recreational impacts would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Findings

The proposed project would result in **less-than-significant** impacts to recreational resources.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less-than-significant Impact
16. 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 a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Disturb paleontological resources?			✓
B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?			✓
C. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			✓
D. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✓

Mandatory Findings of Significance Discussion

A. The project does not include any new construction or installation of impervious surfaces. The project would result in additional vehicle trips to and from the project site, but these would not be significant in terms of air quality, noise or traffic impacts. There are no known paleontological or cultural resources on the site.

B. As discussed in the preceding sections, the project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

C. When impacts are considered along with, or in combination with other impacts, the project-related impacts are less-than-significant. The proposed project will not add substantially to any cumulative effects. Project related impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level; therefore cumulative effects are not considered a significant impact.

D. The project does not have environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The site receives municipal solid waste and recyclables, and hazardous materials may occasionally be present in small quantities. The proposed project is required to comply with all applicable laws concerning hazardous materials.

SECTION IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below potentially would be affected by this project.

___	Land Use and Planning	✓	Hazards
___	Population and Housing	___	Noise
___	Geological Problems	___	Public Services
___	Water	___	Utilities and Service Systems
✓	Air Quality	___	Aesthetics, Light & Glare
___	Transportation/Circulation	___	Cultural Resources
___	Biological Resources	___	Recreation
___	Energy and Mineral Resources	___	Mandatory Findings of Significance
___	None Identified		

SECTION V. DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial evaluation:

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

X 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 the project-specific mitigation measures described in Section III 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 is required.

_____ _____

Signature Date

Tom Buford

Printed Name